

A PROVINCIAL SCHOOL OF ART AND LOCAL INDUSTRY:
THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL OF ART AND ITS RELATIONS
WITH THE GLASS INDUSTRY OF THE STOURBRIDGE DISTRICT, 1850-1905

by

JAMES SCOTT MEASELL

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
April 2016

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

Founded in 1851, the Stourbridge School of Art offered instruction in drawing, art and design to students engaged in industries, especially glass. Using social history methodology and primary sources such as Government reports, local newspapers and school records, this thesis explores the school's development from 1850 to 1905 and explicates its relationships with the local glass industry.

Within the context of political, economic, social and cultural forces, the school contributed to the town's civic culture and was supported by gentry, clergy and industrialists. The governing Council held public meetings and art exhibitions and dealt with management issues. Working class men attended evening classes. Women from wealthy families attended morning classes.

This thesis argues that a fundamental disconnect existed between the school's purpose (art instruction to train designers) and its instruction (basic drawing and fine art). The school enrolled men employed in glass decorating but few from glass manufacturing. Classes reflected the South Kensington curriculum, and the art masters were unaware of the design needs of industry. Glass manufacturing firms provided modest financial support but did not encourage employees to attend, creating frustration for the Council. In contrast, similar schools in Brierley Hill and Wordsley were well-supported by the glass industry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I must thank my academic supervisor, Dr Malcolm Dick. From our first email correspondence in the early fall of 2012 to the completion of this thesis, Dr Dick provided expert guidance regarding sources and helpful suggestions regarding methodology and interpretation that furthered the goals of this study.

My interest in the history of the Stourbridge School of Art began in the late 1980s when I first studied the life and times of Harry Northwood, a Stourbridge School student who emigrated to America in 1881 and became a famous glassmaker. Northwood's granddaughter, Elizabeth Northwood Robb, and other Northwood family members shared documents and memories. David Richardson, president of Antique Publications, helped bring my books on Harry Northwood's glassmaking career to reality, and Holly McCluskey, curator of glass at Oglebay Institute's Mansion Museum in Wheeling, West Virginia, was always interested in Northwood glass.

As a 'distance learning' student, I was amazed at the ease of online access to primary and secondary sources through the University of Birmingham library and via Google Books, Google Scholar, or ProQuest. I am grateful for the cooperation of staff members at the repositories of materials that were consulted in my research: the Dudley Archives and Local History Centre; The Hive in Worcester; the National Archives at Kew; the National Art Library; the Sandwell Community History and Archives Service; and, most especially, the Stourbridge Public Library, where I enjoyed many sessions with microfilm reels of the nineteenth-century newspapers. A special thanks is due ophthalmologist Brenda Jones, MD, for the cataract surgery that enabled my eyesight to cope with aged newspapers on microfilm. Librarians at Marietta College and at the Rakow Library/Corning Museum of Glass helped with interlibrary loans.

I must acknowledge the splendid research and writing of journalist/historian H. J. 'Jack' Haden (1916-2005), and I wish I had known him. Friends in England offered assistance with various aspects of this research project: Brian Clarke, Jane Cooksey, Roger Dodsworth, Charles Hajdamach, Stan Hill, Kari Moodie, John Northwood III, and John V. Sanders. At 'The Willows' in Oldswinford, Stourbridge, Wendy and Tom Rickard provided comfortable lodging, a good breakfast, and friendly conversation during my research trips.

My earliest efforts in historical research were encouraged and supported in the 1960s by professors at Muskingum College and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, so I owe a debt of thanks to them: King W. Broadrick, Otto A. L. Dieter, James L. Golden, Richard P. Murphy, Marie Hochmuth Nichols, Karl R. Wallace, and Joseph W. Wenzel. During my university teaching and research career at Wayne State University during 1970-1997, George V. Bohman and George W. Ziegelmueeller were colleagues and friends, and they always supported my research projects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
	Review of Literature	3
	Government Schools of Art	3
	Provincial Schools of Art and Technical Education	11
	The Glass Industry of the Stourbridge District	18
	Methodology and Sources	22
	Plan of this Study	30
TWO	NINETEENTH-CENTURY STOURBRIDGE: A CONTEXTUAL OVERVIEW	34
	Industrialisation and Urbanisation	40
	Civic Culture	50
	Conclusions	62
THREE	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS OF ART (1835-1852) AND THE FOUNDING OF THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL	63
	Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Forces	64
	Government and the Provincial Schools, 1835-1852	72
	The Department of Practical Art	87
	Founding and Early Operation of the Stourbridge School	89
	Conclusions	105
FOUR	THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL OF ART: HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT, 1851-1881.....	107
	Building and Mortgage Debt	109
	Curriculum and Class Schedule	116
	Art Masters, Assistants and Pupil Teachers	120
	Stourbridge School Students	129
	Relations with the Department of Science and Art	141
	Maintaining Public Support: Meetings and Art Exhibitions	146
	Conclusions	164

TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED

CHAPTER

FIVE	THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL OF ART: HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT, 1882-1905	168
	Mortgage Debt and Building Renovations	171
	Art Masters	175
	Curriculum and Class Schedules	181
	Stourbridge School Students	185
	Relations with the Department of Science and Art and Political Bodies ...	189
	Maintaining Public Support: Meetings and Art Exhibitions	192
	Proposals for a Museum become a Scholarship	205
	Branches at Brierley Hill and Wordsley	208
	Technical Education and Relocation	214
	Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition April-May 1905.....	223
	Conclusions	227
SIX	THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL OF ART: RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE GLASS INDUSTRY.....	231
	The Glass Industry and a Fledgling Institution, 1850-1862	237
	Support from the Glass Industry, 1863-1905	241
	Art Masters, Pupil Teachers and the Glass Industry	246
	Stourbridge Students from the Glass Industry 1852-1905	250
	The Glass Industry and the School of Art: Assessing Relationships	274
	Competitive Classes at Brierley Hill and Wordsley	285
	Conclusions	294
SEVEN	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	299
	Research Questions: Restatements and Resolutions	302
	Implications for Future Research	312
APPENDICES		
ONE	DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTH KENSINGTON CURRICULUM...	315
TWO	BENEFACTORS AND SUPPORTERS, 1851-1855.....	319
THREE	STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL CLASSES AND FEES, 1852-1905	321
FOUR	AWARDS TO STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL STUDENTS, 1852-1905.....	323

TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED

APPENDICES

FIVE	ENROLMENT AT THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL, 1852-1905	349
SIX	STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL <i>REGISTER OF STUDENTS</i> , 1864-1874.....	351
SEVEN	BIOGRAPHICAL PROFILES OF KEY SUPPORTERS OF THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL, 1850-1905	369
EIGHT	JOHN A. SERVICE'S LETTERS TO THE ROYAL COMMISSION	374
BIBLIOGRAPHY		376

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

At its inception in 1851, the Stourbridge Government School of Design was among several newly founded ‘provincial’ schools. Intended to train students to become designers who could be employed for the benefit of local manufacturing industries, these schools were voluntary institutions encouraged and supported by local benefactors, and the schools sought to contribute to the civic culture of their respective towns or cities. Both a Parliamentary grant approved by the Board of Trade and the financial contributions of benefactors were necessary for such institutions, which were renamed ‘schools of art’ in 1852 under the aegis of the newly formed Government Department of Practical Art. The Stourbridge School of Art was expected to educate students who were (or would be) employed by the glass and iron industries then flourishing in the Stourbridge area.

In the environs of the Stourbridge district (including Amblecote, Audnam, Brettell Lane, Brierley Hill, Kingswinford, Oldswinford, Wollaston, Wollescote, and Wordsley), numerous establishments were involved with utilitarian and decorative glass, either as manufacturers or as decorating firms that did cutting, engraving or etching. During the latter half of the nineteenth century and the first few years of the twentieth century, many benefactors and supporters—including gentry, clergy, industrialists, professionals, business owners and tradesmen—were associated with the Stourbridge School.

In considering the history of the Stourbridge School of Art and the glass industry of the Stourbridge district between 1850 and 1905, several questions arise. To what degree did national political, economic, social and cultural forces influence Stourbridge district residents and lead to the founding of the school? Who were the benefactors and what were their motivations? Who were the art masters and what were their qualifications and methods of teaching? What was the nature of the curriculum? Who were the students and

what future successes of those students could be credited to the school? What management issues arose and how did the governing council of the school address those issues? In what ways and to what extent did the school, its staff, its curriculum, and its students influence the progress and the products of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district?

This thesis, using materials ranging from Government reports to contemporary accounts in newspapers, periodicals and books, reports the results of research and analysis in several interrelated areas. The political, economic, social and cultural forces that brought the Stourbridge School into existence and that influenced its development are discussed. Financial benefactors and other supporters of the Stourbridge School are identified, and their respective roles are noted. The structure of the curriculum is ascertained, and the qualifications and teaching methods of the art masters are treated. Students are identified and achievements recorded. The nature of the relationships of the Stourbridge School with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district during the last half of the nineteenth century and the first few years of the twentieth century are described and analysed.

In short, this thesis provides an understanding of the place of the Stourbridge School of Art within the circle of the Government provincial schools and of the relationship of the Stourbridge School to the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. This study describes the context of the nineteenth century in which the Stourbridge School came to exist and during which it functioned. This thesis considers the history of Government schools of art in the nineteenth century as well as circumstances within Stourbridge (and the surrounding area in which the utilitarian and decorative glass industry flourished) that influenced the development of the Stourbridge School.

The remainder of this chapter includes a review of scholarly literature pertaining to Government schools of art in general and to the provincial schools in particular as well as

accounts of the utilitarian and decorative glass industry in the Stourbridge area. Following this review of literature, the methodology of this thesis and the sources available are discussed. An overview of subsequent chapters and appendices completes this chapter.

Review of Literature

The Stourbridge School of Art has not been an object of scholarly study, but there are many brief mentions of the school in accounts of glassmaking in the Stourbridge area. Scholars from various disciplines have completed general studies of Government involvement in art and technical education during the nineteenth century, whilst others have focused upon the history and activities of a local school. This section explores three spheres of scholarly research: firstly, those broad-based accounts of the Government schools of art in the nineteenth century are considered along with studies of the history of art education or technical education during this period; secondly, accounts of particular nineteenth-century provincial schools of art are examined; and, lastly, those works relating specifically to the glass industry of the Stourbridge district are noted.

Government Schools of Art

Over the past half century, several scholars have dealt with the history of the Government schools of art in the nineteenth century, and their approaches and conclusions have varied as they sought to elucidate and analyse the political, economic, social and cultural forces that brought the schools into being and that sustained them over time. Most view the schools as creations born of economic necessity, whilst some are interested in the socio-economic characteristics, the philosophic bases, or the cultural aspirations of the members of Parliament and local gentry or key benefactors who supported the schools.

Nikolaus Pevsner's brief account of the British design schools compares them to established schools in France and Germany and touches upon the influences of designer/architect Owen Jones and designer/architect William Morris upon nineteenth-century art education but falls short of a complete history.¹ The first thorough study of the Government's efforts to offer art education suited to the needs of industry, Quentin Bell's *Schools of Design*, concentrates on the political issues that preceded the formation of the Head School in the mid-1830s along with subsequent developments up to the early 1850s. Bell is most concerned with the tumultuous political climate surrounding the school and the internal discord among its personnel. He focuses upon the disagreements among politicians, the difficulties related to the Royal Academy, the administrative turmoil within the Head School, and the failures of the Head School or controversies in a provincial school, including Manchester in the mid-1840s.² Bell's study explores background regarding the economic rationale for design education, but it does not address the circumstances within which specific provincial schools such as Stourbridge were founded.

In his *History and Philosophy of Art Education*, Stuart Macdonald acknowledges problems within the Head School and the provincial design schools, but he takes a broad

¹ Nikolaus Pevsner, *Academies of Art: Past and Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), pp. 243-268. For information on Owen Jones, see Carol A. Hrvol Flores, *Owen Jones: Design, Ornament, Architecture and Theory in an Age of Transition* (New York: Rizzoli, 2006) and Lesley Hoskins, 'Jones, Owen (1809–1874),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15066> accessed 5 June 2015]. For information on William Morris, see Fiona McCarthy, *William Morris: A Life for Our Time* (London: Faber, 1994), *Anarchy & Beauty: William Morris & His Legacy* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2014) and 'Morris, William (1834–1896),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn., Oct 2009 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19322>, accessed 5 June 2015].

² Quentin Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963). See also Winslow Ames' review of Bell's book in *Victorian Studies*, 8 (1965), pp. 295-296.

view, placing the schools and the history of their formation and development within the framework of differing philosophical tenets underlying art education at various points in history, beginning with Classical times.³ Macdonald also discusses the ‘various classes of persons’ who sought instruction in the Government art schools, and he suggests that the avowed purpose of educating working-class artisans in evening classes was frequently compromised by an emphasis upon day classes for affluent gentlemen and young ladies of similar circumstances.⁴ Such classes, which were integral to the Stourbridge School during its time, generated higher income from fees than did the evening sessions.

In her study of subsidies for art education, Janet Minihan argues that increasing popular interest in art and culture during the latter half of the nineteenth century led to increasing Government support, and, thus, nurtured the establishment of provincial schools of art.⁵ Likewise, Kate Hill’s discussion of the development of public museums in England during this period documents the involvement of both local governments and individual benefactors in the establishment of museums as a response to popular interest.⁶ Christopher Frayling’s summary of the Government schools of art in the nineteenth century is framed within the context of the history of the Royal College of Art, and Anthony Burton’s account

³ Stuart Macdonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London: University of London Press, 1970). In a later work, Macdonald discusses nineteenth-century tensions and controversies regarding art education and details the contributions of influential art teachers to the emerging Arts and Crafts movement; see Stuart Macdonald, *A Century of Art and Design Education* (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2005).

⁴ Macdonald, *History and Philosophy of Art Education*, pp. 143-156.

⁵ Janet Minihan, *The Nationalization of Culture* (New York: New York University Press, 1977).

⁶ Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums, 1850-1914* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2005).

of the Victoria and Albert Museum relates only briefly to the Government schools of art.⁷

In their respective PhD theses, Harry Butterworth explores administrative changes in the 1850s when the Department of Practical Art became the Department of Science and Art as well as the relations between the Department and Parliament throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century, whilst Christopher Duke focuses narrowly on the Department's internal aspects from 1853 to 1864, Arnold Levine concentrates on the influence of Henry Cole and the role of the Department in the development of public taste from 1852 to 1873, and Rafael Cardoso Denis details the nature of the bureaucracy that emerged under the administration of Henry Cole.⁸ Drawing upon key primary sources such as the diary of Henry Cole, Butterworth traces the development of the Department's growing interest in science and technology beginning in the mid-1860s, and he argues that it was not until the trade depression of the 1880s that political support for science education was sufficiently strong to pass legislation authorising Government grants and local funding for technical education (especially for classes in science), although deficiencies in this area had been generally acknowledged since the Paris Exhibition of 1867.⁹

For the most part, the scholars cited in the paragraphs above deal with the history of

⁷ Christopher Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred & Fifty Years of Art & Design* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987), pp. 11-64 and Anthony Burton, *Vision & Accident: The Story of the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London: V&A Publications, 1999), pp. 13-23.

⁸ Harry Butterworth, 'The Science and Art Department 1853-1900' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1968); Christopher Duke, 'The Department of Science and Art: Policies and Administration to 1864' (unpublished PhD thesis, Kings College, University of London, 1966); Arnold S. Levine, 'The Politics of Taste: The Science and Art Department of Great Britain, 1852-1873' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1972); and Rafael Cardoso Denis, 'The Educated Eye and the Industrial Hand: Art and Design Education for the Working Classes in mid-Victorian Britain' (unpublished PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute, University of London, 1995).

⁹ Butterworth, pp. 76-77, 108-109, and 144-145.

the Department of Science and Art in narrative fashion and view its creation and development as political and legislative responses to an economic need, that is, a desire to foster the improved design of goods manufactured by British industry in order to meet foreign competition. Indeed, Macdonald's position is clearly stated: 'National art education was authorised by the British Parliament in the last year of the reign of William IV, during the ministry of Lord Melbourne. It was established as an economic necessity, and certainly would not have been considered at this time if it had not been so regarded.'¹⁰ This study of the Stourbridge School offers an opportunity to assess the viewpoint of 'economic necessity' within the context of the utilitarian and decorative glass industry.

Peter Cunningham's 1979 thesis is devoted to three provincial schools of art in the years 1830-1850, and his alternative explanation to the view of economic need is particularly relevant to this study of the Stourbridge School. Cunningham notes the ambivalence of manufacturers in supporting the respective provincial schools in Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds, and he identifies important 'cultural elite' groups of benefactors who imparted vigour to these individual schools, concluding that 'the true motivation for the schools was as much the encouragement of fine art as of manufactures.'¹¹ Cunningham argues that most manufacturers, particularly those in the textile industry (silk and calico printing), were not pushing for the establishment of Government design schools. Moreover, his research reveals that the schools in Birmingham

¹⁰ Macdonald, *History and Philosophy of Art Education*, p. 60. The viewpoint of 'economic necessity' was also addressed by Edward Bird, 'The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century' (unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University of Technology, 1992).

¹¹ Peter James Cunningham, 'The Formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 1979), p. 79.

and Manchester grew out of well-established institutions in fine arts and that the school in Leeds had its roots in a social milieu favorable to education and culture. This study of the Stourbridge School includes information regarding the Mechanics' Institution as an endeavour that offers insights into the social climate of the town as it became a small city.

In a PhD thesis completed in 1998, Mervyn Romans contrasts Cunningham's approach with the view that legislation for the schools was the political response to economic issues. Romans provides a biographical analysis of members of the 1835-1836 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures and the witnesses who testified, along with the political, social and cultural implications of its report.¹² Romans is wary of definitive conclusions, and his interest in the concept of 'improvement' by means of education leads him to consider issues in historiography regarding social class in the nineteenth century.

This academic debate continues, as Romans's views were challenged in 2011 by Malcolm Quinn, who argues that the impacts of the 1835-1836 Select Committee and the administrative leadership of Henry Cole are best interpreted through an understanding of the modes of art education that existed in the 1830s-1850s. In 2013, Quinn sought to explore the influence of Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian philosophy upon the economic views of members of Parliament who supported art education and the schools of art and upon the

¹² Mervyn Romans, 'Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Central England in Birmingham, 1998); 'Living in the Past: Some Revisionist Thoughts on the Historiography of Art and Design Education,' *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 23 (2004), pp. 270-276; 'An Analysis of the Political Complexion of the 1835/6 Select Committee on Arts and Manufacture,' *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 26 (2007), pp. 215-224; 'Introduction: Rethinking Art and Design Education Histories,' 'A Question of "Taste": Re-examining the Rationale for the Introduction of Public Art and Design Education to Britain in the Early Nineteenth Century,' and 'Social Class and the Origin of Public Art and Design Education in Britain,' in *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays*, ed. by Mervyn Romans (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005), pp. 11-18, 41-53, and 55-65.

question of the development of a public ‘taste’ in nineteenth-century Britain.¹³

For purposes of this thesis, Richard Trainor’s work serves to extend and refine Cunningham’s notion of cultural elites. In his *Black Country Elites*, Trainor defines ‘elites’ as ‘those individuals, from whatever class or stratum, who held leadership posts in the major institutions of the district or town.’¹⁴ Trainor’s concept of elites includes gentry, clergy, business owners and tradesmen and is therefore useful in characterising those Stourbridge district citizens who were financial benefactors or otherwise supported the Stourbridge School. Trainor’s work reveals many supporters of the Dudley School of Art, especially Lord Ward, first Earl of Dudley (1817-1885), who was a longtime benefactor of the Government schools of art in Dudley, Kidderminster, Stourbridge and Worcester.¹⁵ As noted in Chapters Three, Four and Five of this thesis, Lord Ward presided at the public meeting that preceded the founding of the Stourbridge School and was active in the affairs of this voluntary institution for more than three decades.

To extend further the notion of cultural elites, one must touch upon the concepts of

¹³ Malcolm Quinn, ‘The Political Economic Necessity of the Art School 1835-52,’ *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 30 (2011), pp. 62-70, ‘The Disambiguation of the Royal Academy of Arts,’ *History of European Ideas*, 37 (2011), pp. 53-62, and *Utilitarianism and the Art School in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2013).

¹⁴ Richard Trainor, *Black Country Elites: The Exercise of Authority in an Industrialized Area 1830-1900* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 18.

¹⁵ Richard Trainor, ‘Peers on an Industrial Frontier: the Earls of Dartmouth and of Dudley in the Black Country, c. 1810 to 1914,’ in *Patricians, Power and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Towns*, ed. by David Cannadine (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982), pp. 70-132. For biographical details regarding Lord Ward, the first Earl of Dudley, see T. J. Raybould, ‘The Development of Lord Dudley’s Mineral Estates, 1774-1845,’ *Economic History Review*, New Series, 21 (Dec. 1968), pp. 529-544; ‘William, First Earl of Dudley and 11th Lord Ward (Part 1),’ *The Blackcountryman*, 40 (Spring 2007), pp. 60-64; and ‘William, First Earl of Dudley and 11th Lord Ward (Part 2),’ *The Blackcountryman*, 40 (Summer 2007), pp. 31-34.

class and the nature of philanthropy and its relation to class in the nineteenth century. In his study of social welfare in Britain, Geoffrey Finlayson is concerned primarily with the interplay of voluntary efforts and state actions, and, in a discussion of paternalism and philanthropy, he fuses these terms as ‘a sense of social concern and conscience felt by the upper and middle classes of society for those who occupied a lesser station in life.’¹⁶

Defining ‘class’ for the nineteenth century is both challenging and problematic. Eric J. Evans suggests that the terms ‘working classes’ and ‘middle classes’ most characterise mid-nineteenth century viewpoints, and he offers a hierarchy and division that is based on income source: ‘rent (aristocracy or upper class), profit (middle class or bourgeoisie), and wages (working class or proletariat).’¹⁷ In a wide-ranging study of the middle class, Richard Trainor endorses the longstanding ‘tripartite’ division (upper middle class, middle middle class, and lower middle class) that is generally accepted by other scholars, and he notes that the term ‘middle class’ broadened during Victorian times to encompass a variety of occupations.¹⁸ This tripartite division is useful in coming to understand the nature of benefactors and supporters of the Stourbridge School, since they represented various strata within the citizenry of the Stourbridge district. R. S. Neale’s five-class model¹⁹ allows for

¹⁶ Geoffrey Finlayson, *Citizen, State and Social Welfare in Britain 1830-1990* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), p. 46. Regarding philanthropy in the nineteenth century, see David Owen, *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960* (Cambridge: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press, 1964), pp. 97-104 and 211-214; and Brian Harrison, ‘Philanthropy and the Victorians,’ *Victorian Studies*, 9 (1966), pp. 353-374.

¹⁷ Eric J. Evans, *The Forging of the Modern State: Early Industrial Britain 1783-1870*, second edition (London: Longman, 1996), p. 176.

¹⁸ Richard Trainor, ‘The Middle Class,’ in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, vol. III 1840-1950, ed. by Martin Daunton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 674-675.

¹⁹ R. S. Neale, *Class in English History 1680-1850* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981), p. 133.

differentiations within the categories of middle class and working class, so this formulation may be helpful in understanding the motivations of benefactors of the Stourbridge School.

Lastly, brief mention must be made regarding the foremost scholarly literature on the history of the teaching of drawing, since such instruction was integral to Government schools of art during the last half of the nineteenth century. Gordon Sutton does not focus on the Government Department of Science and Art, but the central contribution of his study and the separate work of Richard Carline are accounts of the exponential growth in the numbers of students who received art instruction, particularly in basic drawing, during their time in elementary and secondary schools.²⁰ Much of this instruction in drawing was carried out by art masters, assistant art masters or pupil teachers who were associated with a provincial school, and the Stourbridge School was active in this endeavor, as mentioned in Chapters Four and Five of this thesis.

Provincial Schools of Art and Technical Education

The founding and development of the Stourbridge School of Art from 1850 to 1905 is best understood when framed by an understanding of the history of the provincial schools of art beginning in the 1840s and of the emergence of interest in technical education during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. A decade before the Stourbridge School was founded in 1851, Parliament appropriated monies designated solely for provincial schools of art, and institutions in the following areas were founded: Manchester (1842); York

²⁰ Gordon Sutton, *Artisan or Artist? A History of the Teaching of Art and Crafts in English Schools* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1967) and Richard Carline, *Draw They Must: A History of the Teaching and Examining of Art* (London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd., 1968). For excerpts from key nineteenth century Government reports and commentary, see Clive Ashwin, *Art Education: Documents and Policies* (London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1975), pp. 8-62.

(1842); Nottingham (1843); Coventry (1843); Sheffield (1843); Birmingham (1843); Newcastle (1843-44); Glasgow (1844); Norwich (1846); The Potteries in Hanley and Stoke on Trent (1847); Paisley (1847); and The Irish Schools (1849) in Dublin, Belfast and Cork. In addition to Stourbridge, these provincial schools were founded in the 1850s: Worcester (1851), St. Martins in London (1852), Waterford (1852), and Wolverhampton (1853).²¹

The Head School in London and the provincial schools came under the governance of the Department of Practical Art in 1852, when Henry Cole was appointed as its chief administrative officer. This body became the Department of Science and Art a year thereafter, and Dr. Lyon Playfair, industrial chemist and university professor, was chosen to head the science area.²² However, as several studies have indicated, the impetus for general education in science was slow to develop, due, at least in part, to the lack of a clear delineation as to exactly what areas would be in the sphere of ‘technical education.’²³ Playfair’s memoirs characterise his years of advocacy for technical education as a ‘crusade’ involving ‘weary and dreary work.’²⁴ Playfair and colleagues such as Thomas Henry Huxley and John Scott Russell were interested in theoretical aspects of science, whilst others saw great potential value in educating workers in aspects of applied science such as

²¹ *Second Report of the Department of Science and Art* (London: HMSO, 1855), p. 74 and Bell, *Schools of Design*, pp. 101-102.

²² Graeme J. N. Gooday, ‘Playfair, Lyon, first Baron Playfair (1818–1898),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn., May 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22368>, accessed 5 June 2015].

²³ J. F. Donnelly, ‘The Origins of the Technical Curriculum in England during the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,’ *Studies in Science Education*, 16 (1989), pp. 123-161 and Robin Betts, ‘Persistent but Misguided? The Technical Educationists 1867–89,’ *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society*, 27 (1998), pp. 267-277.

²⁴ Wemyss Reid (ed.), *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lyon Playfair* (London: Cassell and Company, 1899), p. 152.

electricity and mechanics that would have relevance to their occupations. Beginning in the 1830s, many Mechanics' Institutions maintained reading rooms or libraries and sponsored lectures on scientific subjects or offered classes, but there was no common curriculum and the instruction was rudimentary, although some Mechanics' Institutions had success in enrolling members of the 'working classes.'²⁵

Over more than two decades, various Government bodies assessed the state of science education and considered the need for technical education: Newcastle Commission (1861); Clarendon Commission (1864); Select Committee on Scientific Instruction (1867-1868); Taunton Commission (1868); Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction (1872-1875); and the Samuelson Commission (1882 and 1884). The National Association for the Promotion of Technical (and Secondary) Education was formed in 1886 at a meeting attended by members of both houses of Parliament, and this group was soon 'especially active' and 'initiated movements of national importance'²⁶ that secured passage of the Technical Instruction Act in 1889 as well as legislation in 1890 providing for local taxation for funding technical education at the county level. As detailed in Chapters Five and Six of this thesis, the advent of technical education during the 1890s impacted the Stourbridge School as well as the fledgling schools in neighbouring Brierley Hill and Wordsley.

Although the Stourbridge School of Art has not been the focus of historical research, a few provincial schools have been studied, whilst others are discussed in brief works intended to commemorate a significant anniversary of the institution. In general, the

²⁵ Martyn Walker, 'Encouragement of Sound Education amongst the Industrial Classes: Mechanics' Institutes and Working-class Membership 1838–1881,' *Educational Studies*, 39 (2013), pp. 142-155.

²⁶ National Association for the Promotion of Technical and Secondary Education, 'Historical Review,' in *Final Report* (London: Co-Operative Printing Society, Ltd., 1907), p. 5. See also Bill Bailey, 'The Technical Education Movement: A Late Nineteenth Century Educational "Lobby."' *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 7 (1983), pp. 55-68.

publications mentioned below are narrative histories of particular schools, typically focused upon the structure of the curriculum and the influences of longtime art masters as well as those students who achieved success. The depth and detail of these studies varies greatly, and each reflects the nature of source materials that were consulted by the author.

Using key primary sources such as minute books, newspaper accounts and other contemporary records, Reginald Haggar's account of art education in *The Potteries in Staffordshire* documents the inception of art classes in Mechanics' Institutions and details the nineteenth-century history of the various Government schools of art in the district, which embraced Burslem, Fenton, Hanley, Longton, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stoke, and Tunstall. Desire for art education on the part of workers in The Potteries during the 1840s sparked the creation of the earliest schools, but sparse financial support from pottery manufacturers and persistent debts led to a pattern of schools opening and achieving some measure of success as reflected in medals won by students, only to shut down within a few years. Ultimately, philanthropic industrialists associated with pottery manufacturing sought to endow schools at Burslem and Stoke, and these institutions continued to garner financial support from other benefactors. Haggar's work has an alphabetical listing of some former students, many of whom were trained in the schools and employed in local potteries, thus establishing a connection between the desire of workers for art education and the willingness of manufacturers to lend support.²⁷ Haggar's study is significant for its information regarding the efforts of local manufacturers who supported the schools financially and by allowing experienced employees to function as assistants to the art masters and by encouraging young employees to attend the schools.

²⁷ Reginald G. Haggar, *A Century of Art Education in the Potteries* (Stoke-on-Trent: Webberley Limited, 1953).

In studies of the Birmingham Municipal School of Art, Roy Hartnell documents the influence of painter Edward R. Taylor, who served as master of the Birmingham school from 1877 to 1903 and was a prime mover in the formation of the Society of Art Masters in 1888, whilst John Swift describes the administrative and pedagogical changes within the Birmingham school over a lengthy time period.²⁸ Both Hartnell and Swift underscore the conclusion that instruction in fine art was the focus of the Birmingham school and that such an emphasis was reflected in its benefactors, its art masters and its students. Ronald Clarke's account of the Coventry school is a brief chronological history of events, although some mention is made of the relationship of the school to local manufacturers in the ribbon industry.²⁹ William Andrews, a Coventry school student who was an apprentice in ribbon making, kept a diary, but this record covering August 1850 to June 1857 reveals little about the school or its teaching. Andrews was a capable student, and his terse entries typically record pleasure at receiving a medal or a prize such as a box of colours or a book.³⁰ Andrews became employed as a designer of ribbon patterns and also was a manufacturer, but there is no indication of a connexion between his art education and these enterprises.

The school of art at Norwich is the subject of a comprehensive, well-documented

²⁸ Roy Hartnell, 'Edward R. Taylor and the Birmingham Municipal School of Art' (unpublished MA thesis, Royal College of Art, 1976); John Swift, 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800–1921,' *Journal of Art and Design Education*, 7 (1988), pp. 5–29; and David Thistlewood, 'The Early History of the NSEAD: the Society of Art Masters (1888–1909) and the National Society of Art Masters (1909–1944),' in *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays*, ed. by Mervyn Romans (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005), pp. 103–128.

²⁹ Ronald Clarke, *Cast in the Same Mould: The Origin and History of Coventry School of Art 1834–1895* (Coventry: Herbert Art Gallery and Museum, 1979).

³⁰ Valerie E. Chancellor (ed.), *Master and Artisan in Victorian England: The Diary of William Andrews and the Autobiography of Joseph Gutteridge* (New York: Augustus Kelley, 1969), pp. 13–15 and 17–20.

study by Marjorie Allthorpe-Guyton.³¹ Drawing upon newspaper reports and many documents from the school's archives, she isolates key issues, such as the growth of interest in technical education in the 1880s and 1890s, which impacted upon the curriculum and the administration of the Norwich school. The Norwich institution was closely allied with individuals from the Norwich Society of Artists, and the curriculum of the school was firmly rooted in a perspective on art education that encouraged aspiring painters and emphasized the principles of fine art in its educational programmes. Nonetheless, a few students of the Norwich school became designers of patterns for shawls, so there is at least some indication that the Norwich school maintained links with local industry.

John Turpin's works on the school of art in Dublin are comprehensive, but the focus of his interest is the mid-eighteenth century, as he explores the genesis of the organisation in the Royal Dublin Society.³² Hugh Ferguson's history of the Glasgow School of Art covers some 150 years, focusing on education in fine art by tracing the careers of various headmasters and Charles Rennie Mackintosh. Ferguson's work contains illustrations of several certificates awarded to students for their work or success in passing examinations.³³

Helena Jane Cooksey's thoroughgoing study of the school at Wolverhampton offers insights into the increasing role of Government in education and the relationships between

³¹ Marjorie Allthorpe-Guyton, *A Happy Eye: A School of Art in Norwich 1845-1982* (Norwich: Jarrold & Sons, Ltd., 1982).

³² John Turpin, 'The School of Design in Victorian Dublin,' *Journal of Design History*, 2 (1989), pp. 243-256 and *A School of Art in Dublin since the Eighteenth Century: A History of the National College of Art & Design* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1995); see also Turpin's 'The Royal Dublin Society and its School of Art, 1847-1877,' *Dublin Historical Record*, 36 (December 1982), pp. 2-20.

³³ Hugh Ferguson, *Glasgow School of Art: The History* (Glasgow: The Foulis Press of the Glasgow School of Art, 1995). See also George Rawson, 'The Glasgow Government School of Design, 1845-1853,' *Journal of the Scottish Society for Art History*, 4 (1999), pp. 18-25.

a provincial school and the Department of Science and Art during the last half of the nineteenth century. Additionally, her work also examines the impact of legislation, such as the Technical Instruction Acts, upon education generally and the Wolverhampton school specifically.³⁴ Cooksey is sensitive to the role of the Wolverhampton school in furthering the civic culture of the city, and she assesses the impact of the Arts and Crafts perspective on arts education curricula into the early twentieth century.

A few other provincial schools (Leamington, Leeds, Lincoln and Warrington) have been the subjects of accounts of their history or aspects of their educational endeavors.³⁵ These studies offer some information regarding the roles of benefactors and manufacturers in supporting a school as well as the nature of art instruction within the school.

Although these separate studies of various provincial schools typically contain historical accounts of those particular institutions, they tend to focus on local circumstances and the individual personalities connected with those institutions and, thus, are not directly related to the Stourbridge School. However, some discussions of the relationships between a provincial school and the Head School and/or the Department of Practical Art (or its successor, the Department of Science and Art) can shed light on similar circumstances that

³⁴ Helena Jane Cooksey, 'The Impact of Educational Reform on the Wolverhampton School of Art and Design' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wolverhampton, 2006).

³⁵ J. E. Duce, 'A History of the Leamington School of Art from its Original Foundation in 1866 to the Year 1914' (unpublished MA dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1969); E. J. Milton Smith, 'Art Teacher Training in Britain (1852-1985) with special reference to Leeds,' *Journal of Art and Design Education*, 4 (1985), pp. 103-146; Michael J. G. Gray-Fow, 'Lincoln School of Art: From its Beginnings to the close of the Nineteenth Century' (Nottingham: University of Nottingham, 1978 [M. Ed. course paper]); and W. B. Stephens, 'The Victorian Art Schools and Technical Education: A Case Study, 1850-1889 [Warrington School of Art],' *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 2 (December 1969), pp. 13-19.

existed at the Stourbridge School between the 1850s and 1905, especially concerning the emergence of technical education, as noted in Chapters Four and Five of this thesis.

The Glass Industry of the Stourbridge District

This aspect of Stourbridge history has been of considerable interest to those who study decorative and utilitarian glassware made in Britain as well as to writers who focus on a particular kind of glass such as cameo ware or on a specific factory in the Stourbridge area.³⁶ Most of the authors discussed below use the phrase ‘Stourbridge glass’ to refer to decorative and utilitarian glassware produced or decorated in any of the establishments within the entire Stourbridge district (Amblecote, Audnam, Brettell Lane, Brierley Hill, Kingswinford, Oldswinford, Wollaston, Wollescote, and Wordsley). However, there was a time in September and October 1946 when the phrase ‘Stourbridge glass’ was the subject of a spirited exchange of views on the pages of the *County Express*.³⁷ Councillor J. H. Hickman of the Brierley Hill Urban District Council, whilst noting that glass was manufactured within the geographical boundaries of Stourbridge some years ago, said that ‘Brierley Hill glass’ was a more accurate term both historically and for the present of 1946. Rejoinders came quickly from Alderman H. E. Palfrey of Stourbridge and others over the next several weeks until Ernest M. Dinkel, principal of the Stourbridge School of Art, called the dispute ‘much ado about glass’ and observed that the phrase ‘Stourbridge glass’ really ‘conveys the true position of this traditional industry.’ The editor of the *County*

³⁶ H. W. Woodward, *Art, Feat and Mystery: The Story of Thomas Webb & Sons, Glassmakers* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody Limited, 1978) and R. S. Williams-Thomas, *The Crystal Years: A Tribute to the Skills and Artistry of Stevens & Williams Royal Brierley Crystal* (Brierley Hill: Stevens & Williams, 1983).

³⁷ *County Express*, 14, 21 and 28 September 1946 and 5, 12 and 19 October 1946.

Express, after describing the various points of view as having been ‘thoroughly ventilated,’ brought the discussion to an end by declaring that ‘this subject is now closed.’³⁸

The works by D. R. Guttery, Geoffrey Beard, Jack Haden, Charles Hajdamach and Jason Ellis contain information regarding individual artisans and places of employment. Guttery details the locations of various establishments that manufactured glass as well as those that did cutting, engraving or etching, and he also offers documentation regarding the traditional day and hourly schedules of workdays in these areas of the glass industry.³⁹ Beard’s work is devoted exclusively to cameo glass with his major interest being an explication of the techniques used by various cameo artists, but he provides biographical data for artisans who were associated with the Stourbridge School, such as John Northwood I and brothers Thomas and George Woodall.⁴⁰ Haden’s work deals with cameo glass, and his transcription of Thomas Woodall’s reminiscences contributes to this study.⁴¹

Sharply focused on nineteenth-century British glass, Hadjamach’s scholarly work covers a wide variety of glassmaking and glass decorating techniques, and it offers detailed accounts of the history of the key glass establishments in the Stourbridge district, namely, the Richardson, Stevens & Williams, and Webb firms, all of which were associated with

³⁸ *County Express*, 19 October 1946. In 1980, authors Ray and Lee Grover observed that ‘the single word “Stourbridge” has come to stand for all the various glass factories in the region.’ See Ray Grover and Lee Grover, *English Cameo Glass* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1980), p. xiii.

³⁹ D. R. Guttery, *From Broad-Glass to Cut Crystal: A History of the Stourbridge Glass Industry* (London: Leonard Hill, 1956); on p. 108, Guttery notes that an 1806 billhead from the Brierley Hill factory of Honeyborne and Batson in Moor Lane is headed ‘Stourbridge.’

⁴⁰ Geoffrey W. Beard, *Nineteenth Century Cameo Glass* (Newport: Ceramic Book Co., 1956).

⁴¹ H. Jack Haden, *Artists in Cameo Glass Incorporating Thomas Woodall’s Memoirs* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 1993).

the Stourbridge School in some manner.⁴² Ellis's work records many little-known glass industry establishments in the Stourbridge district, and his lengthy index allows one to search for individuals by surname.⁴³ A thesis completed by D. N. Sandilands in 1927 is a rather broad study of the flint glass industry in the Midlands, but the brief appendix titled 'On Education in the Flint Glass Trade' offers some insights into the relationships between glass manufacturers and schools of art, particularly regarding the difficulties of scheduling classes that could be attended by glassworkers in manufacturing plants.⁴⁴ Takao Matsumura completed a PhD thesis dealing with the 'labour aristocracy' among British glassmakers in the Victorian era, and his work, with revisions, was published in book form several years later.⁴⁵ Matsumura's study is a labour history, exploring the changing dynamics within the Flint Glass Makers Friendly Society and the volatile relationships between this organisation and the glass manufacturers, rather than a study of the glass industry itself.

Stourbridge journalist Jack Haden was keenly interested in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, and he authored several short works devoted to this subject.⁴⁶ Over five

⁴² Charles R. Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914* (Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 1991).

⁴³ Jason Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002* (Harrowgate: by author, 2002).

⁴⁴ D. N. Sandilands, 'Thesis on the history of the Midland (Stourbridge) glass industry: with special reference to the flint glass section' (unpublished thesis, University of Birmingham, 1927), pp. 265-272.

⁴⁵ Takao Matsumura, 'The Flint Glass Makers in the Classic Age of the Labour Aristocracy, 1850-1880, with Special Reference to Stourbridge,' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Warwick, 1976) and *The Labour Aristocracy Revisited: The Victorian Flint Glass Makers 1850-80* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983).

⁴⁶ H. J. Haden, *The Stourbridge Glass Industry in the 19th Century* (Halesowen: Reliance Printing Works, 1971) and *Notes on the Stourbridge Glass Trade* (Dudley: Dudley Public Libraries, 1977).

decades, Haden assembled a collection of Stourbridge ephemera and memorabilia that was sold at auction after his death. The handwritten *Register of Students* at the Stourbridge Government School of Art from 1864 to 1874 was among these items, and, as noted later in this chapter, this document is especially important to this study.

Many of the best-known individuals associated with glassmaking in the Stourbridge area (Frederick Carder, Ludwig Kny, Joseph Locke, brothers Thomas Woodall and George Woodall, and John Northwood I and his sons Harry Northwood and John Northwood II) have been the subjects of accounts of their careers, but their association with the Stourbridge School is simply noted briefly by various writers.⁴⁷ Although the Stourbridge School of Art is listed in nineteenth-century directories and other contemporary publications and is mentioned in various secondary sources, there has been no systematic study of the institution or of its place in the history of Stourbridge. Drawing upon a wide variety of primary and secondary sources, this thesis seeks to fill that void.

⁴⁷ For specific mentions of students who attended the Stourbridge School, see W. B. Honey, *English Glass* (London: Collins, 1946), pp. 41-42; Geoffrey Beard, *Nineteenth Century Cameo Glass* (Newport: Ceramic Book Company, 1956), pp. 36-37; John Northwood II, *John Northwood: His Contributions to the Stourbridge Flint Glass Industry 1850-1902* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1958), pp. 7 and 62; Paul V. Gardner, *The Glass of Frederick Carder* (New York: Crown, 1971), pp. 5, 7 and 14; Barbara Morris, *Victorian Table Glass and Ornaments* (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1978), pp. 105, 114, 117; Grover and Grover, *English Cameo Glass*, pp. 5-6 and 51; Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914*, pp. 190 and 233; Dan Klein and Ward Lloyd (eds.), *The History of Glass* (London: Macdonald & Co., 1991), pp. 181 and 188; William Heacock, James Measell and Berry Wiggins, *Harry Northwood: The Wheeling Years, 1901-1925* (Marietta: Antique Publications, 1991); H. J. Haden, *Artists in Cameo Glass: Incorporating Thomas Woodall's Memoirs* (Kingswinford: The Black Country Society, 1993), p. 13; Thomas P. Dimitroff, "The Journey: The Life of Frederick Carder," in *Frederick Carder and Steuben Glass* (Atglen: Schiffer Publishing, 1998), p. 11; Christopher Woodall Perry, *The Cameo Glass of Thomas and George Woodall* (Somerset: Richard Dennis, 2000), pp. 9-13; Charles Hajdamach, "The English Years, 1880-1903: Carder's Artistic Milieu and Early Success," in *Frederick Carder and Steuben Glass*; and Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002*, pp. 460 and 479.

Methodology and Sources

Before turning to the methodology employed within this thesis and the available sources to be examined, it is appropriate to recapitulate and to refine the general research concerns posed near the outset of this chapter: Firstly, to what extent did the national and local political, economic, social and cultural forces that brought the Stourbridge School into existence continue to impact its development and influence its supporters during the nineteenth century? Secondly, who were the benefactors and supporters of the Stourbridge School and what was the nature and extent of their influence during the period from 1850 to 1905? Thirdly, what were the approaches to art and design education of the various Stourbridge art masters during the period from 1850 to 1905? Fourthly, in terms of socio-economic background and/or occupations, what were the characteristics of the students at the Stourbridge School during the period from 1850 to 1905? Fifthly, how did the structure and content of the curriculum at the Stourbridge School contribute to art and design education during the period from 1850 to 1905? Sixthly, what was the nature and character of the relationship of the Stourbridge School and the glass industry of the Stourbridge district during the last half of the nineteenth century, especially regarding the accomplishments of its students?

This thesis is focused on the history of the Stourbridge School of Art, from its inception as a school to train designers for local industry to its reconfiguration as a technical school in the 1890s and its relocation to new quarters in 1905. As such, this study could be viewed as a local history, considering people and place as it seeks to uncover facts about the Stourbridge School as well as those individuals who supported the institution and those students who enrolled and studied there. Because the Stourbridge School was associated with some benefactors and numerous students who were allied with the local

glass and iron industries, this project is also related to the history of industry.

However, as a subject for historical research and writing, the Stourbridge School of Art can be viewed as a social institution, and, thus, this study is best characterised as a social history of an educational organisation. The Stourbridge School was a voluntary institution, one for which benefactors and supporters gave of their time and/or money and one which students chose to attend, albeit for various reasons. Although its mission was unique to it, the Stourbridge School was one among many other social institutions in Stourbridge during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The Stourbridge School was generally not the subject of daily notice by citizens nor was it the object of frequent mention in local newspapers. Nonetheless, this study of the Stourbridge School is more than an exercise in ‘micro history.’ Since the Stourbridge School existed when other Government provincial schools of art were operating in other parts of the United Kingdom, it is desirable to compare and contrast the history of the Stourbridge School with aspects of other provincial schools about which historical accounts are available.

As both John Tosh and Miles Fairburn suggest in their separate works, the methodology for research and writing social history is not a fixed structure, although its typical problems of interpretation and evaluation of sources are not unlike those of traditional history in narrative form.⁴⁸ Tosh agrees that ‘the “history of society” ... is its proper domain,’ and he argues that a study in social history must go beyond narrative and be analytical in nature: ‘Analysis can serve to elucidate the connectedness of events and processes occurring at the same time, and especially to lay bare the workings of an

⁴⁸ John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, fifth ed. (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2010) and Miles Fairburn, *Social History: Problems Strategies and Methods* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999).

institution or a specific area of historical experience.’⁴⁹ To borrow Tosh’s words, this study of the Stourbridge School of Art uses ‘both analytical and narrative modes, sometimes in alternating sections, sometimes completely fused throughout the text.’⁵⁰

Some aspects of this thesis are quantitative whilst others are qualitative in nature. On the quantitative side, the annual student enrolments in the three main classes at the Stourbridge School and the numbers of elementary pupils taught in National schools or elsewhere may reflect trends in the school’s development, as will the annual financial standing insofar as it can be determined. The occupations of some students and/or parents can also be tabulated, and conclusions may be forthcoming in regard to some relationships between the school and the glass industry of the Stourbridge district.

On the qualitative side, the methodology used in this thesis is immediately confronted with several of the ‘problems’ identified by Fairburn,⁵¹ such as those arising from fragmentary evidence or those that result when research seeks to address the differences and similarities between the Stourbridge School of Art and another of the provincial schools of art that existed during the same period in another part of the United Kingdom.

Scholarly studies of the formation and the overall administration of the Government schools of art, such as those of Bell and Macdonald noted above in the review of literature, have been based upon official documents, archival and biographical materials, and accounts in newspapers or other periodicals. The annual reports of the Department of Practical Art (1852-1853) and its successor, the Department of Science and Art (1854 and thereafter), often contain information relating to the Stourbridge School of Art, such as: enrolment

⁴⁹ Tosh, *Pursuit of History*, p. 157.

⁵⁰ Tosh, *Pursuit of History*, p. 158.

⁵¹ Fairburn, *Social History: Problems Strategies and Methods*, pp. 39 and 112.

figures for students, ages of students, occupations of students, teaching activities of art masters, and student achievements in local and/or national competitions.

Previous researchers who have focused upon a particular provincial school have often benefited from primary source materials such as minute books that record the actions of the institution's governing body or other sources that reveal details regarding the history of the school and its teachers as well as its students and their achievements. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive, unified record of the Stourbridge School of Art. The extant evidence pertaining to the Stourbridge School is, at best, fragmentary. The National Art Library has a few pages from annual reports of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution in 1850 and 1851, and these documents reveal information about the attempt to form a school of design there and record individuals who made monetary donations. A sixteen-page account of a public meeting held in Stourbridge in early 1851 is available at the National Art Library; this booklet is entitled *Report of a public meeting held at the Corn Exchange, Stourbridge, on Monday, Feb. 3, 1851; the Right Honourable Lord Ward in the chair; to consider the best means of promoting a School of Design for Stourbridge and Kingswinford*. The booklet lists many of those in attendance, quotes or paraphrases the spoken remarks of individuals, and records the resolutions proposed and approved by the assemblage. The National Art Library also has a few printed reports by the Stourbridge School's trustees or art masters (1862-1863 and 1885), and several similar reports from other years (1870 and 1883) are available at the Stourbridge Public Library. Nigel Perry's volume on Stourbridge history contains a listing of officers and annual subscribers for 1852.

Numerous directories such as the 1850 *Post Office Directory of Birmingham with Staffordshire and Worcestershire* or others published by Kelly, Pigot or Slater are helpful primary sources, although descriptions of institutions are often repeated verbatim across a

span of years. For the purposes of this study, the detailed local newspaper accounts of the Stourbridge School of Art's annual public meetings and art exhibitions or other happenings are important primary sources and can be employed to assemble a tolerable history of the school. Such accounts preserve remarks by the school's art master or trustees regarding the various issues that were addressed during the nineteenth century and reveal the impact of political, economic, social and cultural forces. Newspapers from the nearby cities of Birmingham (*Birmingham Daily Post*) and Worcester (*Worcester Chronicle*, *Worcester Herald*, and *Berrow's Worcester Journal*) report news and events relative to the school in the early and mid-1850s. The *Brierley Hill Advertiser* (later simply *Advertiser*) has regular coverage from 1857 through 1905, and the *County Express* has extensive coverage from 1867 through 1905. These local newspaper accounts of the annual public meetings of the Stourbridge School of Art record the names of many of those in attendance and often reveal information regarding the progress and successes of students, the financial status of the school, and the remarks of invited guest speakers, including former art masters or former students. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the monthly *Pottery & Glass Trades' Journal* (1878) and its successor, *Pottery Gazette* (1879 and thereafter), offer some coverage and commentary regarding events at the Stourbridge School and also document the economic status of the glass manufacturing plants and glass decorating establishments in the Stourbridge district.

The National Archives contains one file (ED 29/176) devoted to the Stourbridge Government School of Art. Much of this file relates to an application for Government funds for building renovations in the 1880s, but correspondence and other documents therein shed some light on the financial condition of the school as well as the operations in place during that time. One local government body, the Stourbridge and District School of Science and

Art Technical Board that was formed in the early 1890s, dealt directly with the affairs of the school, and a minute book covering this body's work from 1891 to 1905 is available.⁵²

The *Register of Students* ledger mentioned earlier affords a unique opportunity for a close look at those who were students from 1864 to 1874. Much information can be gleaned regarding the ages of students, the occupations of students and/or their parents, and relationships with the glass industry. The pages have the heading 'Stourbridge Government School of Art' printed across facing leaves and 'Register of Students Attendances, Fees, and Examinations for the Year 18__' immediately below. The handwritten names of students appear in chronological order as they enrolled or re-entered the school, and their ages, places of residence, and the occupation of their parent (and/or of the student) may be given. As recorded in the *Register of Students* during the 1864-1874 period, there were three distinct groups of students at the Stourbridge School: a 'Female Class' that met two mornings per week; a 'Male Class' that met three evenings per week; and a group of 'Old Swinford Hospital School Boys' ages 11-14. During 1864-1874, the Female Class enrolled as few as 17 pupils in 1870 to as many as 38 in 1867, and the numbers of Old Swinford Hospital School boys ranged from 36 in 1864 to 52 in 1868. The evening Male Class drew many young men who were already employed in the glass industry or whose fathers were so employed; this class had 82 students in 1864, and the lowest number enrolled between 1864 and 1874 was 44 in 1869. Printed areas in the *Register of Students* would allow for the recording of attendance and fee payment within each month as well as information relating to completion of examinations, but these areas are often incomplete and sometimes entirely blank. The *Register of Students* ledger is stored at the Dudley Archives and Local History

⁵² Titled 'Stourbridge & District Technical Board Minute Book,' this ledger-size volume is in the collection at The Hive in Worcester.

Centre.⁵³ The White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum) has some original drawings and examples of modelling created by students (James Hill, Frederick Noke and William Northwood) that were national prize winning entries during their times at the Stourbridge School as well as an extensive card file of individual workers in the area glass trade in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The educational philosophy and courses of instruction at the Stourbridge School of Art were rooted in the 'South Kensington curriculum' developed by Richard Redgrave and administered by Henry Cole. There is a wealth of primary and secondary material available about the curriculum as well as these two men and their compatriots and opponents.⁵⁴ Some specialised nineteenth-century primary sources are also of value for this thesis, especially when discussing the central administration of the Government Schools of Art: Fuller's *Shall We Spend £100,000 on a Winter Garden for London or in Endowing Schools of*

⁵³ 'Historic glass records and artifacts secured,' *Dudley Archives Journal* (Summer 2008), pp. 6-7.

⁵⁴ Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole, K. C. B. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1884); 'Sir Henry Cole,' *Times* [London, England] 20 Apr. 1882: 6, *The Times Digital Archive*, Web. 6 Mar. 2015; Elizabeth Bonython and Anthony Burton, *The Great Exhibitor: The Life and Work of Henry Cole* (London: V&A Publications, 2003); Ann Cooper, 'Cole, Sir Henry (1808–1882),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn., Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5852>, accessed 6 March 2015]; F. M. Redgrave, *Richard Redgrave: A Memoir, Compiled from his Diary* (London: Cassell & Company, 1891); Gilbert Redgrave, *Manual of Design, Compiled from the Writings and Addresses of Richard Redgrave, R. A.* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1876); 'Obituary [Richard Redgrave],' *Times* [London, England] 15 Dec. 1888: 10, *The Times Digital Archive*, Web. 6 Mar. 2015; Kathryn Moore Heleniak, 'Redgrave, Richard (1804–1888),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn., Jan 2011 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23254>, accessed 6 March 2015] Anthony Burton, 'Richard Redgrave as Art Educator, Museum Official and Design Theorist,' in *Richard Redgrave 1804-1888*, ed. by Susan P. Casteras and Ronald Parkinson (London: V&A Museum, 1988); Fredrick Wordsworth Haydon, *Benjamin Robert Haydon Correspondence and Table-Talk* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1876); Wyatt Papworth, *John B. Papworth... A Brief Record of his Life and Works* (London: privately printed, 1879); Marcia Pointon, *William Dyce, 1806-1864* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

Design? (1851); Hudson's *History of Adult Education* (1851); Wallis's *Schools of Art: Their Constitution and Management* (1857); Bartley's *Schools for the People* (1871); Hulme's *Art Instruction in England* (1882); reports issued regarding the London 'International Health Exhibition' (1884); and Frith's *Further Reminiscences* (1888). Also of interest are these early twentieth century sources: Brown's *South Kensington and its Art Training* (1912); Crane's 'Art Teaching' in the 11th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1910); and DeMontmorency's *Progress of Education in England* (1904).

Unfortunately, neither the benefactors of the Stourbridge School nor its art masters or students have left comprehensive accounts or lengthy memoirs of their associations with the school. Nonetheless, as noted in Chapters Four and Five, there are some brief glimpses in newspaper accounts of annual meetings or letters to the editor as well as obituaries or other sources that offer insights into the aspirations and the experiences of those people.

Although fragmentary and often disparate in time, the sources described above make it possible to create a chronology of public meetings and other key events at the Stourbridge School. Government reports reveal the national curriculum, and public notices in local newspapers detail the schedules of classes at Stourbridge. Newspaper accounts preserve the remarks of Council members and other supporters, including representatives of the glass industry, at annual public meetings, and county directories reveal information regarding occupations and social status. Newspaper articles allude to the financial status of the school and often quote or paraphrase the annual reports of the Stourbridge art master or the Council secretary. Students who passed examinations or won awards are listed in Department of Science and Art documents as well as newspaper reports. The handwritten *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 lists students, and county directories and PRO Census rolls offer information, as do sources related to the Stourbridge glass industry.

As a local history study that elucidates the social history of an educational institution, the subsequent chapters of this thesis combine narration with interpretation and analysis. Newspaper accounts and other sources, including Government documents, were the basis for a chronological history and delineation of issues confronting the Stourbridge School, and the remarks of benefactors and other supporters offer opportunities to assess the personal and institutional impacts of those political, economic, social and cultural forces that were manifest regarding the schools of art in the nineteenth century. Primary sources list the names of individual students, and scrutiny of both primary and secondary sources allows for insights regarding the careers of those students who were active in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district as well as other endeavours.

Plan of this Study

This thesis consists of several chapters and eight appendices. Chapter Two, ‘Nineteenth Century Stourbridge: A Contextual Overview,’ considers the historical development of Stourbridge, with a focus on the industrialisation and urbanisation that influenced the civic culture as the market town grew and developed. Trends in population, occupations, and transportation shed light on the nature of industrialisation and urbanisation, and the evolution of civic culture is reflected in changes in municipal government, the erection of public buildings, and the development of education.

Chapter Three, ‘Government Schools of Art (1835-1852) and the Founding of the Stourbridge School,’ identifies and discusses the key economic, political, social and cultural forces that influenced the creation of Government schools of art during the nineteenth century, with a particular focus on Government actions leading to the founding of the various ‘provincial’ schools outside London that were regulated by the Department

of Practical Art and its successor, the Department of Science and Art, and that followed the South Kensington curriculum of instruction developed by Richard Redgrave.

Chapter Four and Chapter Five detail the history of the Stourbridge School. Much specific information has been gathered about the curriculum and the teaching staff as well as the students and their achievements. The major purpose of these chapters, however, is to develop insights into the many and varied issues that confronted the management of the school and to analyse how those issues were addressed. The founding of the school in 1851 was predicated upon support from financial benefactors, and, over the next fifty-five years, it was necessary to maintain this support and to have amicable relations with the Government Department of Science and Art. Some of the issues (initial funding, securing appropriate quarters, enrolment, hiring art masters, changes in administration and policy from the Department of Science and Art, growth of technical education emphasising science, etc.) that impacted some other Government provincial schools were manifest in Stourbridge. Other issues, such as the question of ‘fine art vs. practical art’ and student unrest, did not seem to emerge as important at Stourbridge. Some factors seem to be unique to Stourbridge: the relationship with Oldswinford Hospital School; the development of exhibitions of locally produced glassware; refurbishing of the building in the 1880s; and an unsuccessful effort to create a museum focusing on locally produced industrial products. The founding of art schools in nearby Brierley Hill and Wordsley posed challenges to the Stourbridge School, and the evolution of technical education necessitated changes, especially in terms of the overall curriculum of the school.

Chapter Six, ‘The Stourbridge school of Art: Relationships with the Glass Industry,’ examines the connexions between the Stourbridge School and the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, ranging from glass manufacturers to independent glass decorating

firms that did cutting, engraving or etching. Owners or key personnel from the Richardson, Stevens & Williams, and Webb glassmaking firms were sometimes members of the school Council as well as financial benefactors and supporters. The Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers offered prizes for student competitions, and the role of the school in developing designers for the glass industry of the Stourbridge district is explored. Local newspapers report many details regarding the Stourbridge School, ranging from accounts of annual public meetings and exhibitions to criticism of the curriculum and the establishment of competing schools in nearby Brierley Hill and Wordsley.

Chapter Seven, 'Conclusions and Implications,' begins by reiterating the research questions posed earlier in this chapter and summarising the results of this thesis in terms of those questions. In doing so, this chapter explores the creation and historical development of an educational institution within the context of the political, economic, social and cultural forces that were present during the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century. With specific reference to the Stourbridge School of Art, this study provides insights into the motivations within benefactors and the responses of the school Council to the various challenges faced during five and one-half decades. This thesis discusses the teaching practices of several art masters along with information on the backgrounds and occupations of their students. In its broadest sense, this study offers an opportunity to expand the current scholarly understanding of the general history of schools of art in Britain and of the relationship of a particular provincial school with an important segment of local industry.

The various appendices are integral parts of this thesis. The first appendix, 'Development of the South Kensington Curriculum,' outlines the key stages in the formation of the course of instruction that was used in the Stourbridge School from 1851 to

1905. Appendix Two, ‘Benefactors and Supporters, 1851-1855,’ lists the key individuals who were involved in the founding and early operations of the Stourbridge School and indicates their respective occupations. Appendix Three, ‘Stourbridge School Classes and Fees, 1852-1905,’ is a chronological overview of the various class offerings. Appendix Four, ‘Awards to Stourbridge School Students, 1852-1905,’ records the names of those students who received local and/or national recognition for their work, and the names of the students who can be linked to the glass industry of the Stourbridge district are set in bold type therein. Appendix Five, ‘Enrolment at the Stourbridge School, 1852-1905,’ is a year-by-year tally of the numbers of students attending the school. Appendix Six, ‘Stourbridge School *Register of Students*, 1864-1874,’ is a transcription of this important primary source with additional notes regarding students who had careers in the glass industry. Appendix Seven, ‘Biographical Profiles of Key Supporters of the Stourbridge School, 1850-1905,’ offers information regarding the lives and careers of key individuals who were the most significant benefactors and supporters of the Stourbridge School. Appendix Eight, ‘John A. Service’s Letters to the Royal Commission,’ contains the full texts of two critical letters written in 1883 by a former student of the Stourbridge School.

CHAPTER TWO NINETEENTH-CENTURY STOURBRIDGE: A CONTEXTUAL OVERVIEW

Subsequent to its founding in 1851, the Stourbridge School of Art became an educational enterprise that was supported by a number of political leaders and other influential citizens of the Stourbridge district. Changing social conditions and economic factors, along with an emerging civic culture, shaped their aims and ideals from the eighteenth to the early twentieth century. During this time, Stourbridge evolved from a market town within a predominately agricultural area in north Worcestershire to attain some measure of status as an industrial area in which coal and clay were key resources, and iron, bricks, and utilitarian and decorative glassware were important products.

Following a brief review of general sources that bear on Stourbridge history in the nineteenth century, this chapter establishes the economic, political and socio-cultural context within which the Stourbridge School of Art was founded at mid-century and developed over the successive five decades and into the twentieth century. Three important areas of investigation and research—industrialisation, urbanisation and civic culture—offer insights regarding these interrelated research questions: What was the nature of change in Stourbridge industry and business? What trends are apparent in population and occupations? What support was available for social and educational institutions? How did civic culture develop in Stourbridge?

Various primary and secondary sources yield both generalizations and details regarding the history of Stourbridge during the nineteenth century. William Scott's *Stourbridge and its Vicinity*, published in 1832, provides information on the character of Stourbridge government and the growth of the town to that time, but the greater part of the book is given over to antiquities, topography and the natural history of the Stourbridge area

and nearby Kingswinford, Kinver, Pedmore and Halesowen.¹ About 1867, John Addison, publisher of the *Advertiser* newspaper, wrote a serialized history of Stourbridge with installments devoted to single topics such as the library and the grammar school or particular industries or places of worship. Addison's account of the Mechanics' Institution and the School of Art reveals the relationship between these institutions and is a valuable source of information for Chapters Three and Four of this thesis, as he identifies individuals who were benefactors of both the Mechanics' Institution and the Stourbridge School.²

Published in 1908, G. H. Goodyear's *Stourbridge, Old and New* contrasts the author's view of a modern Stourbridge in the early twentieth-century with that of Stourbridge as it was in the 1830s and 1840s. Documentation is not always evident, but Goodyear's writing reflects a strong sense of civic pride in the changes wrought within Stourbridge, and he refers frequently to those persons who were active in the development of the town during the nineteenth century.³ The *Victoria History of the County of Worcester* contains an overview of the parish of Old Swinford and an account of the evolution of local government in Stourbridge as well as descriptions of churches and charities, but the Stourbridge School of Art is not mentioned.⁴

Other sources, such as the 1850 *Post Office Directory of Birmingham with Staffordshire and Worcestershire* or any of the various directories published by Bentley,

¹ William Scott, *Stourbridge and its Vicinity* (Stourbridge: J. Heming, 1832). See also Roy Peacock, *The Origins of Stourbridge: From the Stone Age to the Middle Ages* (Old Swinford, Stourbridge: Rector and Parochial Church Council of St. Mary, 2014).

² Undated clippings of various segments of Addison's history of Stourbridge are available at the Stourbridge Public Library and at The Hive in Worcester.

³ G. H. Goodyear, *Stourbridge, Old and New* (Stourbridge: Mark & Moody, Ltd., 1908).

⁴ 'Old Swinford,' *Victoria History of the County of Worcester*, vol. 3, ed. by J. W. Willis-Bund and William Page (London: A. Constable, 1913), pp. 213-223.

Kelly, Pigot or Slater during the latter half of the nineteenth century, contain information regarding the governmental bodies, charities and other organisations that were at work in Stourbridge. These directories also record the elected Government officials or appointees and contain alphabetical listings of the local gentry, clergy, industrialists, professionals, business owners and tradesmen. To the same ends, issues of the *Stourbridge Almanack* (annually, 1885 to 1905) contain listings of the members of governmental bodies and charitable organisations. The directories published by Bentley, Kelly, Pigot or Slater are particularly useful in documenting the growth of industries, businesses and professions in Stourbridge, as is the 1865 edition of *Jones's Mercantile Directory*.⁵ Published in 1894, an illustrated 48-page booklet entitled *A Descriptive Account of Stourbridge Illustrated* offers a wealth of information about Stourbridge at that time, ranging from a brief account of its historical development to descriptions of the architectural styles and distinctive features of public buildings such as churches, schools, and a hospital as well as numerous illustrations of the homes of prominent gentry.⁶ About two-thirds of this publication is devoted to Stourbridge area industries and retail establishments. The publication has the laudatory tone of a chamber of commerce document, for its descriptions and details are uniformly positive and reflect a sense of pride in Stourbridge as an industrial centre and as a town that offers inhabitants the variety of goods and services needed for contemporary life in the 1890s.

Several secondary sources are also worthy of mention. Journalist H. J. 'Jack' Haden (1916-2005), longtime reporter for the *County Express* newspaper, was enthusiastic about Stourbridge history and wrote several books. Haden's *Through the Years: Stourbridge*

⁵ *Jones's Mercantile Directory of the Iron District of South Staffordshire and East Worcestershire* (London: Jones and Proud, 1865).

⁶ *A Descriptive Account of Stourbridge Illustrated* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1894), pp. 1-16.

1851-1951 and *Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951* record changes in local government and significant events, although he tends to focus on anecdotes relating to the most noteworthy happenings. His *Stourbridge in Times Past* and *1882 and All That* are helpful for biographical details regarding individuals who were active in political, social and educational circles within Stourbridge. Haden's comprehensive *Street Names of Stourbridge and its Vicinity* includes a wide variety of details about people, buildings, businesses, and organisations (including the Stourbridge School of Art) that were associated with particular geographic locations.⁷

Nigel Perry's work in 2001 follows in many areas addressed by Haden and has chapters organised chronologically as well as others devoted to topics such as 'trade and industry' or 'religion and education,' although documentation is not always readily apparent.⁸ However, used in conjunction with available nineteenth-century newspapers and Haden's works, Perry's discussion of Stourbridge in the Victorian era and his mentions of people who were benefactors of the Stourbridge School of Art are valuable for this study.

The town of Stourbridge has not been the object of extensive study by scholarly historians, although there are some noteworthy efforts. In 1972, Eric Hopkins completed a PhD thesis focusing on the 'working classes' of the Stourbridge district, and, as referenced later in this chapter, his work contains specific information regarding the population and

⁷ H. J. Haden, *Through the Years: Stourbridge 1851-1951* (Stourbridge: Marks & Moody, 1951); *The Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951* (Dudley: Dudley Teachers Centre, 1976); *Stourbridge in Times Past* (Brinscall: Countryside Publications, 1980); *1882 and All That: A Survey of Events in the Dudley Area 100 Years Ago* (Dudley: Dudley Teachers' Centre, 1982); and *Street Names of Stourbridge and its Vicinity* (Dudley: Dulston Press, 1988). For information on Haden's life and career, see Stan Hill, 'Black Country Personalities No. 36 H. Jack Haden,' *The Blackcountryman*, 30 (Summer 1997), pp. 10-16 and 'More Black Country People No. 11 Jack H. Haden,' in *57 More Black Country People* (Kingswinford: The Black Country Society, 2009), pp. 93-95.

⁸ Nigel Perry, *A History of Stourbridge* (West Sussex: Phillimore & Co., 2001).

occupations of the residents as well as the general growth and development of the Stourbridge district in the nineteenth century.⁹ Although his focus is primarily upon larger cities in England during the nineteenth century, Tristram Hunt's insights regarding the roles of gentry and middle-class businessmen in the development of the Victorian city are worthy of consideration, as they are referenced in the discussion of the growth of civic culture within Stourbridge in this study.¹⁰

The secondary sources mentioned above offer useful starting points to create a timeline of Stourbridge history, to chronicle major events, to identify influential persons, and to assemble information regarding various organisations. However, these sources do not elucidate the national political, economic, social and cultural forces of the nineteenth century in order to assess fully their impact upon educational endeavours or other institutions in Stourbridge.

This chapter offers overviews of three major areas: industrialisation, urbanisation and civic culture. Within these spheres, development and advancements are closely related, and

⁹ Eric Hopkins, 'The Working Classes of Stourbridge and District, 1815-1914' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1972). Over a period of about three decades, Hopkins authored several scholarly books and articles that include some additional details about Stourbridge that contribute to this study, see Eric Hopkins, 'Working Conditions in Victorian Stourbridge,' *International Review of Social History*, 19 (December 1974), pp. 401-425; 'Small Town Aristocrats of Labour and Their Standard of Living, 1840-1914,' *Economic History Review*, New Series, 28 (May 1975), pp. 222-242; *A Social History of the English Working Classes: 1815-1945* (London: Arnold, 1979); 'Working Hours and Conditions during the Industrial Revolution: A Re-Appraisal,' *Economic History Review*, New Series, 35 (February 1982), pp. 52-66; *The Rise and Decline of the English Working Classes, 1918-1990: A Social History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991); *Childhood Transformed: Working-Class Children in Nineteenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994); *Working-class Self-help in Nineteenth-Century England: Responses to Industrialization* (London: UCL Press, 1995); and *Industrialisation and Society: A Social History, 1830-1951* (London: Routledge, 2000).

¹⁰ Tristram Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2005).

such changes reflect the political, economic, social and cultural and factors that encouraged the establishment of the Stourbridge School and nurtured its growth. For example, early in the nineteenth century, the canal system contributed to the expansion of existing manufacturing industries and to the establishment of new firms that created wealth for owners and employment opportunities for workers. Concurrently, population growth created increased demand for goods and services, and businesses in the High Street benefited financially. Many who prospered were longtime Stourbridge residents whilst others were relatively new inhabitants. Members of both groups were active in political circles, and some were eager to contribute to emerging social and educational organizations, such as the Mechanics' Institution and the Working Men's Institution, that required leadership and philanthropic support. As Stourbridge changed economically and socially, an environment was created that enabled the School of Art to be established.

The consideration of industrialisation and urbanisation in this chapter focuses on the major industries in the Stourbridge area and is illustrated by trends in population, occupations, and transportation. The consideration of civic culture involves various aspects of municipal government and the erection of public buildings or the creation of public spaces as well as the development of cultural and educational opportunities. Numerous persons involved with the development of industry and business in the nineteenth century were benefactors of the Stourbridge School or other educational institutions, and these individuals came from various social strata, including gentry and clergy as well as industrialists and various professions, businesses or trades.

Industrialisation and Urbanisation

As detailed in this section, the evolution of Stourbridge from an agricultural centre and market town to an increasingly urban environment was marked by the growth of industrial enterprises and concomitant increases in population. This process stimulated demand for goods and services, resulting in the expansion of businesses. Moreover, these circumstances gave rise to changes in government and to the creation of a civic culture in which the philanthropic activity needed for educational efforts such as the Stourbridge School of Art could be sustained.

As the eighteenth century came to a close, Stourbridge was well established as a market town in an agricultural area with modest industrial interests in wool spinning or tanning. Several glassworks producing bottles and other utilitarian items were nearby. The canal network created in the last three decades of the eighteenth century sparked the growth of other industries, especially after 1779 when the Stourbridge Canal was completed. This canal linked with the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal at Stourton to the west of Stourbridge and ultimately connected Stourbridge to Dudley, passing through Amblecote, Brierley Hill and the Delph.¹¹

Ironworks founded as early as the seventeenth century were well established on the banks of the River Stour that separate the north of Stourbridge from Amblecote, but the most significant development took place about 1800, when the initial elements of the John

¹¹ Graham Fisher, *Jewels on the Cut: An Exploration of the Stourbridge Canal and the Local Glass Industry* (Kingswinford: Sparrow Publishing, 2010), pp. 13-15; J. Ian Langford and H. Jack Haden, *Dudley and Stourbridge Canals* (Birmingham: Lapal Publications, 1979); and Charles Hadfield, *The Canals of the West Midlands*, 3rd edition (Devon: David & Charles, 1985), esp. pp. 100-106 and 252-268.

Bradley and Co. ironworks were constructed.¹² After John Bradley (1769-1816) died, industrialist James Foster (1786-1853) oversaw its expansion as well as entering into partnership with John Rastrick in a separate enterprise to manufacture steam locomotives, including the famous *Stourbridge Lion*.¹³ James Foster was involved in local philanthropic efforts, having financed the Amblecote Parish Church and contributed without fanfare to other institutions, and, upon the occasion of his death in 1853, a Worcester newspaper noted that ‘the poor of the neighbourhood have lost a kind friend and benefactor.’¹⁴

The brief description of Stourbridge industry in a late-eighteenth-century publication mentions only several ‘glass manufacturers’ and two manufacturers of ‘superfine cloth.’¹⁵ The 1820 *Worcestershire General and Commercial Directory* relates that Stourbridge ‘abounds with valuable mines of coal, iron-stone, and clay of a peculiar quality, calculated for bricks, crucibles and other vessels destined to bear a considerable degree of heat,’ and lists various manufacturing interests and businesses providing goods or services.¹⁶

In 1829, the description of Worcestershire in Pigot’s *National Commercial Directory* briefly describes the extent of industry in the county by noting ‘considerable tanneries,

¹² Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, p. 129. For an overview of area ironworks 1600-1800, see Marie B. Rowlands, *Masters and Men in the West Midland Metalware Trades before the Industrial Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975).

¹³ Haden, *The Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951*, pp. 13-14 and Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 96 and 98-99.

¹⁴ *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 14 April 1853. Regarding Foster’s life, see Roy Peacock (ed.), *James Foster of Stourbridge 1786-1853: Industrialist and Benefactor* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 2006). For Foster’s business pursuits and those of his nephew William Orme Foster, see Norman Mutton, ‘The Foster Family: A Study of a Midland Industrial Dynasty 1786-1899’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1974).

¹⁵ *A Survey of the County of Worcester* (n. p.: n. p., 1788), pp. 86-87.

¹⁶ *Worcestershire General and Commercial Directory* (n. p.: S. Lewis, 1820), pp. 165 and 182-196.

glass and iron works [and] many hands are also employed in the combing and spinning of wool, linen weaving, the making of needles, nails, fish-hooks, &c.’ but does not directly address Stourbridge industry.¹⁷ The directory lists Francis Rufford’s Stepping Stone brick manufactory as well as several iron founders and manufacturers of chains, nails, edge tools, and vices and anvils.¹⁸ In the 1829 Pigot directory, Stourbridge is noted only briefly as a ‘populous, wealthy, and flourishing market town,’ but the 1835 edition of this directory contains a revised description, reflecting industrial growth by mentioning ‘iron works for manufacturing various descriptions of heavy hardware ... particularly at Stourbridge and the villages adjacent.’¹⁹ On the 1837 *Plan of Stourbridge* map, large ironworks are depicted in the north of town along the River Stour and at the intersection of High Street and the Stourbridge Canal. These were ‘John Bradley & Co. Iron Works’ and ‘Messers. Foster & Orme’s Iron Forge and Manufactory,’ and both were controlled by the Foster family.²⁰ Upon the death of James Foster in 1853, these industries came into the hands of his nephew, William Orme Foster (1814-1899), who was well known publicly and continued the family tradition of local philanthropy.²¹ The ‘Coal Wharf’ and Joseph Pitman’s tannery are near the ironworks on the 1837 *Plan of Stourbridge*, and there are several mills on the

¹⁷ *Pigot and Co.’s National Commercial Directory for 1828-29* (London: J. Pigot and Co., 1829), p. 855 (hereafter cited as *Pigot ... Directory for 1828-29*).

¹⁸ *Pigot ... Directory for 1828-29*, pp. 875-878.

¹⁹ *Pigot and Co.’s National Commercial Directory* (London: J. Pigot and Co., 1835), p. 1.

²⁰ John Wood, *Plan of Stourbridge from Actual Survey 1837* (n. p.: Turner & Co., 1837); the Stourbridge Public Library has a facsimile reprint of this map, which measures 66 cm x 55 cm. For a portion of the map showing the town centre and brief information about the Foster ironworks, see Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 86 and 129-131.

²¹ Janet Byard-Jones, *A History of Wollaston Schools 1859 to 1984* (Wollaston: History of Wollaston Group, 2007), pp. 23 and 26-31 and Peacock, pp. 49-50.

banks of the River Stour. In her broad assessment of industrialisation in Britain, Maxine Berg concluded that South Staffordshire and the Black Country, although 'rich in coal, iron and water power,' experienced 'substantial expansion in heavy industry in 1810-1830' but the area declined after 1860.²²

Haden suggested that the most significant period of growth for the Stourbridge area was 'in the middle years of the nineteenth century.'²³ One study indicates that the number of shops in Stourbridge increased from 74 in the late 1790s to 274 in 1842, and directories from the 1840 and 1850s that describe Stourbridge underscore Haden's listings of the many manufacturing interests and the numerous professionals and tradesmen.²⁴ A gazetteer for Worcestershire in the mid-1850s contains a classified listing of professions and trades in Stourbridge: accountants (2); architects and surveyors (4); auctioneers and appraisers (9); banks (3); builders (6); cabinet makers (8); chemists and druggists (6); carriers (5); insurance agents for numerous firms (7); jewelers and silversmiths (3); physicians and surgeons (7); printers and booksellers (6); solicitors (12); tailors (7); veterinary surgeons (2); and watch and clock makers (5).²⁵

²² Maxine Berg, *The Age of Manufactures, 1700-1820: Industry, Innovation and Work in Britain* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 113.

²³ Haden, *The Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951*, p. 5.

²⁴ Andrew Hann, 'Industrialisation and the Service Economy' in Jon Stobart and Neil Raven (eds.), *Towns, Regions and Industries: Urban and Industrial Change in the Midlands, c. 1700-1840* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), p. 51. See *Bentley's History, Guide, and Alphabetical and Classified Directory of Stourbridge* (Birmingham: Bull and Turner, 1841), pp. 36-45; *Slater's Royal National and Commercial Directory and Topography* (London: Isaac Slater, 1850), pp. 48-51; and *Melville & Co.'s Directory of Dudley and the Mining District* (Worcester: Melville & Co., 1852), pp. 44-53.

²⁵ *M. Billing's Directory and Gazetteer of the County of Worcester* (Birmingham: M. Billing, 1855), pp. 134-138.

The 1860 *Corporation General and Trades Directory of Birmingham* offers a glimpse into the glass decorating businesses then operating near Stourbridge. The proprietors of several glass cutting establishments are named (Joseph Bourne; Benjamin Evans; Joseph Lowe; Thomas Morgan; and Sykes, Buckley, Bate and Bank), and four glass engravers are listed (John Herbert; Josiah Muckley, Philip Pargeter; and Thomas Wood).²⁶

The 1865 edition of *Jones's Mercantile Directory* offers a detailed account of industries, businesses and trades then prominent in Stourbridge as well as nearby areas in Worcestershire or Staffordshire. Many enterprises connected with iron or steel are listed, ranging from makers of iron buckets to ironfounders, iron masters and coal masters.²⁷ The 'Directory of Stourbridge' section encompasses eight pages and includes Amblecote, Lye, Lye Waste, Old Swinford and Wollaston. Many businesses, professions and trades in the Stourbridge High Street are recorded: agents; architects; auctioneers; bakers; basketmakers; beer retailers; booksellers; bootmakers; brushmakers; butchers; cabinetmakers; chemists; confectioners; dentists; drapers; engineers; grocers; hairdressers; hatters; hosiers; jewelers; joiners; milliners; pawnbrokers; photographers; physicians; saddlers; seed dealers; solicitors; surgeons; surveyors; tailors; timber merchants; veterinary surgeons; and wine merchants.²⁸

The 1865 edition of *Jones's Mercantile Directory* also provides a view of the flourishing glass industry in the Stourbridge district. These 'Glass Manufacturers' are

²⁶ *Corporation General and Trades Directory of Birmingham* (Birmingham: William Cornish, 1861), pp. 800-801.

²⁷ *Jones's Mercantile Directory of the Iron District of South Staffordshire and East Worcestershire* (London: Jones and Proud, 1865), pp. 354-359 [cited hereafter as *Jones's Mercantile Directory* (1865)].

²⁸ *Jones's Mercantile Directory* (1865), pp. 157-165.

listed: Boulton & Mills (Audnam); Davis, Greathead and Green (Brettell Lane); Phoenix (Dudley); Hodgetts, Richardson and Pargeter (Wordsley); Mills, Webb and Stuart (Wordsley); John Parrish & Co. (Stourbridge); Richardson & Smith (Stourbridge); George Robinson (Stourbridge); Stevens & Williams (Brierley Hill); Stourbridge Sheet and Crown Glass Co. (Stourbridge); William Walker and Son (Stourbridge); Edward Webb (Wordsley); Joseph Webb (Stourbridge); and Thomas Webb & Sons (Stourbridge).²⁹ The proprietors of glass decorating establishments in Wordsley or Brierley Hill are also of interest: Jeremiah Bourne; George Castry; Benjamin Davis; Benjamin Levi; Thomas Morgan; John & Joseph Northwood; John Parrish and Co.; Parrish, Lowe and Haden; Perry, Davies and Perry; and Pownall & Co.³⁰ Additionally, nine ‘Glass House Pot Manufacturers’ are listed for Stourbridge, and another is located in nearby Brierley Hill.

Published in 1894, the *Descriptive Account of Stourbridge Illustrated* reveals considerable information about the town and its industries and businesses.³¹ The following list contains most of the establishments mentioned, with the added parenthetical notes offering further details:

Thomas Rhodes & Son, Providential Works (fabricated iron and steel products)
 Stevens and Williams Glass Works (decorative art glass)
 Jones and Attwood (heating and ventilating engineers)
 Castrey & Gee Holloway End Glass Works (decorative art glass)
 Lye Fire-Clay and Brick Works (refractory bricks and fixtures for glassmaking)
 Wordsley Brewery Co. (maltsters and mineral water)
 Hayes Galvanized Iron Works (iron and steel sheet and hollow-ware)
 King and Co. (brick, tile and terra cotta)

²⁹ *Jones's Mercantile Directory* (1865), p. 323.

³⁰ *Jones's Mercantile Directory* (1865), p. 323. The Levi firm continued until the summer of 1893 when it closed and its fixtures were sold at auction; see *County Express*, 19 August 1893.

³¹ *A Descriptive Account of Stourbridge Illustrated* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1894), pp. 1-16.

G. Carder and Sons (pottery ware)
 Charles Ward and Sons (ornamental wrought iron)
 Webb, Shaw & Co. (decorative and utilitarian glass)
 James T. Wood and Bros. (iron and brass castings; tile)
 C. E. Firmstone and Bros. (iron founders)
 Mark Palfrey and Co. (sheepskin rugs)
 Jabez Attwood (hot water heating and plumbing)
 Mark and Moody (printers and publishers)
 Collis and Co. (wine merchants)
 Oates, Perrins & Wooldridge (land agents and auctioneers)
 Mr. A. Pearson (coach builder)
 Mr. Henry Wilcox (tailor)
 Mr. William North (builder and contractor)
 Mr. John Jones (ladies' and children's outfitter)
 Mrs. T. Ward (corset maker)
 Mr. G. W. Bates (music warehouse)
 Prince of Wales Hotel & Pleasure Grounds (lodging, dining, and outdoor games)³²

The *Descriptive Account* credited 'the increase of the population' and the 'increasing wealth of the community' for the current state of 'retail trading establishments of a very high order,' concluding that 'residents ... now find it no longer necessary to make excursions into Wolverhampton or Birmingham, as was formerly the case, to purchase more than the bare necessities of life.'³³

Although population increases and the growth of industry and business were not as dramatic in Stourbridge as in other parts of England such as Manchester, these areas do offer some insight into the emerging urban identity of the town. Over some 110 years, the population of Stourbridge tripled, rising from 3,431 in 1801 to 10,774 in 1911. However, the most significant increases came in the first half of the nineteenth century, when the population increased from 3,431 in 1801 to 8,237 in 1851.³⁴ As Eric Hopkins noted, the

³² *A Descriptive Account of Stourbridge Illustrated*, pp. 18-46.

³³ *A Descriptive Account of Stourbridge Illustrated*, p. 11.

³⁴ Eric Hopkins, 'The Working Classes of Stourbridge and District, 1815-1914,' p. 16; Hopkins reports census figures as follows: 3,431 (1801); 4,072 (1811); 5,090 (1821); 6,148

percentage increases for Stourbridge in this period ‘soar ahead of the figures for England and Wales’ and increases for nearby Amblecote, Wollaston and Upper Swinford were equally strong, especially at mid-century.³⁵ As indicated earlier, this increase in population reflected employment opportunities in industry and also stimulated local demand for goods and services.

Due to the paucity of comparable data from decade to decade, it is difficult to determine occupational changes. Nonetheless, the numbers of those engaged in agriculture decreased whilst the numbers of those employed in manufacturing and other industries were on the increase.³⁶ In his analysis of the district-wide (Dudley, Old Swinford and Stourbridge) figures from 1851 regarding 7017 workers, Hopkins concluded that about 50% (3547, of which 2493 were men) were employed in some aspect of the iron industry, and the next most prevalent occupations for men were as general ‘labourers’ (585) or in glassmaking (409), mining (360), and woodworking (249). Not surprisingly, key occupations among the 2253 women were ‘in service’ (741) or as dressmakers (206), but many were employed in the iron industry (1054) and some were in brickyards (134).³⁷ In Lye near Stourbridge, many families (men, women and children) were engaged in nailmaking or brickmaking, including firebrick essential for the local glass manufacturing

(1831); 7,481 (1841); 8,327 (1851); 8,783 (1861); 9,376 (1871); 9,757 (1881); 9,386 (1891); 10,372 (1901); and 10,774 (1911).

³⁵ Hopkins, p. 15. Although Stourbridge is not mentioned, this source offers insights regarding similar towns in the last half of the nineteenth century: Stephen A. Royle, ‘The Development of Small Towns in Britain,’ in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, ed. by Martin Daunton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), Vol. III, pp. 151-184.

³⁶ On this trend, see Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City*, p. 18.

³⁷ Hopkins, ‘The Working Classes of Stourbridge and District, 1815-1914,’ pp. 40-42.

industry. Workers tended to reside near places of employ, so it is not surprising that the iron and glass industries proximate to Stourbridge in 1851 account for many of the workers described here.

The major glass plant within Stourbridge proper was the Heath Glassworks that originated in the late 1600s and operated almost continuously under various owners until the 1880s. In the 1850s, this plant was flourishing under the ownership of William Walker and his eldest son James. In Brettell Lane near Stourbridge, the firm of Davis, Greathead and Green was producing fancy decorative and utilitarian glassware, including elegant articles that were displayed at the 1851 Great Exhibition. Other glassmaking establishments, including the Dial Glasshouse at Audnam and the various Webb, Richardson, Stuart, and Stevens & Williams firms at Brierley Hill or Wordsley were also near Stourbridge, and, as noted earlier, there were numerous glass cutting establishments in nearby Wordsley by the mid-1860s.³⁸ Writing in 1867, Addison estimated that the glass trade ‘gives employment to about 1,500 people in this district,’ and his estimate likely reflects those involved in glass manufacture as well as the persons employed in decorating glass by cutting, engraving or etching.³⁹

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the iron and glass industries in the northern part of Stourbridge and the areas of Amblecote, Audnam, Brierley Hill and Wordsley depended greatly upon the network of canals for transportation to bring in raw materials and to ship out finished products. Railways came to the Stourbridge area in the 1850s, and there were stations in Stourbridge and Brettell Lane. Connections from

³⁸ For information on these various glassmaking firms, see Charles Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914* (Suffolk: Antique Collectors’ Club, 1991) and Jason Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley, 1612-2002* (Harrowgate: Xlibris, 2002).

³⁹ Undated newspaper clipping (Stourbridge Public Library).

Stourbridge to Birmingham via Smethwick were available on the West Midlands Railway Company in 1860. The short rail line between Stourbridge Junction and Stourbridge Town opened in 1879, but a rail line serving industries on the north edge of Stourbridge and into Amblecote was operational in the 1860s.⁴⁰ In 1868, *Noake's Guide to Worcestershire* called Stourbridge a 'comparatively modern town,' and the development of industry and transportation likely contributed to this judgment.⁴¹

Horse drawn omnibuses were present in Stourbridge in the 1850s-1860s, although these were used primarily between the Talbot Inn and the Stourbridge Junction railway station about a mile distant. For personal transport to more remote points, coaches could be had for journeys to Birmingham, Dudley, Leominster, Ludlow, or Worcester. For day-to-day life and work, people walked to places of employment and to market or locations such as the Stourbridge School. A steam tramway between Dudley and Stourbridge via Brierley Hill was operating in mid-1884, and, by 1899, this tramway was powered by electricity.⁴²

The economic developments detailed above, ranging from industrial and business expansion to the establishment of new enterprises for goods and services that served an increasing population, also posed challenges to the political bodies in Stourbridge. The reaction of those political bodies and the activities of private enterprise and individual benefactors combined to create a civic culture in Stourbridge that could nurture the Stourbridge School of Art, as detailed in the next section of this chapter.

⁴⁰ Haden, *Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951*, p. 24 and Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 102-104.

⁴¹ John Noake, *Noake's Guide to Worcestershire* (London: Longman and Co., 1868), p. 330.

⁴² Haden, *Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951*, pp. 57 and 84; see also Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 96 and 109 and Paul Collins, *By Tram from Dudley* (Stroud: The History Press, 2013).

Civic Culture

During the course of the nineteenth century, local governments throughout England undertook increasing responsibilities, such as improving sanitation through drainage and upgrading the condition of streets with paving as well as providing for town lighting, piped water and gas and, later, electricity, for both commercial and residential interests. These improvements and provisions for enhanced infrastructure were influential factors in the manifestation and growth of civic culture. Like other towns in England, Stourbridge witnessed economic development as it evolved from a market town to an industrial centre. The changing urban environment was concurrent with expansions of municipal government. In Stourbridge and other areas of England, private and public buildings were renovated, and new private and public buildings, including churches and town halls, were erected. Simultaneously, opportunities for education across England were enhanced by voluntary efforts and by national legislation that financed the building of schools. These areas—municipal government, new public buildings, and education—were integral to the emergence of a civic culture in nineteenth-century Stourbridge and to the shaping of the social and cultural environment in which a Government school of art could be initiated and sustained for many years.

Under ‘Municipal Government’ in his 1832 publication, William Scott refers only to court magistrates and to ‘management of the poor.’⁴³ Indeed, except for the administration of justice by magistrates, other forms of municipal government did not come to Stourbridge until nearly mid-century, although official entities such as the Improvement Commissioners were charged with specific duties. The activities of this body and other governmental groups were mentioned from time to time in various newspapers, such as the *Birmingham*

⁴³ Scott, *Stourbridge and Its Vicinity*, p. 61.

Daily Post or *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, both of which reported on events in Stourbridge from time to time during the first several decades of the nineteenth century.

In conjunction with the Poor Law Board, the Stourbridge Board of Guardians was responsible for oversight of the Stourbridge Union workhouse and other provisions for the poor. Appointed 'relieving officers' monitored conditions, and 'medical officers' reported to the board, which met weekly. The Board of Guardians was also involved with public health considerations, especially during outbreaks of cholera or another malady.⁴⁴ By 1885, the Board of Guardians was responsible for much of the area surrounding Stourbridge, and its appointees included the following: registrars for births, deaths and marriages; nine medical officers; three vaccination officers; and three inspectors of nuisances. The entire Board of Guardians met 'every Friday ... at 10 a.m.,' and monthly meetings were scheduled for three sub-groups: assessment committee, school attendance committee, and sanitary committee.⁴⁵

Years earlier, a Parliamentary act in 1825 had placed Stourbridge under the authority of a Board of Improvement Commissioners (also known as 'Town Commissioners'). This body worked quickly to finance the building of the new Market House that was completed in 1828, and it was empowered to deal with street maintenance and gas lighting as well as the general improvement of the town. However, Haden suggests that these commissioners, who were required to own property valued at £1500 or more, were 'local gentry, professionals and business men who took their duties lightly, attending meetings just when it suited their convenience or their interests.'⁴⁶ The Commission was large, numbering as

⁴⁴ *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 8 October 1853.

⁴⁵ *Stourbridge Almanack 1885* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1885).

⁴⁶ Haden, *Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951*, p. 6.

many as 54 in the early 1860s, and one local newspaper lamented that ‘only ten or twelve choose to attend’ the monthly meetings.⁴⁷ The Commission became increasingly involved with issues of town improvement, and in 1866, the town of Stourbridge was divided into districts (East Ward, West Ward, and South Ward) and 27 commissioners were elected to serve.⁴⁸ In 1889, Stourbridge local government was reorganized as the Stourbridge Urban District Council, and, in 1891, the number of commissioners was reduced to 18.

Although many individuals involved in Stourbridge government were benefactors or otherwise supported the Stourbridge School of Art, only one governmental body, the Stourbridge and District Technical Education Board, dealt directly with this institution. This board came into being in the early 1890s when Parliamentary legislation for technical education took effect. In March 1891, the Worcester County Council granted £500 for the support of technical education within the parish of Oldswinford, and the board then became known as the Stourbridge and District School of Science and Art Technical Board.⁴⁹

As noted earlier, the iron and glass industries were particularly important to the economic development of the Stourbridge area, and numerous retail shops and service enterprises also had their respective roles in determining the emerging urban identity and civic culture of Stourbridge. Haden provides a comprehensive listing of dozens of shops in

⁴⁷ *Stourbridge Observer*, 24 December 1864.

⁴⁸ Haden, *Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951*, p. 33.

⁴⁹ Haden, *Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951*, p. 69 (as noted in Chapter One, minute books covering this body’s work from 1891 to 1905 are available); for a succinct summary of Stourbridge government from the 1880s to 1914, see H. J. Haden, *The Borough of Stourbridge 1914-1964* (Stourbridge: Stourbridge Borough Council, 1964), pp. 3-8.

the High Street in 1851,⁵⁰ and an account of High Street businesses, trades and professions in 1865 was noted earlier in this chapter, reflecting increasing urbanisation in Stourbridge.

Mention must be made of those structures that were public buildings, that is, places where citizens could gather in large groups for various purposes, such as political gatherings, public meetings, church services, periodic markets, recreation, or special entertainments. As Tristram Hunt suggests, ‘the age of England’s urban enlightenment’ was characterised by leaders who valued ‘sociability, rational knowledge, voluntary association and a strong civic culture outside the confines of the state.’⁵¹ One might argue that the construction of new public buildings and the renovation of others were surely reflections of such values.

The area designated ‘markets’ bounded by New Street, High Street, and the Rye Market on the 1837 *Plan of Stourbridge* contained the Market House, which was described in 1841 as ‘a fine spacious structure, well-adapted for the purpose....’⁵² Soon after its construction in 1828, the Market House interior was modified to create the Corn Exchange, which became a venue for various meetings and all manner of popular amusements.⁵³

Published in 1841, *Bentley’s History, Guide, and Alphabetical and Classified Directory of Stourbridge* offers an effusive account of the state of the town. After noting that ‘liberal subscriptions from the inhabitants’ had improved the roadways in 1823, the directory records that similar efforts in 1829 left the streets ‘in excellent repair, well-

⁵⁰ Haden, *Stourbridge Scene, 1851-1951*, pp. 8-10.

⁵¹ Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City*, p. 159.

⁵² *Bentley’s History, Guide*, p. 14.

⁵³ Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 81-82. In early February 1851, a public meeting in the Corn Exchange marshaled citizen support for the establishment of a Government school of design, as detailed in the next chapter of this thesis.

flagged, spacious, and handsome.’ Furthermore, *Bentley’s History, Guide* reflects an interest in improving public taste, noting that ‘many of the more ancient and least ornamental houses have been removed, and are in the course of removal, to make room for modern, substantial and ornamental shops and houses.’⁵⁴ This 1841 directory also records that several houses of worship had recent or ongoing construction or renovation projects that were financed by voluntary subscriptions or through large donations by benefactors such as Lord Ward.⁵⁵

Other developments in nineteenth-century Stourbridge, from the founding of the Mechanics’ Institution in 1835 and its construction of a building in 1838 to a new bridge over the River Stour in 1840, improvements in sanitation in the early 1850s and the erection of the town clock in 1857, contributed to the development of the civic culture of the town. A new Post Office was built in the High Street during the mid-1880s, but the most significant construction project of the decade was the Town Hall erected in 1887 as an important element in the town’s celebration of Queen Victoria’s Golden Jubilee. The Town Hall project required substantial public subscriptions, and the *County Express* newspaper had frequent coverage of the fundraising and listed contributors by name. Two major benefactors, William J. Turney and Charles Evers-Swindell, contributed £1000 each.⁵⁶ In 1888, the Stourbridge Town Hall was enlarged and renovated to create a new Corn

⁵⁴ *Bentley’s History, Guide*, p. 6. In 1926, Isabel Evers (1841-1926), wife of Stourbridge School benefactor Frank Evers (1827-1912) dictated reminiscences of her life in Stourbridge; for her account of Stourbridge in the mid-1860s, see Elliot Evers, *Butterflies in Camphor: A Family Chronicle* (London: Research Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 30-33.

⁵⁵ *Bentley’s History, Guide*, pp. 7-10.

⁵⁶ *County Express*, 2 April 1887. During 1887, this newspaper often published listings naming the individual contributors and the amounts each had given.

Exchange and headquarters for the fire brigade as well as meeting rooms for the Stourbridge town council and offices for the town officials.⁵⁷

During the 1890s, a new Dispensary was constructed on Worcester Street. Originally founded in 1832, the Mendicity Office and Dispensary in New Road depended upon major benefactors such as Lord Lyttelton for financial support in order to offer medical help for poor residents for whom there were no other provisions. Also in the 1890s, in anticipation of the 1897 Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, there was considerable discussion among Stourbridge town leaders regarding plans for the construction of a public building to be called the Victoria Institute. Some preferred other commemorative projects, ranging from a statue of the Queen to public baths or a public library. The Stourbridge Urban District Council favored the Victoria Institute and authorised the making of architectural plans, but the Council's efforts did not garner popular enthusiasm or sufficient financial support from potential benefactors. In 1900, the Council decided to build public baths, and the purpose-built structure in Bath Road was completed in 1901.⁵⁸

In 1902, the Stourbridge Urban District Council revived the idea for the Victoria Institute, and its broad vision was for a building intended to house both a free public library and the Stourbridge School of Science and Art. At the time, the latter was generally known as 'the technical school,' and the Council had been interested in providing better quarters for this institution for over a decade. Because a public library was part of the project, philanthropist Andrew Carnegie pledged £3000, and the Stourbridge Free Library and Technical Institute building at the intersection of High Street, Hagley Road and Church

⁵⁷ Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 110-111.

⁵⁸ Haden, *Stourbridge Scene, 1851-1951*, pp. 58-59, 71 and 87; see also Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 87-88 and 193.

Street was completed and opened to the public in 1905.⁵⁹ Many of those benefactors who supported the Stourbridge School of Art over the years were active in this project to enhance educational opportunities in Stourbridge, and these individuals—whether gentry, clergy, industrialists, professionals, business owners or tradesmen—can be seen as enthusiastic participants in the ‘culture of civic benevolence and philanthropy’ that Hunt views as important to the Victorian city.⁶⁰

During the nineteenth century, educational opportunities throughout Britain were expanded greatly through a series of Parliamentary acts that impacted children and adults. The Factory Act (1802) and the Parochial Schools Bill (1807) were the initial events, and the advent of government grants to church schools in 1833 is regarded as an especially important milestone. The Grammar Schools Act (1840) was followed by a series of School Sites Acts over the next 12 years that appropriated funds for the erection of school buildings and, ultimately, the Elementary Education Act (1870) that provided for local school boards, school inspectors, and, perhaps most importantly, improved education for children.⁶¹ In Stourbridge, of course, all of these developments had their impact, but mention must also be made of various educational institutions in Stourbridge that have substantial histories.

⁵⁹ Haden, *Stourbridge Scene, 1851-1951*, pp. 89 and 91-92.

⁶⁰ Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City*, pp. 175-178. On the nature of civic culture as manifest in public buildings, see Jon Stobart, ‘Cultural Space and Civic Boosterism in a “New” Industrial Town: Burslem, 1761-1911,’ *Social History*, 29 (November 2004), pp. 485-498.

⁶¹ For a timeline, an overview of various Acts, and other aspects of the history of education in England during the 1800s, see Derek Gillard’s web site: educationengland.org.uk (accessed 13 Feb. 2013); see also Gillian Sutherland, *Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Historical Association, 1971) and John S. Hurt, *Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes, 1860-1918* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979).

Tracing its roots to the sixteenth century Chantry School, the King Edward VI Free Grammar School for boys was a fixture in Stourbridge during the nineteenth century.⁶² Financial support came from an endowment fund, and there was strong emphasis on instruction in Greek and Latin. When enrollment dropped dramatically in 1832-1833, influential Stourbridge citizens, led by barrister Robert Scott, held public meetings and petitioned the school's governors 'to consider what measures can be adopted to restore the Utility of the school.'⁶³ New procedures were implemented, and the school flourished.

Founded in the 1660s by industrialist Thomas Foley (1617-1677), the Old Swinford Hospital School is in 2016 a boarding and day school with a rigorous academic curriculum to a sixth form. Foley's father, Richard Foley I (1580-1657), was a nail maker, and, over several decades, he acquired numerous iron making establishments and became prosperous, primarily due to 'the successful introduction of the slitting or rod mill that turned iron bar into rods suitable for immediate use in the nail or chain shop.'⁶⁴ Thomas Foley expanded the iron making business considerably in the 1650s and 1660s and became a very wealthy man before his three sons came into the enterprise. Like his father and a younger brother, Thomas Foley had a strong interest in support for education through local philanthropic efforts, and historian Roy Peacock suggests that the 'greatest legacy' of the

⁶² R. L. Chambers, *The History of King Edward's School Stourbridge* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1988) and Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 160-163.

⁶³ Chambers, pp. 154-156 and 168-170. As mentioned in the next chapter, Robert Scott was active in the civic life of Stourbridge in the 1830s-1850s, including the Mechanics' Institution and the Stourbridge School of Art.

⁶⁴ Roy Peacock, *The Seventeenth Century Foleys: Iron, Wealth and Vision* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 2011), p. 18.

Foley family ‘was the foundation of Old Swinford Hospital.’⁶⁵ Throughout the 1800s, Old Swinford Hospital School pursued its original mission, namely, admitting boys ages 7 to 11 whose parents were not ‘undeserving poor’ (that is, those who had been the recipients of some form of poor relief).⁶⁶ The boys were to be educated with a view toward future employment through apprenticeships commencing at age 14.⁶⁷ The feoffees (trustees) of Old Swinford Hospital School enrolled many groups of boys at the Stourbridge School of Art as early as the 1850s, and the *Register of Students* for 1864-1874 records most of those in attendance during that time. As noted in later chapters of this thesis, newspaper accounts of student achievements make mention of Old Swinford Hospital boys.

The 1837 *Plan of Stourbridge* shows the Madras School near the wharf and Glover’s School in Red Hill Road, but Scott’s Charity School in Wollaston Road is not depicted, although it had existed since the 1790s. The 1841 *Bentley’s History, Guide* mentions both Scott’s school and Wheeler’s Charity School as well as several other private schools and schools for boys and girls at Lye Waste.⁶⁸ Hopkins briefly traces the development of various schools, including the National Schools, in the Stourbridge area, and he notes that enrollments in 1870 then totaled about 1900 day students and 300 evening students.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Peacock, p. 76.

⁶⁶ Peacock, p. 78.

⁶⁷ Perry, *History of Stourbridge*, pp. 164-165; see also Eric Hopkins, ‘A Charity School in the Nineteenth Century: Old Swinford Hospital School, 1815-1914,’ *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 17 (1969), pp.177-192.

⁶⁸ *Bentley’s History, Guide*, p. 36. For a list of schools operating in 1850-1851, see *Post Office Directory of Birmingham, with Staffordshire and Worcestershire* (London: W. Kelly and Co., 1850), p. 477 and *Slater’s Classified Directory of the Extensive and Important Manufacturing District 15 Miles Round Birmingham* (Manchester: Isaac Slater, 1851), pp. 128-129.

⁶⁹ Hopkins, ‘The Working Classes of Stourbridge and District, 1815-1914,’ pp. 196-197.

Following passage of the Elementary Education Act in 1870, a public meeting was held in Stourbridge on 2 January 1871 to consider the establishment of a school board. The resolution favoring the creation of such a board was defeated, and it was not until 1873 that a school board came into being.⁷⁰

In terms of opportunities for adult education, one must consider the many Mechanics' Institutions that were founded during the nineteenth century as well as the lesser numbers of Working Men's Institutes. Both organizations sought to provide educational opportunities for working class adults. Industrial towns and cities in the Midlands, the north of England and Scotland were home to quite a few Mechanics' Institutions.⁷¹ *Bentley's History, Guide* for 1841 describes the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution's 'newsroom' and its library of 600 volumes devoted to 'scientific, political, historical and general literature' and recounts the brief history of the organization from its founding in 1835 and the subsequent erection of a 'neat and suitable building' in 1838.⁷² J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, was involved with the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution for more than two decades, and he was its president in November 1857 when the organization joined with the local Working Men's Institute to form the 'Stourbridge Mechanics and Working Men's Associated Institute' and held a soiree at the Corn Exchange that was described in great

⁷⁰ Haden, *Stourbridge Scene, 1851-1951*, pp. 40 and 42-43.

⁷¹ W. H. G. Armytage, *Four Hundred Years of English Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 97-101 and Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City*, pp. 166-167. For an account of selected Mechanics' Institutions (especially Manchester) during the early nineteenth century, see Mabel Tylecote, *The Mechanics Institutes of Lancashire and Yorkshire before 1851* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957).

⁷² *Bentley's History, Guide*, p. 14; see also *National Commercial Directory* (London: J. Pigot and Co., 1835), p. 31.

detail by the *Brierley Hill Advertiser* newspaper.⁷³ The Mechanics and Working Men's Associated Institute maintained a library and reading room and, from time to time, hosted lectures on scientific subjects or offered classes in such subjects as Latin, French, chemistry and mathematics. These two educational institutions were supported financially by some of the same benefactors, but they maintained separate membership rolls until the early 1890s when a formal amalgamation took place.⁷⁴

Nineteenth-century Stourbridge also saw numerous cultural institutions and social organisations, and these were also integral to the civic culture of the town as it grew in population and economic importance. In 1828, Pigot's *National Commercial Directory* mentioned various churches as well as a 'bible society' and public library, the latter supported financially by patrons 'of the first order of respectability.'⁷⁵ In the 1840s and 1850s, bookseller Thomas Mellard maintained the 'Athenaeum Reading & News Room' in the High Street.⁷⁶

The issues of Mark and Moody's *Stourbridge Almanack* published in the 1880s provide an overview of the wide variety of organisations then in existence in Stourbridge: friendly societies (Foresters, Becher Club, Freemasons, Hearts of Oak, and Odd Fellows); musical groups (Choral Society, Harmonic Society, Orchestral Society, People's Concert Society, and Philharmonic Society); political groups (Conservative Association, Liberal

⁷³ *Brierley Hill Advertiser*, 7 November 1857.

⁷⁴ *County Express*, 7 March 1891 and H. E. Palfrey, *The Story of Stourbridge Institute and Social Club 1834-1948* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1948).

⁷⁵ *National Commercial Directory for 1828-9* (London: J. Pigot and Co., 1828), p. 874. The library was founded about 1790, and patrons paid 1 guinea per year. See also *Bentley's History, Guide*, pp. 12-14.

⁷⁶ *Post Office Directory of Birmingham, with Staffordshire and Worcestershire*, p. 477.

Association, Liberal Unionist Association, and Primrose League); recreation/sports clubs (bicycling, chess, cricket, and football); religious societies (British and Foreign Bible Society, Church Missionary Society, English Church Union, Society for Propagation of the Gospel, Sunday School Union, and Zenana Mission); and others (Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Cottagers' Floral Society, Horticultural Society, Temperance Society, and Rifle Corps).⁷⁷

In his 1908 publication, G. H. Goodyear reviews various areas of public progress in Stourbridge during the nineteenth century, ranging from changes in the structure of governmental bodies and enhanced municipal services (sanitation, police and fire brigade) to improvements in the town infrastructure (roads, drains and sewers, lighting, gas, electricity, and newly erected or renovated public buildings) and the proliferation of civic and benevolent organisations.⁷⁸ All of these contributed to the development of civic culture in Stourbridge. The surnames of influential and prominent citizens occur throughout Goodyear's work, and these and others can be seen later in this study during discussions of the benefactors and supporters of the Stourbridge School of Art: Collis, Evers, Evers-Swindell, Firmstone, Foley, Foster, Freer, Harward, King, Lyttelton, Pargeter, Scott, Smith, Stringer, Turney, Ward, Webb, and Worthington. Noting that nineteenth-century Stourbridge had benefited greatly from the efforts of 'men of keen public spirit,' Goodyear suggested that the years beyond 1908 would continue to 'see no slackening in the supply of men of courage and zeal, who will devote themselves to the high duties of citizenship.'⁷⁹

⁷⁷ See *Stourbridge Almanack* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1885-1889).

⁷⁸ Goodyear, *Stourbridge, Old and New*, pp. 51-65.

⁷⁹ Goodyear, p. 56.

Conclusions

The development of Stourbridge from a market town to an industrial centre in the first half of the nineteenth century was necessarily accompanied by an increasing population of labouring class individuals who found employ in manufacturing rather than in agriculture. This increase in population, in turn, created needs for everyday consumer goods and services that enabled the growth of various businesses, professions and trades, especially in the Stourbridge High Street. National legislation facilitated further educational opportunities at many levels, including adult education. The economic demands of industry created an impetus for improved aesthetics in the design of manufactured goods, and political interests were agreeable to funding art and technical education to address this need. Gentry, clergy, industrialists, business owners, professionals, and tradesmen alike became benefactors and supported educational institutions and other voluntary social organisations through their philanthropic efforts. As the century went on, local government became more complex as a civic culture emerged and began to flourish as leaders from various social strata sought to improve Stourbridge through the construction of new public buildings and support for educational endeavours. All of these factors came to bear on the history and development of the Stourbridge School of Art, as detailed in the next chapter of this thesis.

CHAPTER THREE

GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS OF ART (1835-1852)

AND THE FOUNDING OF THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL

As noted in the first chapter of this thesis, several scholarly works trace the development of the Government schools of art in the nineteenth century, and these range from well-documented examinations of the Head School in London to studies of the provincial schools. Regarding the Head School, this chapter does not consider the polemics of artist Benjamin Robert Haydon in the Government proceedings that led to the creation of the Head School, nor does it offer a recapitulation of the many administrative changes and other events that took place between the 1830s and 1852, for the accounts by Quentin Bell, Stuart Macdonald, and Christopher Frayling provide both details and insights regarding these events and the conduct of the Head School itself.¹

Instead, this chapter focuses upon the emergence and founding of a provincial school, namely, the Stourbridge School of Art. Firstly, the major economic, political, social and cultural forces that were influential in the creation of the Head School and in the expansion of the provincial schools of art are discussed; secondly, Government actions from 1835 to 1852 are detailed as they pertain to the impetus for provincial schools during the 1840s and early 1850s; thirdly, the establishment of the Department of Practical Art and its longtime administrators, Henry Cole and Richard Redgrave, is considered, for much of the first year of operation of the Stourbridge School was regulated by this new Government department. The fourth and final section of this chapter is a discussion and analysis of the events and

¹ Quentin Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963); Stuart Macdonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London: University of London Press, 1970); and Christopher Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred & Fifty Years of Art & Design* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987), pp. 11-34.

key individuals involved in the founding and operations of the Stourbridge School during the first several months of its existence.

Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Forces

Industrialisation, characterised by the advent of steam power, new and/or improved technological processes, and innovative machinery to facilitate mass production, created great potential for increasing British economic strength as an exporting nation, and it also had the effect of concentrating populations in manufacturing towns and, simultaneously, fostering a need for education that transcended age levels and classes of society. The Stourbridge area grew differently than such cities as Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield or Wolverhampton, but its development from a market town into an industrial centre for the production of iron and iron products as well as decorative and utilitarian glassware is illustrative of the impact of the growth of industry within the West Midlands.

The first several decades of the nineteenth century were replete with legislation that both reveals and reflects the forces that impacted upon British life in general and came to bear upon the Government schools of art. These are too numerous to recount in detail, but these key political actions from the first half of the nineteenth century are paramount: legislation outlawing trade unions (1799-1800); the Apprentices Act (1802); the passage of Corn Laws (1815); legislation providing for trade unions (1824); the Reform Act (1832); the Factory Act (1833); the Poor Law reforms (1834); the Municipal Corporations Act (1835); formation of the Committee of Council on Education (1839); the Grammar Schools Act (1840); proposed legislation in Graham's Factory Bill (1843); the Factory Acts (1844 and 1847); Museums Act (1845); repeal of Corn Laws (1846); the Public Health Act (1848); and the Public Libraries Act (1850). These political events are evidence of changes

within Government as well as within the fabric of society. With these events in mind, one can detect shifts and alterations within Government policies away from *laissez-faire* in economic and social matters toward a climate in which politicians advocated Government intervention (financial support or legal restrictions), and the populace became increasingly willing to accept or, indeed, to expect, such activity.²

Historians have characterized the latter years of the eighteenth century and the first several decades of the nineteenth century with broad terms or phrases, ranging from E. L. Woodward's simplistic 'reform,' David Thomson's 'forces of change,' Walter Houghton's vague 'transition' and Eric Hobsbawm's 'revolution' to Asa Briggs's broad 'improvement,' F. M. L. Thompson's robust 'rise of respectable society,' and Boyd Hilton's conclusive 'the foundation of the modern centralized and bureaucratic state.'³ Whatever word or phrase is chosen to describe the first half of the nineteenth century, however, one must bear in mind that changes did not happen rapidly and that those brought about by political responses to

² K. Theodore Hoppen, *The Mid-Victorian Generation 1846-1886* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), esp. 'The Nature of the State,' pp. 91-124 and Janet Minihan, *The Nationalization of Culture: The Development of State Subsidies to the Arts in Great Britain* (New York: New York University Press, 1977), pp. ix-xii and 29-36. See also Tristram Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2005), p. 315 and Eric J. Evans, *The Forging of the Modern State: Early Industrial Britain 1783-1870*, second edition (London: Longman, 1996), pp. 407-408 for a listing of 'factory and industrial legislation' that reflects 'the growth of government.'

³ E. L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform 1815-1870* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939); David Thomson, *England in the Nineteenth Century* (Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1950), pp. 35-55; Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957); Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution 1789-1848* (New York: Mentor Books, 1962); Asa Briggs, *The Making of Modern England 1783-1867: The Age of Improvement* (New York: David McKay Co., 1959); F. M. L. Thompson, *The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain 1830-1900* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988); and Boyd Hilton, 'Government and Politics 1783-1846,' in *The Cambridge Historical Encyclopedia of Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. by Christopher Haigh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 249-254.

economic factors or social pressures could be described as ‘fits and starts’ rather than as a straight line that somehow indicates progress.

During the first several decades of the nineteenth century, there was growing interest within Government regarding the expansion of educational opportunities. Among the earliest efforts, the Apprentices Act of 1802 purported to maintain the health and morals of orphaned or poor youngsters who were serving as apprentices. This legislation regulated work hours and mandated instruction in ‘Reading, Writing, and Arithmetick, or either of them, according to the Age and Abilities of such Apprentice ...’ during the first four years of a seven-year apprenticeship, although no procedures were specified for enforcement.⁴ In 1871, George Bartley viewed the Apprentices Act as starting the ‘Educational Society Period.’⁵ Gordon Sutton suggests that ‘the opening of the nineteenth century saw this country moving towards a greatly expanded provision of elementary education for the poor under the aegis of voluntary effort.’⁶

⁴ ‘An Act for the Preservation of the Health and Morals of Apprentices,’ in John Raithby, *The Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. I (London: George Eyre and Andrew Strahan, 1822), p. 386; W. H. G. Armytage, *Four Hundred Years of English Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 77-78; and A. S. Bishop, *The Rise of a Central Authority for English Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 6.

⁵ George C. T. Bartley, *The Schools for the People* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1871), p. 24.

⁶ Gordon Sutton, *Artisan or Artist?* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1967), p. 45. See also P. W. Musgrave, *Society and Education in England since 1800* (London: Methuen and Co., 1968), pp. 19-21; Bishop, pp. 1-9; and John Lawson and Harold Silver, *A Social History of Education in England* (London: Methuen and Co., 1973), pp. 267-308. In 1808, Quakers founded the Royal Lancastrian Society (also known as the ‘Institution for Promoting the British System for the Education of the Labouring and Manufacturing Classes of Every Religious Persuasion’ and renamed ‘British and Foreign Schools Society’ a few years later), and, in 1811, the ‘National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales’ came into being; see Armytage, pp. 90-91; Musgrave, pp. 19-20; and Lawson and Silver, pp. 241-243. Although these voluntary organisations could be viewed as rivals because of their differing religious orientations, they drew attention to the need for Government assistance and succeeded in

In 1831, James Millingen sought to refute the *laissez-faire* position of those who opposed Government grants for education in science and art. Firmly convinced that knowledge is power, Millingen lamented that ‘illiberal government’ was responsible for the nation’s decline in science and literature, and he suggested that ‘encouragement should be given to the Science and Arts and that a taste for serious studies should be brought into fashion.’ Millingen was interested in the improvement of ‘knowledge and taste,’ and, after comparisons between British and French practices, he concluded that special institutions should be founded and supported by Government to further education in science and in art.⁷

In her study of Government support for art spanning 1800 to World War II, Janet Minihan links a number of events in the eighteenth century and first half of the nineteenth century to the proposition that Government was responding to economic and social pressures with an increasing willingness for direct intervention, including involvement in aspects of art, art education and culture in general. She argues that purchases for the British Museum, the acquisition of the Elgin Marbles, the founding of the National Gallery, and the consideration of artistic decoration for the rebuilt Houses of Parliament can be taken as

creating schools known as National Schools or British Schools, respectively, for young children in manufacturing towns. Lord Henry Brougham and others pushed legislation to allocate Government funds to erect school buildings in these areas, and, in 1833, the Appropriation Act provided grants for this purpose. Several years thereafter, Dr. James Kay-Shuttleworth, who was Secretary of the Privy Council on Education, became responsible for many administrative activities and curriculum developments, and, as both Gordon Sutton and Richard Carline have documented, instruction in elementary drawing came to be an important part of the curriculum; see Sutton, pp. 48-50 and Richard Carline, *Draw They Must: A History of the Teaching and Examining of Art* (London: Edward Arnold, 1968).

⁷ James Millingen, *Some Remarks on the State of Learning and the Fine-Arts in Great Britain, on the Deficiency of Public Institutions and the Necessity of a Better System for the Improvement of Knowledge and Taste* (London: J. Rodwell, 1831), pp. iii-iv. For information on James Millingen, see Gordon Goodwin, ‘Millingen, James (1774–1845),’ rev. Elizabeth Baigent, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18758>, accessed 7 June 2015].

cumulative evidence of the willing manifestation of Government in the spheres of art and art education.⁸ Kate Hill notes the increasing willingness of both local governments and middle-class benefactors to be involved with art generally and museums particularly.⁹

Government support for education and for art in general was supplemented by a multitude of voluntary efforts, some of which can be characterized as ‘self-help.’¹⁰ In his study of this concept among the working class, Eric Hopkins considers various organizations (friendly societies, trade unionism, and cooperatives), although one must also be aware of other associations such as Mechanics’ Institutions that were funded by benefactors. The Mechanics’ Institution movement began under the leadership of George Birkbeck, and it gained great momentum during the 1820s.¹¹ Samuel Smiles’ influential

⁸ Minihan, pp. 1-28. See also Charles Saumarez Smith, *The National Gallery: A Short History* (London: Frances Lincoln, 2009).

⁹ Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums, 1850-1914* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 9-16. See also P. R. Sharp, ‘Victorian Values and the Private Funding of Art Education—the Case of the Schools of Art in the 1860s,’ *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 21 (1989), pp. 18-27.

¹⁰ Eric Hopkins, *Working-Class Self-Help in Nineteenth-Century England: Responses to Industrialization* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1995).

¹¹ For nineteenth century views on the Mechanics’ Institutions, see James Hole, *An Essay on the History and Management of Literary, Scientific, & Mechanics’ Institutions* (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1853) and Henry Solly, *Working Men’s Social Clubs and Educational Institutes*, second edition (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1904). Scholarly assessments of the success of Mechanics’ Institutions include these: Mabel Tylecote, *The Mechanics Institutes of Lancashire and Yorkshire Before 1851* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957); Edward Royle, ‘V. Mechanics’ Institutes and the Working Classes, 1840-1860,’ *The Historical Journal*, 14 (1971), pp. 305-21; Ian Inkster, ‘The Social Context of an Educational Movement: A Revisionist Approach to the English Mechanics’ Institutes, 1820-1850,’ *Oxford Review of Education*, 2 (1976), pp. 277-307; Shoji Katoh, ‘Mechanics’ Institutes in Great Britain to the 1850s,’ *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 21 (1989), pp. 1-7; and Martyn Walker, ‘Solid and Practical Education within reach of the Humblest Means: The Growth and Development of the Yorkshire Union of Mechanics’ Institutes 1838-1891’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Huddersfield, 2010) and ‘Encouragement of Sound Education Amongst the Industrial Classes: Mechanics’ Institutes and Working-class Membership

Self Help was published in 1859 and often reprinted, but Hopkins points out that ‘the belief in getting on by one’s own endeavours and without external assistance of any kind was already familiar to many Victorians.’¹²

Lord Henry Brougham’s 1825 pamphlet on education advises ‘the people themselves’ to seek the acquisition of knowledge and asserts that they ‘must be the source and the instruments of their own improvement,’ but also calls upon ‘their more affluent neighbours’ to be of aid.¹³ Brougham was interested in making publications available to working people at modest prices and in book clubs, reading societies and organisations to bring people together for public lectures and scientific demonstrations. The *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* recounts Brougham’s role in passage of the Reform Bill in the House of Lords and characterises him as a ‘champion of middle-class causes.’¹⁴ Beginning about 1832 and extending into the early 1840s, the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, of which Brougham was a founder, published its *Penny Magazine* and *Penny Cyclopaedia*.¹⁵

J. W. Hudson’s *History of Adult Education*, published in 1851, offers an overview of the many and varied institutions then in existence, as its subtitle suggests: ‘a full and complete history of the mechanics’ and literary institutions, athenaeums, philosophical,

1838-1881,’ *Educational Studies*, 39 (2013), pp. 142-155.

¹² Hopkins, *Working-Class Self-Help in Nineteenth-Century England*, p. ix.

¹³ Henry Brougham, *Practical Observations upon the Education of the People, Addressed to the Working Classes and their Employers* (London: Longmans, 1825), p. 1.

¹⁴ Michael Lobban, ‘Brougham, Henry Peter, first Baron Brougham and Vaux (1778–1868),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3581>, accessed 30 June 2013].

¹⁵ Boyd Hilton, *A Mad, Bad and Dangerous People? England 1783-1846* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), p. 174.

mental and Christian improvement societies, literary unions, schools of design, etc....’¹⁶

Hudson reports that 665 Mechanics’ Institutions with a membership of nearly 1.5 million persons were in operation in England and Scotland in 1850.¹⁷ A Mechanics’ Institution was founded in Stourbridge in the mid-1830s, and, instruction in drawing began there about 1848. Several of the influential Stourbridge citizens who were involved with the Mechanics’ Institution in the 1830s and 1840s became important benefactors for the emerging Stourbridge School of Art.¹⁸

In his ‘Preface,’ Hudson referred to ‘the unexampled efforts now making in every part of the kingdom for the intellectual and physical improvement of the lower classes of the community,’ and he suggested that such efforts ‘distinguish the present, as the age of philanthropy and good-will to all men,’ concluding that ‘the middle classes vie with the rich in promoting the great and good-work of education.’¹⁹ The Stourbridge School of Art depended greatly on individual benefactors for annual financial subscriptions or occasional contributions to meet a specific need. Such voluntary support could be characterized as paternalism, philanthropy, or *noblesse oblige*, and, as detailed in the next chapter, this support for the Stourbridge School came from various social strata: gentry, clergy, industrialists, business proprietors, shop owners, and tradesmen as well as those in

¹⁶ J. W. Hudson, *A History of Adult Education, in which is comprised a Full and Complete History of the Mechanics’ and Literary Institutions, Athenaeums, Philosophical, Mental and Christian Improvement Societies, Literary Unions, Schools of Design, etc. of Great Britain, Ireland, America, etc. etc.* (London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans, 1851), title-page.

¹⁷ Hudson, p. 10.

¹⁸ H. E. Palfrey, *The Story of Stourbridge Institute and Social Club 1834-1948* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1948). See also *Black Country Bugle*, 29 October 2009.

¹⁹ Hudson, p. v.

professions such as law or medicine.

Other influential social and cultural factors, such as a general concern for the improvement of public taste, also served to justify Government support of the Head School and to aid in the establishment of provincial schools. Interest in culture and art was reflected in the popularity of subscriptions (one guinea *per annum*) to the Art-Union of London beginning in 1835 and in the ready availability of engravings of historical pictures.²⁰ Such enthusiasm sparked efforts to offer free admission to museums or art exhibitions and to make private art collections publicly accessible on occasion.

The Great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace during 1851 both intensified British interest in the design of manufactured goods and kindled discussions of artistic taste. The prospects for establishing a Government school at Stourbridge first surfaced in the late 1840s within the Mechanics' Institution, and an important public meeting toward that end was held on 3 February 1851, a few months before the Great Exhibition. Crowds flocked to the Crystal Palace, and the Great Exhibition generated a substantial profit and made possible the establishment of the South Kensington Museum. Political interest in museums and libraries was further reflected in legislation passed in the 1840s and early 1850s, and, as Hill suggests in her study of public museums, 'the 1840s were a period where middle-class interest in art and science was becoming much more mainstream, and no longer confined to a specialist group.'²¹

²⁰ Hoppen, *The Mid-Victorian Generation 1846-1886*, pp. 409-410; see also 'The Art-Union of London,' *The Art-Union*, vol. I, No. 2 (March 1839), p. 20.

²¹ Hill, p. 43. See also John Fletcher, 'Public Libraries Legislation and Educational Provision in Nineteenth-Century England,' *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 28 (1996), 97-113.

Government and the Provincial Schools, 1835-1852

Political, economic, social and cultural forces influenced the environment in which financial benefactors and other supporters came together in the late 1840s and early 1850s to found the Stourbridge School. Over the course of nearly two decades, Government actions, ranging from Parliamentary legislation to the enquiries and reports of several select committees, resulted in the establishment of a Head School in London and in setting forth the provisions for provincial schools in England, Ireland and Scotland.

In the mid-1830s, MP William Ewart proposed to the House of Commons that a ‘Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures’ be established.²² During much of the 1830s, agitation for political reform and improvements in education was accompanied by scrutiny and debate regarding the appropriate roles for government to have in matters of everyday life, ranging from basic education to high culture. Ewart’s interests reflected both economic considerations and a desire for social change.

The Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures published the testimony of some 30 witnesses in September 1835, but no report was issued, as the Committee simply reiterated the areas of enquiry: ‘(1) The state of Art in this country and in other countries, as manifested in their different manufactures; (2) The best means of extending among the People, especially the Manufacturing Classes, a knowledge of and a taste for Art; (3) The state of the higher branches of Art, and the best mode of advancing them,’ concluding that ‘the investigations of the Committee have been principally confined to the first and second

²² W. A. Munford, *William Ewart, M. P. 1798-1869: Portrait of a Radical* (London: Grafton & Co., 1960), pp. 76-85. Ewart was also instrumental in legislation for public libraries, see W. A. Munford, *Penny Rate: Aspects of British Public Library History 1850-1950* (London: The Library Association, 1951), pp. 14-30 and S. M. Farrell, ‘Ewart, William (1798–1869),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, January 2010 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9011>, accessed 30 June 2013].

sub-divisions of the subject’ and recommending that the work of this Committee continue ‘early in the next Session of Parliament.’²³

In August 1836, the Select Committee, after further testimony from more than 40 witnesses, issued its report. Asserting that ‘the connexion between art and manufactures is most important,’ the Committee alluded to the ‘want of instruction experienced by our workmen’ and concluded that ‘there exists among the enterprising and laborious classes of our country an earnest desire for information in the Arts.’²⁴ The Committee cited testimony to the superiority of French designs as well as to the availability of government support for design education in France and Prussia. This testimony can be characterized as follows: various British manufacturing interests, especially those in textiles such as silk, were aware as early as the 1820s that practices in the design of manufactured goods were falling short of those on the European continent, especially within France, where design schools funded by government monies had been in existence for some years. Moreover, the concern over design was twofold: British products were useful but not as attractive as those of foreign competitors, and the annual volumes of British products being exported were diminishing.

The tone of this report was that of a fact-finding body, and there are few declarative statements or specific suggestions for Government action, although some remarks foreshadow the advent of provincial schools. For example, the Select Committee recognized the efforts of the Mechanics’ Institutions in Glasgow, Manchester, and Coventry for providing ‘much valuable instruction in the Arts’ and related that ‘manufacturing workmen in the neighbourhood of Coventry have ... specifically petitioned

²³ *Report from Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures*, 4 September 1835 (London: HMSO, 1835), p. iii [cited hereafter as *Report* (1835)].

²⁴ *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures*, 16 August 1836 (London: HMSO, 1836), pp. iii-iv [cited hereafter as *Report* (1836)].

the House of Commons for instruction in design.’²⁵ The Committee observed that ‘a Normal School of Design’ was proposed by Government, adding that ‘local schools, where the Arts reside as it were with the manufacture to which they are devoted, appear to possess many practical advantages.’ This statement was followed by a prediction: ‘In such situations, it is probable that the Arts will eventually strike root and vegetate with vigour.’²⁶

The remainder of the 1836 report is given over to other matters: art and design education in France, Prussia and Bavaria; Mechanics’ Institutions in England, Ireland and Scotland; the availability of cheap publications on scientific subjects and art; free public admissions to exhibitions, art galleries, and private collections; piracy of designs and copyright protection for designs; excise laws that restrict manufacturing; the rules and conduct of the Royal Academy; and the formation of a National Gallery, including provisions for a catalogue of works and public monies to secure acquisitions. In response to the 1836 report, the *British and Foreign Review* offered its strident endorsement of education for artisans: ‘The political, moral and intellectual greatness of England, yea, her whole futurity as a nation, depends upon the direction in which the energies of her masses may be turned by National Education!’²⁷

The first Government School of Design (usually called Head School or Normal School but also dubbed Central School or Metropolitan School) at Somerset House in London opened in mid-1837 for male students. The school was under the authority of the members of an unpaid, appointed Council of the Board of Trade, and, shortly thereafter, additional Parliamentary grants led to the creation of two nearby ‘branch’ schools, the

²⁵ *Report* (1836), pp. iii-v.

²⁶ *Report* (1836), p. v.

²⁷ *British and Foreign Review*, 6 (January-April 1838), p. 97.

London Female School of Design and a school at Spitalfields.²⁸

During the 1840s, a number of provincial schools were founded in England, Ireland and Scotland, and these institutions were intended to enhance local manufactures. A decade before the Stourbridge School was founded in 1851, Parliament appropriated £10,000 for provincial schools, that is, those located outside the London metropolis. Institutions in these areas qualified for Government grants of at least £150 by raising matching funds through subscriptions from local citizens: Manchester (1842); York (1842); Nottingham (1843); Coventry (1843); Sheffield (1843); Birmingham (1843); Newcastle (1843-1844); Glasgow (1844); Norwich (1846); The Potteries in Hanley and Stoke on Trent (1847); Paisley (1847); and The Irish Schools (1849) in Dublin, Belfast and Cork.²⁹

Reports prepared by the Council of the Board of Trade regarding the London Head School between 1842 and 1851 offer insights into the policies governing the provincial schools, the courses of instruction, and the expectations for such schools, as do reports prepared by a Special Committee of the Council of the Board of Trade in 1847 and a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1849. These reports generally focus on matters pertaining to the Head School, but numerous statements relating to the fledgling provincial schools reveal the combination of political, economic, social and cultural forces within which the Stourbridge School came to be established.

In February 1842, the Council of the Board of Trade recognized the potential relationships of provincial schools with specialized areas of manufacturing: 'The Council,

²⁸ Bell, pp. 101 and 136, Macdonald, pp. 134-135, and Edward Bird, 'The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century' (unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University of Technology, 1992), p. 113.

²⁹ For overviews of the provincial schools and brief accounts of some individual schools, see Bell, pp. 99-141 and Macdonald, pp. 84-86 and 102-110.

having communicated with the principal manufacturing towns in England, have ascertained that there exists a general opinion favourable to the establishment of Schools, and a disposition, greater or less, to provide subscriptions for their support.’ The report advised that ‘in some respects the Provincial schools will have an advantage over the Central School, as the Art of Design applicable to any particular manufacture may be taught under more favourable circumstances in a place where the manufacture is carried on....’³⁰

The Council recommended the establishment of no more than six provincial schools with annual grants of £150 each and mandated that ‘a local Committee of respectable persons shall be appointed, who shall provide adequate rooms for the School, and a fixed annual subscription, or other equivalent aid, for a period of not less than three years.’³¹ In 1842-1843, the Council approved financial support for provincial schools in Manchester, Birmingham, York, Coventry, Sheffield, Nottingham, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne but postponed applications for support to Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Liverpool, Paisley, and Glasgow as well as for Mechanics’ Institutions in Leeds and Liverpool. In considering the establishment of the school at Sheffield, the Council took particular notice of the enthusiastic support of individual benefactors, mentioning that the application ‘came in the form of a memorial, signed on the part of the Master, Warden, and Corporation of Sheffield, and by many other respectable inhabitants....’ This memorial stated that ‘the proposed institution would greatly improve the talent and skill of the artisans, and the quality of the staple productions of the town, and at the same time that it would gratify and

³⁰ This 1842 report is quoted at length in the later *Report of the Council of the School of Design, 1842-3* (London: HMSO, 1843), pp. 8-9 [hereafter cited as *Report 1842-3*].

³¹ *Report 1842-3*, p. 8.

elevate the public taste in all branches of the fine arts.’³²

In the 1840s, financial support from the Government for a provincial school was subject to the formation of a local committee to oversee the affairs of the school, and the Government funds could be used toward the salary for an art master. Additionally, as much as £300 could come from Government as an ‘Outfit Grant’ for the purchase of furniture, art supplies, and instructional aids such as casts and ‘copies of the Arabesques of Raffaele [sic] in the Loggie of the Vatican.’³³ The Council cautioned that ‘these schools must be regarded as an experiment only, which, if successful, would be of great service to the manufactures of this country....’³⁴ There were numerous regulations for the local committees, covering matters from the administration of the school and its operations to the safekeeping of school property and the supervision of the art master. The Council appointed an Inspector of Provincial Schools who was to visit each school quarterly and to report regarding its progress.

The provincial schools were mandated to follow the curriculum of instruction that was in place at the Head School. In 1843-1844, this hierarchical curriculum was comprised of seven stages, and, by 1846, it was further articulated into twelve stages (see Appendix One, ‘Development of the South Kensington Curriculum’). The initial stage was always elementary drawing with pencil and the final stage was design, whilst the intermediate stages embraced various aspects of fine art, such as drawing and painting the human figure or modeling from casts or nature. Such a hierarchy reveals a key tenet of an underlying philosophy of art education, namely, that the attainment of proficiency in practical design

³² *Report 1842-3*, p. 11.

³³ *Report 1842-3*, p. 15.

³⁴ *Report 1842-3*, p. 16.

depends upon the acquisition of traditional areas of fine art. Indeed, the relationship between principles of fine art and the demands of practical design for industry was an ever-present tension in the Government schools of art.

In the mid-1840s, provincial schools submitted quarterly reports to Somerset House, and, for the quarter ending in March 1844, these reports reveal that the overwhelming majority of students were engaged in the ‘elementary stages of drawing.’³⁵ Beginning in October 1844, the provincial schools submitted monthly summaries, for the Council came to recognize that each school tended to go its own way depending upon the particular interests of the respective art masters, most of whom were inclined toward instruction in fine art rather than the practical demands of training students for design related to manufacturing. The reports of the Council for 1844-45 and 1845-46 contain information regarding the numbers of students and their occupations. For example, student enrollment in February 1845 totaled 1,767 with 585 at Somerset House and Spitalfields; the remaining 1,182 students were at various provincial schools, with Glasgow (372), Birmingham (257) and Manchester (148) the largest and Sheffield (47) and Nottingham (36) the smallest.³⁶ Some 61 students at Manchester were ‘engaged in cotton, woolen and silk manufactures,’ and four of the 31 students at Newcastle-upon-Tyne were listed as ‘glass painters.’³⁷

In 1846, the Council began its account of the provincial schools with this tentative declaration: ‘In general, it may be stated that the operations of the Provincial Schools are

³⁵ *Third Report of the Council of the School of Design for the Year 1843-4* (London: HMSO, 1844), p. 29 [hereafter cited as *Third Report, 1843-4*]. A prior three-section curriculum was similar, with various elements under drawing, modeling, and colouring; see *Report 1842-3*, pp. 4-5).

³⁶ *Fourth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the Year 1844-45* (London: HMSO, 1845), p. 19 [hereafter cited as *Fourth Report, 1844-45*].

³⁷ *Fourth Report, 1844-45*, pp. 25 and 31.

evidently progressive, and warrant encouraging hopes of their gradually effecting valuable improvement in ornamental art throughout the kingdom.’³⁸ Such a statement is understandable when one is aware of the dire economic conditions of the 1840s that impacted voluntary funding for the provincial schools. Moreover, there was debate, disagreement and controversy among Head School art masters, professors and administrators regarding the appropriate subjects to be taught; the content and structure of a curriculum that began with elementary drawing and sought to harness principles of fine art to practical design; the methods of teaching; and, most importantly, the real impact of the design schools on the manufacturing industries.

In response, the Council of the Board of Trade convened a Special Committee in November 1846 ‘to consider and report upon the state and management of the schools.’

Eight areas of enquiry were set forth, and the first three reflected crucial concerns:

[1] That the principles of Ornament, and the practice of original design as applicable to manufactures, are not efficiently taught. [2] That a knowledge of manufacturing processes, so as to enable the students to unite fitness and practicability in Ornament, is not communicated. [3] That a large proportion of the students receive instruction only in elementary drawing....³⁹

In testimony before this committee, artist Richard Redgrave asserted that the design schools were ‘mere Government Drawing School[s]’ and, thus, worthless to both the students who attended them and the manufacturers who were the intended beneficiaries.⁴⁰

A Second Special Committee of the Council of the Board of Trade was formed in June

³⁸ *Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the Year 1845-46* (London: HMSO, 1846), p. 15 [hereafter cited as *Fifth Report, 1845-46*].

³⁹ *Report of a Special Committee of the Government School of Design, to consider and report upon the state and management of the school* (London: HMSO, 1847), p. 5 (hereafter cited as *Special Committee*).

⁴⁰ *Special Committee*, p. 18.

1847, and its charge was to formulate ‘measures for carrying out the recommendations’ of the report of the Special Committee that had convened in November 1846.⁴¹ The report of this Second Special Committee concentrated upon changes to the administrative structure (art masters and professors) of the Head School as well as modifications to the curriculum. The proposed ‘course of instruction’ encompassed three major areas (form, colour and ornament), each consisting of an elementary section, explanatory lectures, and a design section as well as a ‘course of general lectures on the history, principles, and practices of ornamental art and on the chief processes of manufacture as connected with them.’⁴² This course of instruction was to be ‘assimilated’ into the provincial schools ‘as speedily as possible,’ and, henceforth, art masters to be appointed for the provincial schools ‘shall in all possible cases, be taken from among the Masters, or the most advanced students, of the Head School.’⁴³ Thus, these ‘measures’ taken by the Second Special Committee reflected the need to establish and to maintain a common curriculum in the Head School and throughout the provincial schools as well as providing art masters for the provincial schools who had been educated in the Head School.

The measures adopted by the Council to improve the Head School and the provincial schools accomplished little during 1847-1848, however, and controversy continued, so, on 15 March 1849, the House of Commons empowered a Select Committee ‘to Inquire into

⁴¹ *Report of the Second Special Committee of the Council of the Government School of Design* (London: HMSO, 1847), p. 1 (hereafter cited as *Second Special Committee*).

⁴² *Second Special Committee*, p. 5.

⁴³ *Second Special Committee*, p. 7. See also Derek Hanson, ‘The Art Masters,’ *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 19 (February 1971), pp. 40-50.

the Constitution and Management of the Government School of Design.’⁴⁴ As mentioned above, classes in drawing had begun at the Mechanics’ Institution in Stourbridge during 1848 and continued to be conducted on a weekly basis during 1849.

The Select Committee of 1849 met 15 times, and, during April-July 1849, examined numerous witnesses, including art masters and others from the Head School as well as art masters from several provincial schools. The most important witnesses, who held opposing positions regarding the future direction for the schools, were Stafford Henry Northcote, legal assistant to the Board of Trade and a member of the Committee of Management of the School of Design, and Henry Cole, a vocal critic of the schools who had seized every opportunity to detail their shortcomings on the pages of his *Journal of Design and Manufactures*, which was first published in March 1849. Northcote was the first witness examined, and Cole came before the committee several times.

To aid in its deliberations, the Select Committee sent letters of enquiry directly to various manufacturers, including many in the following areas: metals, glass, earthenware, paper hangings, carpet, other textiles, etc.⁴⁵ Manufacturers were asked to respond to these letters by providing the names of employees who did design work and, if applicable, the training those employees had received in any Government school of design. Four glass manufacturers responded to the letters of inquiry, namely, Richardson’s (Wordsley); Pellat’s (London); Osler’s (Birmingham); and Molyneux, Webb and Co. (Stourbridge). Glass manufacturer Apsley Pellat also appeared as a witness on 22 May 1849. In its

⁴⁴ *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design* (London: HMSO, 1849), p. iii (hereafter cited as *Select Committee*, 1849). See Bell, *The Schools of Design*, pp. 224-238, for details of Henry Cole’s interaction with committee members outside of his direct testimony in formal sessions.

⁴⁵ *Select Committee*, 1849, p. 438.

response to the committee, the Richardson firm named no employees and stated simply ‘we design ourselves’ whilst adding a comment that likely relates to the drawing class at the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution: ‘A school of design should be established at Stourbridge on purpose to instruct the makers and cutters that are employed in the Flint Glass Works there. We have a small school for general purposes, and which we encourage as much as we can.’⁴⁶ As noted in the next chapter, glass manufacturers Benjamin Richardson and Joseph Webb became involved with the Stourbridge School as members of its governing council in the early 1850s.

The Select Committee’s final report was issued on 27 July 1849, and its conclusions and recommendations constituted the initial steps toward the formation of the Government Department of Practical Art. This Select Committee viewed the provincial design schools as institutions of ‘national importance,’ but it also acknowledged ‘difficulties,’ ‘prejudices’ and ‘differences of opinion,’ particularly in regard to areas that ‘impeded the uniformity of its operation.’⁴⁷ The Select Committee found the current system of schools to be struggling with a variety of problems, ranging from an increasing need to impart elementary drawing lessons to large numbers of students and a short supply of qualified art masters who were also effective teachers to vacillating support from manufacturers and benefactors. The report also articulated the unrealistic expectation that such schools could relate to different manufacturing interests and produce proficient designers in a brief period of time. The Select Committee addressed concerns over the layers of oversight given to the design schools by recommending that the Board of Trade be ‘directly responsible for management’ rather than delegating such management to the current Council that was ‘variously

⁴⁶ *Select Committee*, 1849, p. 445.

⁴⁷ *Select Committee*, 1849, p. iv.

composed and consisting of unpaid members....'⁴⁸

In a specific recommendation regarding the provincial schools, the Select Committee deemed it 'desirable that the masters of the London school should occasionally visit the chief seats of manufacture,' and, during such travels, 'profitably put themselves in communication with the masters of the provincial schools, for the purpose of giving and receiving information.' The Select Committee underscored its recognition of the need for practical training in design in the provincial schools, recommending that 'one or more paid inspectors, acquainted with ornamental designing, should be appointed, who should frequently visit and report upon the provincial schools.'⁴⁹

In its conclusions, the Select Committee accepted the judgment of Northcote that advanced students in the provincial schools should complete their study at the Head School. The Select Committee expressed its approval of steps 'for extending the operations of the schools, by bringing the mechanics' institutes and other institutions where elementary drawing is taught into connexion with the system.'⁵⁰

If Henry Cole aspired to shape the conclusions of the Select Committee and to enhance his candidacy for future responsibilities within the design schools, his actions in seeking to influence the committee's final report proved to be ineffective. Cole was active in the London Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (typically known simply as the 'Society of Arts'), and he anticipated that he had an important role to play in the future of the design schools, as his testimony before the committee was supplemented by lengthy documents he had prepared earlier during

⁴⁸ *Select Committee*, 1849, p. v.

⁴⁹ *Select Committee*, 1849, p. v.

⁵⁰ *Select Committee*, 1849, p. vi.

September-December 1848 at the invitation of the Board of Trade.⁵¹ After the Select Committee released its report, Cole returned to his *Journal of Design and Manufactures* and continued to author critiques of the schools, and, in October 1849, Northcote responded to some of Cole's remarks with an article in the *Edinburgh Review*.⁵² Incidentally, Cole was neither first nor alone in his criticism, for the periodical *Builder* described the Government design schools as 'copy, copy, copy, and nothing more' as early as the mid-1840s.⁵³

The report of the Select Committee of 1849 reflected an expectation of improvements to be made within the provincial schools, and Inspector Ambrose Poynter visited many provincial schools during the first six months of 1850. In a report issued by the Head School for the year ending in July 1850, Poynter stated that 'manufacturers ... have the least appreciation of the legitimate objects of the schools' because of their 'erroneous expectations' that the schools would 'furnish the pupils with all that long experience and an intimate acquaintance with the conditions of art manufacture can teach, in less time than is necessary to master the elements of drawing.'⁵⁴ Poynter's report also called attention to the persistent difficulties in gaining satisfactory funding for the provincial schools through the soliciting of voluntary subscriptions from benefactors, especially when local committees called upon manufacturers seeking support for a particular school. In his study of the provincial schools at Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds, Peter Cunningham notes that financial support or involvement from local manufacturers was not always forthcoming,

⁵¹ *Select Committee*, 1849, pp. 340-357.

⁵² Bell, *Schools of Design*, pp. 238 and 240-241.

⁵³ *Builder*, 22 August 1846, p. 403.

⁵⁴ *Reports and Documents exhibiting the State and Progress of the Head School and Branch Schools of Design during the last Twelve Months* (London: HMSO, 1850), pp. 6-7.

albeit for various reasons.⁵⁵

In August 1851, the Head School issued another annual report on its progress and that of the provincial schools. A statement over the names of the Head Masters (J. R. Herbert, Richard Redgrave and Henry James Townsend) noted that preparations for the Great Exhibition had diminished attendance at the schools as ‘art workmen’ were in demand as employees, and much of the report was devoted to the public exhibition of works from the Head School and ‘works sent up for inspection from the branch schools’ that had taken place at Marlborough House during the spring of 1851.⁵⁶ Inspector Ambrose Poynter described the ‘progress and influence’ of the provincial schools in positive terms as ‘distinctly marked during the past year’ and called attention to ‘the spreading desire to introduce the study of art into establishments for popular education’ as well as ‘an already existing movement towards the study of art among artizan classes in the manufacturing districts....’⁵⁷ This report from August 1851 mentions that a weekly drawing class of ‘about forty pupils’ had been conducted ‘for the last three years’ at the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution and that the Board of Trade recently granted £150 ‘to provide a permanent master for this school.’⁵⁸

The next episode in the development of the provincial schools came after the close of

⁵⁵ Peter James Cunningham, ‘The Formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 1979), pp. 159-161, 189, 206-207, 235-236, 241-242, 258, 269, 289-290, and 293-297.

⁵⁶ *Reports and Documents exhibiting the State and Progress of the Head School and Branch Schools of Design, in the Year 1850-1851* (London: HMSO, 1851), pp. 4 and 9-17 (hereafter cited as *Reports and Documents ... 1850-1851*).

⁵⁷ *Reports and Documents ... 1850-1851*, p. 21.

⁵⁸ *Reports and Documents ... 1850-1851*, pp. 50 and 59.

the 1851 Great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace. Despite predictions to the contrary, the Great Exhibition was a financial windfall, generating a surplus of some £186,000. Considerable discussion ensued regarding the appropriate uses for these funds, most of which were eventually directed toward the establishment of a museum in South Kensington that was strongly supported by Henry Cole. During this discussion, however, one proposal advocated the conversion of the Crystal Palace structure to create a winter garden inside. In opposition to this suggestion, Francis Fuller, Chairman of the Council of the Society of Arts in 1849-1850 and a member of the executive committee for the Great Exhibition along with Henry Cole, expressed his view that deficiencies in the design of British manufactured goods were best addressed by greatly increasing Government funds for the provincial schools.⁵⁹ Fuller thought that ‘the profits ... could not be worse applied than in establishing a luxurious monopoly for the benefit of a wealthy district of London and could not be better applied than in diffusing principles of science and taste.’ These principles of science and taste, Fuller concluded, were ‘needful for the success of our manufacturers and the full employment of our population throughout the length and breadth of this land.’

The various reports cited above span a decade and a half (1836-1851), and they focus on the potential economic impact of the provincial schools, namely, that the training of designers should, in future, improve the state of British manufactured goods and blunt foreign competition. The reports make mention of the need to relate design education in an individual provincial school to the manufacturing interests in the area of that school. Lastly, the reports note an expressed desire for education both among workers employed in manufacturing facilities and among industrialists who were engaged in manufacturing.

⁵⁹ Francis Fuller, *Shall We Spend £100,000 for a Winter Garden for London or in Endowing Schools of Design in Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, Belfast, Glasgow, Leeds, &c. &c.?* (London: John Ollivier, 1851), pp. 19-20.

As noted later in this chapter, the implications of these reports are reflected in the motivations and aspirations of financial benefactors and other supporters who came together in founding the Stourbridge School in the early 1850s and in nurturing the institution during the earliest years of its operation.

The Department of Practical Art

After the close of the Great Exhibition in 1851, the Board of Trade sought to articulate a more precise mission for the Government schools and to strengthen the central administration in order to improve oversight of the provincial schools. To these ends, the Board turned to Henry Cole, whose efforts toward the success of the Great Exhibition were then well known. As the major force behind his *Journal of Design and Manufactures*, which first appeared in March 1849, Cole had voiced strong criticism of the Government design schools. Indeed, the initial issue of this publication promised ‘to be the friend to the School of Design by helping to accomplish a complete reformation of it.’⁶⁰ However, his central role in the Great Exhibition left no doubts as to his energy and executive abilities. Cole’s memoirs suggest that he was offered the post of ‘Secretary’ in the Head School by Lord Granville in October 1851, but an official appointment did not take place until late January 1852, when the Government Department of Practical Art (Cole’s suggested name) was created and Cole was granted an annual salary of £1000 and accorded the title ‘General Superintendent.’⁶¹ Artist Richard Redgrave, who had held various instructional posts within

⁶⁰ *Journal of Design and Manufactures*, 1 (March 1849), p. 24.

⁶¹ Alan S. Cole and Henrietta Cole (eds.), *Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole, K. C. B.*, (London: George Bell and Sons, 1884), pp. 281 and 297; see also Elizabeth Bonython and Anthony Burton, *The Great Exhibitor: The Life and Work of Henry Cole* (London: V&A Publications, 2003), pp. 147-149.

the Head School since late 1847, was appointed Art Superintendent with a part-time salary of £300, and he continued to develop and refine the standard course of drawing and art instruction that ultimately became known as the ‘South Kensington curriculum.’

Redgrave’s views on the teaching of design encompassed broad areas, ranging from ‘the acquisition of technical skill, consisting of the power of imitating the form and colour of objects, acquired by carefully copying the fine examples of former times and the works of Nature’ to ‘the inculcation of a pure taste in design.’ All of this, Redgrave suggested, was to be ‘together with the exposition of the principles upon which those fine examples have been composed [and] the knowledge of manufacturing processes.’⁶² The completed curriculum, which encompassed 23 stages with various subdivisions, became the basis for both examinations and competitions under the aegis of the Department of Practical Art and its successor, the Department of Science and Art. Like its predecessors, the 23-stage curriculum developed by Richard Redgrave begins with basic drawing and copying exercises and culminates with two stages devoted to design (see Appendix One, ‘Development of the South Kensington Curriculum’). Many of the intermediate stages embrace various aspects of fine art, ranging from drawing and painting the human figure, animals, flowers or foliage to modelling these same subjects, including sculpting in clay.

The emerging scope of mandates and regulations affecting the provincial schools can be seen in the *First Report of the Department of Practical Art*. Published in January 1853, this report reflects the policies and procedures being put into place under Henry Cole when the Stourbridge School was in its initial stages of operation in 1851-1852. The *First Report*

⁶² F. M. Redgrave, *Richard Redgrave: A Memoir, Compiled from his Diary* (London: Cassell & Company, 1891), p. 358. Designer Christopher Dresser, who was a prize student at the Head School in the late 1840s, became an important influence on the curriculum through his *Unity in Variety*, which dealt with botany, and his *Principles of Decorative Design*, a more general work that included sections on pottery and glass.

begins with a lengthy statement by Cole in which the purposes of the Department are listed—general elementary instruction in art, advanced instruction in art, and application of the principles of technical art to the improvement of manufactures—followed by the notion that ‘future management’ should ‘endeavour to make the Department as far as practicable self-supporting in all its branches....’⁶³

The *First Report* contains examples of the required monthly forms relating to the numbers of students receiving instruction as well as a sample financial balance sheet showing expenditures and income from fees, subscriptions, donations, Parliamentary grants or other sources such as admission charges for exhibitions or lectures. As can be seen in the next two chapters of this thesis, the *First Report* and the similar reports issued annually thereafter by the Department of Science and Art contain considerable information regarding the Stourbridge School and the policies and regulations within which it functioned.

Founding and Early Operation of the Stourbridge School

The Stourbridge School grew out of the drawing classes in the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution. Founded in 1835, the Mechanics’ Institution erected its own building on Market Street in 1838, and the drawing classes commenced there sometime in

⁶³ *First Report of the Department of Practical Art* (London: HMSO, 1853), p. 2 [hereafter cited as *First Report, DPA*]. To achieve self-support, the provincial schools were required to: (1) establish relationships with at least three local elementary schools for the teaching of drawing, each school agreeing to pay the art master £5 annually and to purchase requisite teaching aids; (2) outfit the premises for a distinct school and purchase casts, models and other examples for about £35 from the Department; and (3) schedule both day and evening classes for fee-paying students, with the art master to receive half the fees toward a guaranteed annual salary of at least £70. Women students who were not employed typically attended the day classes, and they paid higher fees than the employed boys and men who came to the evening classes.

1848 with ‘about 40 pupils’ enrolled in weekly sessions.⁶⁴ An 1850 *Post Office Directory* and the *Annual Reports* of the institution from 1850 and 1851 offer insights into the administration and progress of this endeavor. The directory mentions a school ‘of Design, for Instruction in Fine & Industrial Art’⁶⁵ and lists Stourbridge barrister Robert Scott and bank manager John Amery as Visitors (a traditional term for those who oversee the affairs of a charity or similar institution). The 1850 *Annual Report* of the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution lists barrister Robert Scott and accountant Paul Matthews as Visitors and records that women and men were attending drawing classes on Mondays (12 ladies from 2 to 4 pm and 26 men from 7 to 9 pm).⁶⁶

The 1850 *Annual Report* of the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution lauded the School of Design as a ‘very important branch ... making satisfactory progress’ under instruction by teachers W. O. Williams and J. Williams, and the accompanying financial report revealed that the design school had receipts of £58 9s 6d. Subscriptions amounted to £13 2s (although £4 was in ‘arrears’), and £45 7s 6d was student fees.⁶⁷ However, the total expenditures of the school were £82 13s 11d, leaving a deficit of more than £24, although the overall finances of the Mechanics’ Institution were solvent.

Additionally, the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution offered instruction in arithmetic, French, Latin, vocal music and writing. The Mechanics’ Institution also sought to improve the social habits of its members by maintaining a ‘Reading Room’ in which, ‘on one or two

⁶⁴ *Reports and Documents ... 1850-1851*, pp. 50 and 59.

⁶⁵ *Post Office Directory of Birmingham, with Staffordshire and Worcestershire* (London: W. Kelly and Co., 1850), p. 477.

⁶⁶ Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution, *Annual Report with a List of Officers and Members* (Stourbridge: J. Heming, 1850), p. 8 [hereafter cited as *Annual Report* (1850)].

⁶⁷ *Annual Report* (1850), p. 13.

Evenings per week ... Members can be served with Coffee and where Reading, Conversation, Chess and such other rational amusement may agreeably and profitably diversify their pursuits.’⁶⁸

Referring to the conclusions of recent Select Committees regarding Government financial support, the 1850 *Annual Report* of the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution said that Stourbridge was among ‘a few important Towns’ for which such funding was ‘almost placed within its reach’ and concluded that ‘a liberal local subscription’ from manufacturing interests and ‘influential inhabitants’ would secure a provincial school of design for the town. As president of the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution, J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, was involved with the efforts to obtain a Government grant, as was barrister Robert Scott, a former MP (see Appendix Seven, ‘Biographical Profiles of Key Supporters of the Stourbridge School, 1850-1905’). These circumstances in Stourbridge, that is, key individuals involved with the Mechanics’ Institution seeking Government support for a school of design, are similar to those of Huddersfield and Leeds in the mid-1840s.⁶⁹

The 1849 *Report from the Select Committee on the Schools of Design* records that ‘applications,’ including some submitted repeatedly, were made from at least eight towns, and the Select Committee concluded that ‘Macclesfield, Bradford, Stourbridge, [and] Kidderminster, as the seats of important decorative manufactures, have superior claims to some of the selected places [for new schools].’⁷⁰ In late 1850, the *Worcester Herald*

⁶⁸ *Annual Report* (1850), p. 8.

⁶⁹ Edward Bird, ‘The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century’ (unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University of Technology, 1992), pp. 117 and 209-221.

⁷⁰ *Report from the Select Committee on the Schools of Design together with the proceedings of the committee, minutes of evidence, appendix, and index* (London: HMSO, 27 July 1849), p. xxviii.

reported that J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, had received notice from Somerset House indicating that a grant of £100 was forthcoming along with ‘the requisite outfit of examples of art, books and school furniture provided that suitable rooms are provided for the business of the proposed school.’⁷¹ The 1850 *Annual Report* of the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution records that this communication from Somerset House had been announced at the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution soiree on 26 November 1850 and went on to characterise the positive response of the Government to the application from Stourbridge ‘as bearing testimony to the industry and improvement of the pupils in this School, and to the great skill and ability of their teachers.’⁷²

At the time those influential individuals associated with the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution were seeking local support for a school of design, Lord Ward [William Ward, 1st Earl of Dudley (1817-1885)] was advocating a similar school for Worcester, and he soon became much involved in the Stourbridge effort, along with Lord Lyttelton [George William, 4th Baron Lyttelton (1817-1876)]⁷³ and other gentry, clergy, industrialists, professionals and business owners within the Stourbridge district. Lord Ward and Lord Lyttelton were supporters and benefactors of the Stourbridge School throughout their lives, and one or both of them attended nearly every annual public meeting of the school for

⁷¹ *Worcester Herald*, 28 December 1850; this article is quoted in Geoffrey Beard’s *Nineteenth Century Cameo Glass* (Newport: Ceramic Book Company, 1956), p. 36 and p. 51 note 4 (the date is given incorrectly as 28 November 1849).

⁷² *Annual Report* (1850), pp. 9-10. The Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution’s *Annual Report* for the year ending 31 December 1851 notes that the School of Design is ‘a separate concern.’

⁷³ Peter Gordon, ‘Lyttelton, George William, fourth Baron Lyttelton and fourth Baron Westcote (1817–1876)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn., May 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17307>, accessed 6 March 2015].

about a quarter century (see Appendix Seven, 'Biographical Profiles of Key Supporters of the Stourbridge School, 1850-1905' for further biographical information).

Lord Ward's interest in establishing schools of design was occasioned by visiting a Government school in Stoke on Trent or Hanley, and his views on the benefits of such schools were revealed in a letter to the Worcester Chamber of Commerce in January 1851. His words reflect both an interest in promoting the development of taste and the potential economic benefits from improvements in the aesthetics of manufactured goods:

I have but lately returned from the Potteries in Staffordshire, which I found in the enjoyment of a Government School of Design in full work, training up pupils, giving taste where none has previously existed, diffusing a knowledge of all the best models of ancient and modern art and laying the foundation for the manufacture of that district answering the requirements now being insisted upon more and more each day, of a blending of the beautiful and useful together....⁷⁴

Printed announcements regarding a scheduled public gathering were circulated in Worcester, and the same was likely done in Stourbridge. In due course, separate public meetings to consider establishing provincial schools were held on 3 February 1851 in Stourbridge and in Worcester.⁷⁵

The individuals who gathered at one o'clock in the Corn Exchange in Stourbridge on Monday, 3 February 1851, sought to gain favour for the school and to raise sufficient funds via subscriptions to match the Government grant in order to pay an art master and to secure

⁷⁴ *Worcester Herald*, 25 January 1851. The schools in Stoke and Hanley were known as 'The Potteries.' See *First Report DPA*, pp. 94-163 *passim*, and p. 178.

⁷⁵ For a report of the Worcester meeting, see *Worcester Herald*, 8 February 1851; see also John Fletcher, 'A Study in Educational Development and Civic Pride in the City of Worcester during the 19th Century' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Bristol, 1979), pp. 59-65. When local industrialists and merchants sought to form a school of design in Wolverhampton later in 1851, a public meeting was held; see Helena Jane Cooksey, 'The Impact of Educational Reform on the Wolverhampton School of Art and Design' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wolverhampton, 2006), pp. 18-19.

suitable quarters along with the requisite furniture and supplies that would be needed. Lord Ward attended the Stourbridge gathering, and, at the request of J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, Lord Ward occupied the chair.⁷⁶ Those in attendance at Stourbridge included leading gentry (Lord Ward, Lord Lyttelton, Captain William Bennett and others) as well as J. H. Hodgetts Foley, a current member of Parliament, and at least one former member, barrister Robert Scott. Clergy representing the largest congregations in the Stourbridge area were in attendance, as were representatives of the medical and legal professions and numerous well-established industrialists, business owners and tradesmen (see Appendix Two, ‘Benefactors and Supporters, 1851-1855,’ for a listing of those who attended and brief information regarding their respective occupations). Some in attendance were current or former holders of local political offices, and many were active in religious groups and voluntary associations, including the Mechanics’ Institution. These individuals had financial interests or other ties to the Stourbridge district, so it is not surprising that they sought to advance the civic culture of the town by supporting the efforts for a Government school of design.

The *Worcester Herald* reported that the Corn Exchange was ‘filled by a most influential company’ on 3 February 1851, and the subsequent booklet (*Report of a public meeting ... 1851*) described ‘a highly respectable assemblage, consisting of the nobility and

⁷⁶ The Stourbridge meeting was reported in the *Worcester Herald* of 8 February 1851 and in greater detail by a sixteen-page booklet printed soon after the meeting. A copy of this booklet, entitled *Report of a Public Meeting held at the Corn Exchange, Stourbridge, on Monday, Feb. 3, 1851; the Right Honourable Lord Ward in the chair; to consider the best means of promoting a School of Design for Stourbridge and Kingswinford* (Worcester: Knight and Arrowsmith, 1851), is in the National Art Library at the Victoria and Albert Museum (hereafter cited as *Report of a Public Meeting ... 1851*).

gentry of the neighbourhood, with a good display of ladies, the chief tradesmen and a large number of artisans of the town, including many of the pupils of the drawing class.’⁷⁷

The remarks of Lord Ward and several others who spoke at this meeting reflected many of the political, economic, social and cultural currents that were manifest in the mid-nineteenth century: acceptance of Government involvement and eagerness to secure funds from grants; concern regarding foreign competition and the need for enhanced design of British manufactured goods; philanthropic motives within the ranks of gentry, professionals and industrialists toward education for artisans and workers; and a general interest in the improvement of public taste and morality through exposure to art and museums.

In opening the meeting, Lord Ward spoke of the rationale for the government grant, namely, ‘the advancement and cultivation of taste,’ and he said that ‘the town of Stourbridge itself felt it could not go on without making an effort to elevate taste to a higher standard.’ In discussing the ‘great advantages of the proposed School of Design,’ Lord Ward said that ‘he was quite sure that the verdict of that room would be in favour of embracing such an opportunity’ and that local gentry and manufacturers alike ‘would not let a favourable opportunity like the present pass away.’ He also directed remarks to the ‘artizans’ who were present, suggesting that they ‘hitherto probably had never received any adventitious aid either from the government or their richer neighbours.’ Lord Ward called upon three interests—‘the gentry, the master manufacturers, and the artizans’—to ‘combine in carrying on this institution.’

⁷⁷ *Worcester Herald*, 8 February 1851 and *Report of a Public Meeting ... 1851*, p. 3 (unless otherwise indicated, quotations regarding the Stourbridge meeting of 3 February 1851 are from this latter source). The meeting was reported briefly in London newspapers, *Daily News* (7 and 11 February 1851) and *Examiner* (15 February 1851) and in *The Critic*, 1 March 1851.

As mentioned above, Lord Ward's letter to the Worcester Chamber of Commerce in January 1851 recounted a visit to the Government school of art at The Potteries, and his suggestion that The Potteries school was 'giving taste where none has previously existed [and] diffusing a knowledge of all the best models of ancient and modern art' reflected his view of what art education should be.⁷⁸ Directing his remarks to the artisans present at the meeting in Stourbridge, Lord Ward said that a school of design would be an alternative to 'scenes of riot and dissipation' and would afford 'advantages' to benefit the artisans 'for all the remainder of their lives' and 'refine their minds, improve their tastes, and draw inexhaustible treasures from the artistic objects before them.'⁷⁹

In remarks about design, Lord Ward expressed concern about those manufacturers that 'persevered in the old custom of admitting utility uncombined with beauty.' In general terms, he called upon the local iron and glass interests to seek 'new forms and new lines of thought,' but he did not speak to a strong sense of an economic need for improved design in manufactured goods.

During the meeting in Stourbridge, resolutions were put forth, and each was supported by the gentleman who offered it. These statements generated 'cheers' or 'hear, hear' from those assembled and served as rhetorical inducements to crystallize opinion and stimulate action. However, from the perspective of this study, these resolutions must also be viewed in the context of the political, economic, social and cultural forces manifest in the mid-nineteenth century that fueled the establishment of the Government schools:

[proposed by Lord Lyttelton and seconded by William Orme Foster] 'That the rapid development of art throughout the civilized world renders necessary systematic instruction in design and in taste to the artisans employed in the processes of manufacture.'

⁷⁸ *Worcester Herald*, 25 January 1851.

⁷⁹ *Worcester Herald*, 8 February 1851 and *Report of a Public Meeting ... 1851*, p. 6.

[proposed by J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, and seconded by Thomas Clark] ‘That in foreign countries, especially in Belgium and in France, the artisans have long enjoyed peculiar advantages in public schools, instituted under instructors of high ability, to teach them the arts of drawing, painting and modeling, by which the beauty of their manufactures is such as cannot be equaled in the productions of less favored nations.’

[proposed by Rev. William Henry Lyttelton and seconded by John Davis] ‘That the manufacturers of this kingdom are bound by their own interests to promote the formation of Schools of Design; and that districts where no such school is established must soon yield to those more happy places where greater public spirit shall have secured the required boon.’

[proposed by Robert Scott and seconded by T. Wood] ‘That the grant by Government of liberal assistance to the Stourbridge and Kingswinford School of Design demands the hearty co-operation of the gentry, manufacturers, and well wishers to the district, to provide a suitable building for the school, and to ensure its efficiency on a scale adapted to the importance of the manufactures of this neighbourhood.’

These resolutions, like those offered at similar gatherings in other towns and cities in England, are rooted in the economic considerations mentioned earlier in this study, namely, a need to improve the design of British manufactured goods in order to compete with foreign products and, to some extent, to elevate taste generally. The resolutions and the remarks made in support at Stourbridge have similarities to earlier efforts to establish Government schools of design in other locations. In Norwich during 1837, John Barwell, a prominent member of the Norwich Society of Artists, delivered several lectures urging the establishment of a school of design for the benefit of the local textile industry, and he and his wife Louisa were instrumental in securing a school about four years later.⁸⁰ At Manchester, those who attended a public meeting in 1838 in support of such a school had sought to ‘enhance the value of the manufactures of this district’ and ‘to improve the taste of the rising generation [and] to infuse into the public mind the desire for symmetry of form

⁸⁰ On Barwell’s influence, see Marjorie Allthorpe-Guyton, *A Happy Eye: A School of Art in Norwich 1845-1982* (Norwich: Jarrold & Sons, Ltd., 1982), pp. 31-34.

and elegance of design.’⁸¹ The schools of design founded at Wolverhampton and Worcester during 1851 were predicated upon similar views. In Wolverhampton, businessmen and manufacturers desired an institution to provide artisans with ‘knowledge of ornamental art’ and promote ‘moral improvement of the working classes of the district.’⁸² In Worcester, a school of design was sought to benefit manufacturers in porcelain, furniture and upholstery and ‘to have an essential influence on the moral as well as the intellectual improvement of the pupils, giving them better taste and making them seek after better things as the sources of their enjoyment.’⁸³

On 3 February 1851, those assembled at Stourbridge noted the political climate (acknowledging the ‘liberal assistance’ of Government) in providing grants for design schools and were mindful of the efforts taking place in other districts, including Worcester. They called for the immediate support of local manufacturers as well as the philanthropic efforts of gentry and others. Moreover, those in attendance sought to harness ‘public spirit’ to enhance the civic culture of the Stourbridge district with a ‘suitable building’ in which ‘systematic instruction’ would take place. In combination, these actions would ‘secure the required boon.’

In supporting the first resolution, Lord Lyttelton spoke briefly regarding the ‘superiority ... other nations were rapidly acquiring over England,’ and he predicted that the forthcoming exhibition in 1851 ‘would occasion at least a great development to the arts and sciences throughout the world.’ Industrialist William Orme Foster noted that the school

⁸¹ *Manchester Guardian*, 12 February 1838 [as cited in David Jeremiah, *A Hundred Years and More: A History of Art and Design Education in Manchester* (Manchester: Manchester Polytechnic, 1980), p. 4].

⁸² Cooksey, ‘The Impact of Educational Reform on the Wolverhampton School of Art and Design,’ p. 19.

⁸³ *Worcester Herald*, 8 February 1851.

could be of benefit to his 'branch of manufactures,' namely, the iron trade, but he also believed that the school would be of advantage 'more particularly to the glass trade.'

The second resolution was proposed by J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, and he began by revealing the efforts that had led to securing a Government grant for Stourbridge before calling for 'a liberal and spirited subscription from the manufacturers, aided by the cordial co-operation of the nobility, gentry, and tradesmen of the neighbourhood.' Thomas Clark, who was headmaster of the Government school of design in Birmingham, spoke of foreign competition in manufactured goods and the availability of government sponsored schools of art in France, and he also pointed out that 'our museums and collections of art had been more or less inaccessible to the people,' an implicit suggestion that greater accessibility would be of benefit to the public by elevating taste and appreciation for fine art.

Clergyman William Henry Lyttelton put forth the next resolution by noting that the formation of provincial schools of design was 'a chief means of educating mechanics in taste and drawing.' Rev. Lyttelton agreed that France and Prussia were ahead of England in government support for design education, and he suggested that the school would improve morality, since 'those who were spending their time in idleness or uselessness' could attend the school and 'would be led to see how many pleasant and beautiful occupations there were in which they might engage.'

Supporting the next resolution was barrister Robert Scott, a former MP (Walsall) and current Stourbridge district magistrate.⁸⁴ Scott first observed that Stourbridge was recently 'inactive in carrying out public works,' but he trusted that the civic culture of Stourbridge was to improve because the town 'would now assume a new character and place itself in

⁸⁴ 'Death of Robert Scott, Esq.,' *Worcester Chronicle*, c. early March 1856; *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Review* (April 1856), pp. 428-429; and www.wellbelove.org

the proper sphere.’⁸⁵ Scott emphasized that the proposed school would aid area manufacturers, and he made mention of the potential economic benefits to the utilitarian and decorative glass industry of the district, indicating that such establishments ‘would be dead to their own interests if they neglected this opportunity of educating young men in drawing.’ He extended this economic argument by concluding that manufacturers who ‘neglected to improve their artisans and their products ... would be deservedly punished by the gradual loss of their trade’ and, after acknowledging the efforts of Lord Ward, Scott urged manufacturers to ‘rise to contribute toward an object of which they themselves were to reap the chief profit.’ The final resolution of the meeting called for £2500 to be collected and created a committee ‘to solicit subscriptions and to prepare plans and estimates for the consideration of the subscribers.’

Several conclusions can be drawn from the remarks of those who spoke in favor of the resolutions approved at the meeting on 3 February 1851. First and foremost, those assembled in Stourbridge felt strongly that the school had the potential to benefit local manufacturing interests, especially the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. The economic benefits to be derived were twofold, namely, a need to meet foreign competition and a desire to improve the design of British manufactured goods. Secondly, the ranks of nobility, gentry, industrialists, professionals and tradesmen were generally united in their acceptance of Government support for design education, and many expressed optimism that the necessary local financial support would be forthcoming. Lastly, those in attendance

⁸⁵ *Report of a Public Meeting ... 1851*, pp. 10-12.

shared a degree of interest in improving taste generally through art education and through improved public access to art collections and museums.⁸⁶

Three weeks after the Stourbridge meeting, a Public Notice in the *Worcester Herald* listed the listed the initial benefactors (Lord Ward, £100; Lord Lyttelton, £25; J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, £50; Robert Scott, £100; James Foster, £100; William Orme Foster, £50; Joseph Pitman, £25; and William Blow Collis, £50) and noted that subscriptions ‘will be received at all the banks in Stourbridge, Kidderminster, and Dudley.’⁸⁷ The references to banks in Kidderminster and Dudley likely reflected the intentions of some individuals who sought to involve all three towns, a plan that ‘was early found to be impracticable,’⁸⁸ perhaps because of the distances of Kidderminster and Dudley from Stourbridge and the lack of transportation. In May 1851, the school committee requested architect and builder Edward Smith to prepare plans for construction of a building, and, in July, J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, announced that the Government grant of £100 had been increased to £150.⁸⁹

The Stourbridge School began by continuing the drawing classes in the Mechanics’ Institution. Henry Alexander Bowler was appointed art master by the Head School in

⁸⁶ On developing a ‘national taste,’ see Mervyn Romans, ‘A Question of “Taste”: Re-examining the Rationale for the Introduction of Public Art and Design Education to Britain in the Early Nineteenth Century,’ in *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays*, ed. Mervyn Romans (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005), pp. 41-53.

⁸⁷ *Worcester Herald*, 22 February 1851. On 3 May 1851, the *Worcester Herald* said that ‘students of the drawing school in the Mechanics’ Institute’ contributed £6 10s. In 1867, Lord Lyttelton referred to the late J. H. Hodgetts Foley and the late Robert Scott as the founders of the school; see *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 21 December 1867.

⁸⁸ John Addison, ‘History of Stourbridge’ (undated clipping, Stourbridge Public Library).

⁸⁹ *Worcester Herald*, 3 May 1851 and 5 July 1851.

London, and he came to Stourbridge in September 1851.⁹⁰ The Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution's *Annual Report* for 1851 called the school 'a separate concern' whilst expressing the hope that 'young men of the district' would 'elevate their condition as workmen' by attending. When the school was part of the Mechanics' Institution in 1849-1851, J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, donated £5 yearly, and some 25 individuals contributed a total of £52 13s, whilst nine others pledged annual subscriptions totaling £15 9s.⁹¹

By early 1852, the Stourbridge School of Art was operating under the auspices of the Government Department of Practical Art. Although some members of the local governing body of the school and other benefactors were active in Stourbridge political circles or held elective office, the affairs of the school were not subject to oversight by any local, district or county political entity.

In 1851-1852, the Stourbridge School was governed by a group called the 'Committee of Management' in documents of the Department of Practical Art, but this group was generally known in Stourbridge as the 'Council.' Lord Ward was president, and there were three vice-presidents: the Earl of Stamford and Warrington; Lord Lyttelton; and J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP. The other Council members were: barrister Robert Scott, who served as chairman; insurance agent Charles W. Gibson, who was secretary; Rev. William Henry Lyttelton; industrialist William Orme Foster of the Bradley iron manufacturing firm; solicitor John Harward; tanner Joseph Pitman; currier William Akroyd; draper John Cooke; glass manufacturer Joseph Webb; glass manufacturer Benjamin Richardson; and clock and

⁹⁰ William Vaughan, 'Bowler, Henry Alexander (1824–1903)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32004, accessed 6 March 2015].

⁹¹ Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution, *Annual Report for the Year ending 31st December, 1851* (Stourbridge: J. Heming, 1851), pp. 9-10.

watchmaker Edward Blurton.⁹² The *First Report of the Department of Practical Art* listed these men but mentioned the occupations for only Richardson and Webb, perhaps in anticipation of a potential relationship between the school and the glass manufacturing industry of the Stourbridge district. This *First Report* also specifies occupations for some council members at other provincial schools, including Glasgow, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Paisley, Sheffield, and Worcester.⁹³

In September 1852, *Berrow's Worcester Journal* reported on matters regarding the Stourbridge School.⁹⁴ Although about £800 had been raised, that sum was insufficient to construct a new building, so the Council purchased a vacant theatre, obtained a mortgage and converted the structure 'into a suite of rooms admirably well adapted for the purposes.' A 'Conversazione' to celebrate the school's first anniversary was held in early September 1852, and the main room of the school was 'filled with the *elite* of the town and

⁹² *First Report DPA*, pp. 99-100.

⁹³ *First Report DPA*, pp. 95 and 97-100. Council members at Glasgow included six calico printers, two goldsmiths, two merchants, a cabinetmaker and upholsterer, an engineer, and two others identified simply as 'manufacturer.' Council members at Newcastle-on-Tyne included two medical professionals, two solicitors, an architect, a banker, a civil engineer, a glass-stainer, a magistrate, a merchant, and a plumber. Council members at Paisley included five shawl manufacturers, a land surveyor and architect, an iron founder, a merchant, a painter, a soap manufacturer, a thread manufacturer, and two others identified as 'manufacturer.' Council members at Sheffield included two silver plate manufacturers, two medical professionals, an architect, a coal owner, an ironmaster, a publisher, a solicitor, a snuff manufacturer, a stove grate manufacturer, a white lead manufacturer, a wine merchant, and three others identified as 'merchant and manufacturer.' Council members at Worcester included six bankers, an alderman, a civil engineer, a doctor, a magistrate, and two others associated with local 'porcelain works.' Other Council members at these schools came from the ranks of gentry and clergy or held offices such as mayor or justice of the peace.

⁹⁴ *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 9 September 1852. The Worcester Government School of Design held its first annual public meeting on 3 November 1852, and its report can be found in Bernard Denvir, *The Late Victorians: Art, Design and Society, 1852-1910* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1986), pp. 164-167.

neighbourhood’ during this event. Lord Lyttelton declared that the school was ‘established for the benefit of all and not one particular class,’ and he remarked that ‘its leading object was to elevate and improve the mind, and promote the general well-being in the neighbourhood.’

During 1851-1852, Ralph N. Wornum, Librarian and Keeper of Casts at the Head School in London, traveled to many Government provincial schools to deliver lectures. At Stourbridge, he presented free evening lectures on ‘Analysis of Ornament’ in April 1852 and on ‘History of Ornament’ (Egyptian, Greek, and Roman) in December 1852. An audience of 250 in the town hall was reported for the April lectures, and the audience for the December series was 150.⁹⁵

Nothing is known regarding Henry Alexander Bowler’s teaching methods in 1851-1852, but elementary drawing likely remained the focus of the Stourbridge School as it became independent of the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution. Two Stourbridge School students, identified only as ‘R. Wilson and J. Allsop,’ were awarded medals in 1852 for their outline drawings of ornament.⁹⁶

⁹⁵ *First Report DPA*, pp. 226-227; Wornum also lectured at schools in Belfast, Birmingham, Cork, Coventry, Dublin, Glasgow, Liverpool, Macclesfield, Manchester, Newcastle, Norwich, Nottingham, Paisley, Sheffield, Stoke, Worcester and York. For these lectures, see the first edition of Ralph N. Wornum’s *Analysis of Ornament [and] the Characteristics of Styles: An Introduction to the Study of the History of Ornamental Art* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1856). A newspaper account of a lecture at Liverpool records that Wornum ‘gave a short history of design in general, and explained the elements of form, which in themselves were exceedingly simple, and based on certain fixed laws’ (see *Liverpool Mercury*, 11 November 1851).

⁹⁶ *First Report DPA*, pp. 161 and 304. The identity of another Stourbridge student, Thomas Bott, is suggested by a newspaper report of the 1853 Great Industrial Exhibition in Dublin. In a lengthy account of a visit to the exhibition by Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, the newspaper (see *Freeman’s Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*, 3 September 1853) described the Prince Consort’s great interest in a porcelain ‘pastile [incense] burner of exquisitely graceful design and ornamented in gold in the most elaborate and tasteful manner.’ The article indicates that this item, exhibited by Kerr and Binns of Worcester, was

Conclusions

This chapter provides a discussion of economic, social and cultural factors that influenced political events and, subsequently, Government policy toward education in general and art education in particular during the early nineteenth century. As Stourbridge evolved from a market town to become a modest industrial centre, its population grew, and increased demand for goods and services led to the establishment of a variety of shops and businesses. During the decades this economic change occurred, national political forces responded to increasing public interest in the expansion of educational opportunities.

This chapter also provides an account of the Select Committee of 1835-1836 and later official reports from various bodies that describe the Head School, its curriculum, and the relationship between the Head School and the provincial schools after the initial formation of the Department of Practical Art. When the Stourbridge School completed its first year of operation in 1852, the Department of Practical Art, under Henry Cole and Richard Redgrave, was well on its way toward establishing policies and procedures for the administration and oversight of the growing ranks of provincial schools.

Lastly, this chapter details the founding of the Stourbridge School and offers insights into the efforts of local benefactors that reflect the prevalent national economic, political, social and cultural forces. Like some other provincial schools, the Stourbridge School grew out of efforts for drawing instruction within a Mechanics' Institution. Those who came forward as the initial supporters of the Stourbridge School represented various social strata ranging from gentry and clergy to industrialists, business owners, professionals and tradesmen, but they were generally united in their feeling that the advent of a provincial

the work of one who 'served seven years to the trade of spade-handle making, but having a taste for the fine arts, studied in the Stourbridge School of Design' prior to his employment in the Royal Porcelain Works at Worcester.

school in Stourbridge would be of economic benefit to local manufacturing industries and would contribute to the elevation of public taste. As will be seen in subsequent chapters of this thesis, many benefactors who supported the Mechanics' Institution continued their efforts when the Stourbridge School was in operation, but the impact of the school upon local manufacturing and the influence of the school upon public taste are, however, complex questions to consider.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL OF ART: HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT, 1851-1881

From the time of its founding in 1851 and throughout the next three decades, the governing Council of the Stourbridge School, like that of other provincial schools, confronted management issues as the educational institution evolved. These issues ranged from concerns about finances for ongoing operations or the deteriorating condition of the building to the employment and compensation of art masters who were proficient instructors and successful in maintaining student enrolments. Operating under the auspices of the Government Department of Practical Art and its successor, the Department of Science and Art, the school was governed by a Council of voluntary members, including several who were active in aspects of the civic culture of Stourbridge. Between 1851 and 1881, there was an ongoing need for funds from benefactors to conduct the school and to manage a substantial mortgage debt that produced a near crisis in the early 1880s. After the brief tenures of art masters Henry Alexander Bowler in 1851-1852 and Andrew MacCallum in 1852-1854, the school employed George Yeats from September 1854 to October 1863. William Bowen succeeded Yeats and served as art master until the close of 1881.

This chapter addresses the following research questions: What were the motivations of benefactors in supporting the school? How did the art masters obtain their qualifications? Did the curriculum, class schedules and methods of teaching meet the needs of local industry? What social strata did the students represent? Can the future successes of Stourbridge students be credited to the school? What were the responses of the governing Council of the school in addressing management issues and policy changes within the Department of Science and Art? To the extent supported by the available evidence, the resolutions of these interrelated research questions reveal the various factors that came to

shape the history of the Stourbridge School. These factors range from the composition and interests of the members of the governing Council of the school and the instructional practices of its art masters to matters regarding student enrolments and the role of the school relative to local industries and to the civic culture of Stourbridge. Other important factors include the responses of the Council in addressing local concerns, such as mortgage debt and the need for frequent fundraising efforts, or in dealing with broader issues that were raised by the Government Department of Science and Art.

This chapter covers interrelated areas that are germane to the development of the Stourbridge School over the first thirty years of its existence. Descriptions of some of these areas—such as curriculum, class schedules, student fees and enrolment or the backgrounds of art masters—are essential for an understanding of the character of the school. Additionally, the approaches to art education taken by the art masters and the socio-economic status of the students offer insights into the nature of the school, as do the prizes awarded for student achievements. Other areas, beginning with the need for benefactors and public support as well as aspects of the relationship of the Stourbridge School with the Department of Science and Art, are also worthy of analysis. As this chapter indicates, various management concerns, ranging from the burdensome mortgage debt to the impacts of changing policies from the Department of Science and Art, came to the fore at times during 1851-1881, but the Stourbridge School was generally able to sustain its purpose: providing art education by a qualified art master and assistants to relatively steady student enrolments through drawing and art instruction within the rigid curriculum mandated by the Department.

Building and Mortgage Debt

From its inception in September 1851 until its relocation to a new building in a prominent area in 1905, the Stourbridge School was in Theatre Road, near Talbot Street (earlier known as Back Lane). Although the school was not far from the market area and the intersections of the High Street with Coventry Street and New Street, the renovated theatre building was isolated from the economic and social centres of Stourbridge by other structures, and its location was poorly lighted.¹ Residents patronising shops along the High Street or going to market or walking to or from work at Stourbridge industries would not likely notice the Stourbridge School. Constructed in the 1790s, the theatre building was labeled 'Coach Work' on the 1837 map of Stourbridge and was vacant when the first Council of the Stourbridge School decided to purchase it in 1851.²

Those attending the public gathering on 3 February 1851 had supported a resolution to empower a Committee to commence fundraising for £2500 to finance the construction of a new building. This desire for a purpose built structure reflected the enthusiasm of civic leaders such as J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, barrister Robert Scott, solicitor William Blow Collis and industrialist William Orme Foster, all of whom were involved with the founding of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution in the 1830s.³ These gentlemen were instrumental in the fundraising efforts that led to the construction of a building on Market Street for the

¹ H. J. Haden, *Street Names of Stourbridge and its Vicinity* (Dudley: Dulston Press, 1988), pp. 26 and 326-331. Using the web site www.oldstourbridgemaps.kjdocs.co.uk, one can view the Ordnance Survey Map published in 1884 to see the physical location of the School of Art in relation to other structures in Stourbridge at that time.

² John Wood, *Plan of Stourbridge from Actual Survey 1837* (n. p.: Turner & Co., 1837) and Chris Gittins, *Theatres and Cinemas of Stourbridge 1752-1952* (Dudley: Dudley Teachers' Centre, 1980), p. 3. The Ryemarket Centre now occupies this area.

³ H. E. Palfrey, *The Story of Stourbridge Institute and Social Club 1834-1948* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1948), pp. 8-9.

Mechanics' Institution. Their involvement with the founding of the Government school in Stourbridge in 1851 afforded them further opportunities for their philanthropy and their interest in education to contribute to the civic culture of the town.

In a remark that both reflects his concern with the quality of the built environment and the prospects for an emerging civic culture in Stourbridge, Lord Ward, one of the leading benefactors, stated that the proposed new building ought to be of 'tasteful design' and should itself serve as 'a model of taste.'⁴ Lord Ward and two other prominent Stourbridge citizens, barrister Robert Scott and industrialist James Foster, donated £100 each, and contributions soon totaled £500. Subsequent contributions in 1851 brought the total to about £800, far short of the £2500 goal. A new building was out of the question, so the Committee purchased the disused theatre for £700 and obtained a mortgage to fund the renovations needed to create suitable classrooms.⁵ In order for Stourbridge to qualify for a yearly Government grant of £150 and further support, the Committee was required to 'provide suitable rooms ... for the business of the proposed school' and to guarantee sufficient monies to operate the school for three years.⁶ Committee members were confident they could fulfill these requirements, but, without the funds from the mortgage, the school would not have been able to open. In subsequent years, the need for operating funds and the mortgage debt were constant concerns to the school Council.

The first report of the Government Department of Practical Art described the facilities at Stourbridge in 1853 as accommodating 'about 120' students with 'two class

⁴ *Worcester Herald*, 8 February 1851.

⁵ *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 9 September 1852.

⁶ *Worcester Herald*, 28 December 1850; this article is quoted in Geoffrey Beard's *Nineteenth Century Cameo Glass* (Newport: Ceramic Book Company, 1956), p. 36 and p. 51 note 4 (the date is given incorrectly as 28 November 1849).

rooms, library, masters room, and attendant's house.'⁷ Fundraising continued because monies were needed for the day-to-day operations of the school. A Council report in 1855 noted that the building 'was bought with borrowed money, and the fitting-up, alterations and furniture paid for with donations and subscriptions of the public as far as they went.'⁸ Such a remark likely reflects the disappointment among the members of the Council regarding the result of their fundraising efforts. Eight individuals who contributed £25 to £100 each were responsible for £500 of the initial £800 raised in 1851.⁹ A list of subscribers from 1852 reveals that 42 individuals and only three industrial firms (glass manufacturers Davis, Greathead & Green; ironmasters Wood Brothers; and iron founders Keep and Watkin) pledged subscriptions totaling nearly £43 to the Stourbridge School.¹⁰ More than one-third of this sum was from Council members (the largest donations, two guineas each, came from four members), including glass manufacturers Benjamin Richardson and Joseph Webb, who donated one guinea each.¹¹ A few others (William J. Hodgetts, Joseph King, and Thomas Wilkes Webb) associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district donated small sums. With the constant need for fundraising confronting

⁷ *First Report DPA*, p. 104. The Stourbridge School consisted of these rooms on the ground floor: advanced room (28 ft. x 37 ft. with high ceiling) and elementary room (28 ft. x 27 ft.) that connected by a doorway to the small one-storey attendant's house. The modelling room (27 ft. x 13.6 ft.) and the library/master's room (21 ft. x 14 ft.) were on the first floor. A lavatory for men was on the ground floor, and a cloakroom and lavatory for ladies was on the first floor (see file ED 29/176 in the National Archives at Kew).

⁸ *Trustee's Remarks on the Report of the Stourbridge School of Design for the Year 1855* (Stourbridge: Thomas Mellard, n. d.). Hereafter cited as *Trustee's Remarks 1855*, this document is in the National Art Library at the Victoria and Albert Museum.

⁹ *Worcester Herald*, 22 February 1851.

¹⁰ *Slater's Classified Directory of the Extensive and Important Manufacturing District 15 Miles Round Birmingham* (Manchester: Isaac Slater, 1851), p. 137.

¹¹ Nigel Perry, *A History of Stourbridge* (West Sussex: Phillimore, 2001), p. 167.

them, Council members faced an ongoing need to attract donors to support the school, and, in subsequent years, this proved to be a difficult task, perhaps an undertaking that consumed so much of the Council's efforts that it inhibited the ability of the school to assess its curriculum and instructional practices in relation to the needs of industries within the Stourbridge district.

By late 1855, the Stourbridge School was operating with expenditures in excess of income, so the Council decided to secure the existing mortgage of £700. Three Council members (William Blow Collis; J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP; and Robert Scott) agreed to underwrite 'a joint security to make up any deficiency in case of sale.' In its planning, the Council assumed that yearly income from student fees etc. would reach £80 and that annual subscriptions would amount to at least £60.¹² Subsequent evidence suggests that the Council's outlook was tenuous but viable, as annual income over the next several years typically exceeded expenditures. Although yearly subscriptions were less than anticipated, the Council transferred £30 to a 'Mortgage Liquidation Account' in 1862-1863.¹³ However, little progress was made on the mortgage debt for nearly two decades thereafter.

Additional interior building renovations were accomplished in mid-1856, and a newspaper reporter who visited the school in August declared that 'the general arrangements are decidedly superior to what they were,' a statement that reflects poorly on the previous accommodations.¹⁴ Over the next two decades, Council reports at annual meetings make brief mentions of maintenance or repair concerns, but specific Council

¹² *Trustee's Remarks 1855.*

¹³ This printed document in the Stourbridge Public Library contains a 'List of Subscribers, 1862,' a 'Cash Account for the Year ending December 31, 1963' and a brief letter of explanation signed by Lord Lyttelton.

¹⁴ *Brierley Hill Advertiser*, 30 August 1856.

actions were not reported. In 1862, the lighting in some rooms was improved to accommodate added students, and, in 1866, the interior was 're-painted and decorated.'¹⁵

Nonetheless, the ongoing need for funds and the mortgage debt continued to loom over the Stourbridge School. Potential donors or other benefactors may have been deterred by the presence of the debt, just as current supporters were unable to make progress toward retiring the debt. Characterised as 'a burden' of £640 in 1867, this debt remained unchanged in 1870 because only the annual interest was being paid. The Council convened an extraordinary meeting in April 1870, ultimately deciding 'to take steps to raise the sum of £400' and to apply for a special Government grant of £300. Accounts to receive donations were opened at banks in Birmingham, Kidderminster and Stourbridge.¹⁶ Despite the Council's optimism, this fundraising was unsuccessful and the debt was undiminished.

In 1871, the Council applied for a building grant from the Department of Science and Art. During July, architect James Allsop, a former student at the Stourbridge School during 1852-1855, prepared notes regarding the exterior and interior along with information regarding lighting and heating, and, in November, Council secretary William King began the application process.¹⁷ Correspondence regarding plans for skylights and interior alterations ensued, but the effort came to no result in December 1875, when the application was either withdrawn by the Council or rejected by the Department because the mortgage debt encumbered the school. Soon thereafter, Lord Lyttelton described the building as

¹⁵ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 16 December 1862 and *Advertiser*, 2 July 1866.

¹⁶ *County Express*, 21 December 1867 and 16 April 1870; *Advertiser*, 16 April 1870.

¹⁷ Documentation of this application (and the subsequent application of 1883 that is discussed in the next chapter) comes from file ED 29/176 in the National Archives at Kew, and the information referenced in this thesis is taken from these original documents, which include forms supplied by the Department of Science and Art and numerous pieces of handwritten correspondence between the Stourbridge School and the Department.

being in a 'state of very great dilapidation,' a remark that likely reflected the feelings and frustrations of his colleagues on the school Council regarding both the physical condition of the building and the prospects for payment of the mortgage debt.¹⁸

The mortgage debt remained unchanged throughout 1876-1877, and the financial situation worsened when subscription income dwindled to just £38 in mid-1877.¹⁹ At the next annual meeting, the Council attributed the decrease in subscriptions to 'the death[s] of old friends of the institution.'²⁰ Although the deaths of Lord Lyttelton and others were a factor, one must also note that the Council was unsuccessful in gaining additional supporters, either among individuals or from industrial and business enterprises within the Stourbridge district. Later in 1877, a Government school inspector's report was sharply critical of the need for building repairs, and the Council responded quickly, expressing itself as 'most anxious' to right the situation.²¹ Renewed fundraising efforts pushed subscription income to more than £83 in 1878, but the mortgage debt was unchanged at £640, whilst income from student fees and Government grants fell.²² Diminishing fees and grants were important factors in the financial picture, and the deaths of some benefactors certainly had some impact. However, it is also clear that the Council faced continuing difficulties in generating public enthusiasm for the school.

¹⁸ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1876 and *Stourbridge Observer*, 15 January 1876.

¹⁹ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1876 and *County Express*, 15 January 1876; and *Advertiser*, 13 January 1877.

²⁰ *Advertiser*, 12 January 1878.

²¹ *County Express*, 17 October 1877.

²² *County Express*, 26 October 1878.

The financial situation was unchanged throughout 1879, but there were developments at the annual meeting in January 1880. The guest speaker was John Henry Chamberlain, the current chairman of the council at the Birmingham School of Art and vice-president of the Birmingham Society of Artists.²³ Chamberlain's initial remarks were forthright regarding the mortgage debt. He responded to the Council's report, saying that 'within the school it was a satisfactory report, but if they took the great extent of Stourbridge and its surroundings, it was not so encouraging as it ought to be.'²⁴ He said that he was 'lost in wonder' because there were 'only thirty persons of sufficient magnanimity to subscribe to the school.' After expressing a wish that he 'had some of the power of the local people in Stourbridge,' he addressed the fundraising committee directly, suggesting that they 'should see the rich men and ask their support, and get other people to subscribe so much.' 'Those rich people,' he said, 'would be ashamed, and if that would not do, let the committee enlist the services of the ladies,' a remark that elicited 'hear, hear' from those assembled.

Chamberlain's remarks posed a challenge, and some longtime donors responded. Industrialist Charles Evers-Swindell contributed £50 toward the mortgage debt, and an unnamed 'gentleman' came forth to promise £50 if nine others 'could be induced to give £50 each or if four gentlemen would give £100 each, he would also give £100.'²⁵ This challenge was not met, although it was reiterated in January 1881, with business owner William J. Turney revealed as the 'gentleman' and Charles Evers-Swindell noted as having

²³ G. C. Boase, 'Chamberlain, John Henry (1831–1883)', rev. Michael W. Brooks, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5047>, accessed 26 Nov 2015].

²⁴ *Advertiser*, 10 January 1880 and *The Artist* (15 March 1880), pp. 79-80.

²⁵ *Advertiser*, 10 January 1880.

contributed £200 to the mortgage liquidation account with donations over four years.²⁶ The mortgage debt became an even greater concern in the early 1880s. Only a small number of individual benefactors, typically longtime Council members who were gentlemen of independent means, were willing to undertake ongoing financial support of the Stourbridge School. This circumstance, coupled with a lack of contributions from industrial enterprises in the Stourbridge district, made it difficult for the Council to manage the finances of the school and hindered the development of the institution.

Curriculum and Class Schedule

In the 1850s and for many decades thereafter, the Government provincial schools of art were required to follow the curriculum established by the Department of Practical Art and maintained by its successor, the Department of Science and Art. As Stuart Macdonald described it, this curriculum was characterised by ‘exact uniformity’ and ‘no examination could be passed, no prize won, no grants made, nor certificate obtained, except in specified stages of this course.’²⁷ The provincial schools submitted regular reports enumerating the students engaged at each stage along with the numbers of works completed.²⁸ As a beginning institution in the 1850s, the Stourbridge School engaged the great majority of its students in basic drawing and other art instruction within the lower stages of the mandated curriculum until a small number of advanced students progressed to higher stages.

²⁶ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1881 and *County Express*, 15 January 1881 and 22 October 1881.

²⁷ Stuart Macdonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London: University of London Press, 1970), p. 188; see also Quentin Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), p. 259 and Christopher Frayling, *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred & Fifty Years of Art & Design* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987), pp. 41-42.

²⁸ *First Report DPA*, pp. 84-85.

When the Stourbridge School celebrated its first anniversary in September 1852, the twenty-three-stage curriculum (see Appendix One, ‘Development of the South Kensington Curriculum’) was in place throughout the Government provincial schools. In 1852, most Stourbridge students, like those at other provincial schools, were engaged in basic drawing, that is, stage 1 (geometrical perspective and architectural detail) or stage 2 (outlining ornament from the flat). In 1852, Stourbridge students completed some 65 works at stage 1 with 20 ‘passed through’ by the art master, and 470 works were completed at stage 2 with 81 ‘passed through.’²⁹

By 1852-1853, a few students were engaged in stage 6 (drawing the human figure from the flat), and there were 20 works in stage 22 (elementary design) and 6 works in stage 23 (applied design, modeled and flat).³⁰ No descriptions can be found for the works at stages 22 or 23, although these likely incorporated principles of fine art in the design of utilitarian or decorative objects. Student Josiah Fairfax Muckley, age 21, was awarded a medal for design work at stage 23, and Thomas Adams, also age 21, was awarded a medal for a stage 22 drawing that was a design for carpet. According to the 1851 PRO Census, Muckley was a glass engraver at the firm operated by his father Jabez Muckley and Thomas Adams worked in Kidderminster as a carpet weaver, so their respective employments and years of experience likely had a part in their achievements.

In 1862-1863, the Stourbridge School proclaimed that its ‘general course of instruction’ was intended to impart ‘a knowledge of the scientific principles of Art.’ This statement is a clear reflection of the philosophy of art education and the instructional

²⁹ *First Report DPA*, p. 143. Two students, R. Wilson and James Allsop, were awarded Government ‘Students Prize’ medals for their work at stage 2, outline drawing of ornament.

³⁰ *First Report DPA*, p. 143.

orientation of the curriculum promulgated by the Department of Science and Art. The Stourbridge School also sought to ‘encourage and promote the training of skilled workmen’ in order to assist ‘the individual exertions of persons preparing for special branches of our local trades and manufactures.’³¹ Despite the allusions to local industry, these statements reveal that the focus of the Stourbridge School was a general approach to the principles of drawing and the rudiments of fine art with the ultimate but elusive goal of instructing artisans in the principles and elements of design. There were no special classes or areas of the curriculum devoted to aspects of glass manufacturing or glass decorating or to any consideration of the design needs of the branches of the iron industry. In his analysis of the curriculum and instructional practices in the provincial schools, Macdonald argues that ‘the stress was on drawing, not in design.’ To borrow Macdonald’s words, the evening sessions in the Stourbridge School were really ‘night classes for drawing’ at a basic level.³²

Regarding class schedules and student fees, the Stourbridge School had opportunities to adjust class offerings in keeping with local circumstances and could set fees accordingly, although the Department of Science and Art sought to mandate the provincial schools to become self-supporting from fees and through adherence to guidelines for monies from Government grants. In comparison with other provincial schools, the Stourbridge School had fewer individual class offerings, and there were no classes that were related specifically to industries of the Stourbridge district. At Stourbridge during 1852-1862, separate afternoon ‘private’ classes for young men and women carried fees of 21s per quarter, whilst

³¹ *School of Art, Stourbridge* (printed sheet, c. 1862-1863, in the Stourbridge Public Library). On 25 September 1869, a Public Notice in the *Advertiser* announced that classes would begin on 4 October and suggested that ‘this is a favourable opportunity for intending pupils to join the School’ because there would be ample time to prepare for the next Government examinations in drawing to be held in March 1870.

³² Macdonald, *History and Philosophy of Art Education*, p. 176.

the evening class mandated by the Department of Science and Art for the ‘artisans’ who were at work during the day had fees of 6s per quarter, payable at 2s per month.³³ The Male Private Class had little enrolment, but the private class for women often enrolled two dozen or more students and generated considerable income from the fees. A portion of the art master’s income was dependent upon fees, so it is understandable that the private classes were important to the school. As mentioned later in this chapter, many of those attending the private class for women came from families headed by a member of the Council.

The evening class convened on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, and the modest fee of 2s per month remained unchanged for many years (see Appendix Three, ‘Stourbridge School Classes and Fees, 1852-1905’). As detailed later in this chapter, the majority of the students in the evening class were employed young men, many of whom were working in the glass decorating industry of the Stourbridge district. Two glass manufacturers, Benjamin Richardson and Joseph Webb, served on the Council in the early 1850s, and the Webb firm supported a few students by paying their fees, as recorded in the *Register of Students* (see Appendix Six, ‘Stourbridge School *Register of Students*, 1864-1874’). Beginning in the 1860s, the J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley also paid fees for some of its young employees who attended the evening class. The *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 does not mention any other enterprises of the Stourbridge district that supported employees by paying fees, and there is evidence that several Council members expressed disappointment from time to time regarding the general lack of encouragement on the part of employers in the Stourbridge district.³⁴

³³ *First Report DPA*, p. 120; for class schedules and fees at other provincial schools, see *First Report DPA*, pp. 117-121.

³⁴ *Brierley Hill Advertiser*, 10 January 1857; *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865; *Birmingham Daily Post*, 11 December 1865; *Advertiser*, 22 December 1866; *Advertiser*, 31 January

In terms of the curriculum, the Department of Practical Art under Henry Cole and Richard Redgrave sought to standardise the teaching of drawing throughout the provincial schools by establishing a uniform sequence of instruction in art, beginning with elementary drawing. The twenty-three-stage curriculum developed by Redgrave and the voluminous rules and regulations of the Department were the essential means to achieve these ends.

Art Masters, Assistants and Pupil Teachers

An art master was at the head of each provincial school, and those who held this post functioned as both teachers and administrators. Among the criticisms levelled toward the provincial schools in the 1840s was the lack of consistent instruction along with a tendency for each art master to emphasise areas of fine art that were his preferences. By 1852, every art master within the Department of Practical Art was responsible for drawing and art instruction within the twenty-three-stage curriculum and for the ‘proper conduct’ of students and the ‘general charge of the school.’³⁵ The art master was expected to ‘use only those examples for study and teach according to the principles that are those sanctioned by the Department.’³⁶ This admonition to adhere to the curriculum remained unchanged throughout the nineteenth century and some years beyond. The assistant art masters or pupil teachers were often obligated to teach drawing in nearby elementary schools that paid fees, and the expectation was that some students would enrol in the Government school later.

1874; and *County Express*, 31 January 1874. For early remarks by J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, see ‘Art in the Provinces,’ *The Art-Journal*, New Series, 6 (1854), p. 56.

³⁵ *First Report DPA*, p. 87. On the training of art masters at the Head School, see Macdonald, pp. 163-166.

³⁶ *First Report DPA*, p. 87.

In 1852, the Department of Practical Art stated that the art master of a provincial school ‘must make himself acquainted with the staple manufactures of the place’ and required him annually to ‘send up ... to Marlborough House an ornamental design applicable to some class of such manufactures.’³⁷ This requirement reflected the Department’s intent that art instruction should be of economic benefit to manufacturers, a view that echoed the conclusions of the Select Committees of 1835-1836 and 1849 in regard to the desired impact of a provincial school upon local industries.³⁸ However, there is no evidence that this requirement was enforced, and there is no indication that the art masters in Stourbridge interacted with the industries of the Stourbridge district.

Although information about them is limited, the following six gentlemen held the post of art master at the Stourbridge School of Art during various times in the last half of the nineteenth century: Henry Alexander Bowler, 1851-1852; Andrew MacCallum, 1852-1854; George Paterson Yeats, 1854-1863; William Plastons Bowen, 1863-1881; Edward John Simms, 1882-1893; and George Henry Cromack, who served from 1893 until his death in March 1924. All six received their training within the twenty-three-stage curriculum under the auspices of the Head School in London. Each was talented and well versed in one or more aspects of fine art (painting, sculpture, etc.), but none had any connexions with the glass or iron manufacturing interests in the Stourbridge area, and there is no evidence that any of them sought to interact with the local glass or iron manufacturers

³⁷ *First Report DPA*, p. 87. In subsequent annual reports, there is no indication that these mandates were followed by the art masters or enforced by the Department.

³⁸ *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures*, 16 August 1836 (London: HMSO, 1836), pp. iii-v and *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design* (London: HMSO, 1849), p. v.

beyond the occasions of Council sessions or the annual public meetings.³⁹ The four art masters who served between 1851 and 1881 are discussed below, and Simms and Cromack are discussed in the next chapter.

In keeping with the usual practice of the Head School in the 1840s and 1850-1851, someone from the London institution was sent to a newly established provincial school. Henry Alexander Bowler (1824-1903) served in Stourbridge from September 1851 through the summer of 1852. An aspiring painter, Bowler was a student at the Head School in March 1851, when he was awarded £1 for a watercolour of fruit or flowers from nature.⁴⁰ After his brief time at Stourbridge, Bowler returned to the Head School, became an Inspector in the Department of Science and Art, and taught perspective at the Royal Academy for many years until retiring in 1891. Bowler's most famous painting, *The Doubt: Can These Dry Bones Live?*, is in the Tate collection.⁴¹

Educated in Nottingham and at the Head School, Andrew MacCallum (1821-1902) was assistant art master in 1850-1852 at the Manchester School of Art before coming to Stourbridge in late summer 1852 as the 'newly-appointed master.'⁴² He remained for about

³⁹ The Government schools of art at Sheffield and Exeter had strong relationships with local manufacturing; see Dorothy Bosomworth, 'Design Education in the Provinces: Converting Principles into Practice,' *Prince Albert and the Development of Education in England and Germany in the 19th Century*, ed. Franz Bosbach (Munich: Saur, 2000), pp. 114-115.

⁴⁰ *Reports and Documents exhibiting the State and Progress of the Head School and Branch Schools of Design, in the Year 1850-1851* (London: HMSO, 1851), p. 41 (hereafter cited as *Reports and Documents ... 1850-1851*) and *First Report of the Department of Science and Art* (London: HMSO, 1854), p. 138 (hereafter cited as *First Report DSA*).

⁴¹ William Vaughan, 'Bowler, Henry Alexander (1824-1903)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32004>, accessed 10 Aug 2013]; see also *This England* (Autumn 1986), inside front cover.

⁴² *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 9 September 1852 and *First Report DPA*, p. 103.

two years, until the Department of Science and Art awarded him a scholarship for study in Italy.⁴³ MacCallum returned to Stourbridge as the guest speaker at annual meetings in 1884 and 1887, and, on the first occasion, he was praised as a distinguished artist and for his 'high position at South Kensington.'⁴⁴ In 1887, MacCallum related that he had 'spent one of the happiest periods of his life in Stourbridge' and that he had 'made some of his most valued and lasting friendships' whilst there.⁴⁵

George Paterson Yeats (1824-1901) came to the Stourbridge School as classes began in the fall of 1854. Born in Scotland, he was a student at the Government School of Art in Glasgow in 1850-1852, receiving prizes for 'drawing from the antique' in 1850 and for 'drawings from the life model' in 1852.⁴⁶ Whilst at Stourbridge in 1855, Yeats submitted studies of ornament and was selected by the Department of Science and Art to attend the

⁴³ MacCallum's manuscript, 'Report of a sojourn in Italy, from the year 1854 to 1857 for the purpose of making studies of the modes of execution and treatment of works of ornamental art, compiled from notes, memoranda and sketches made on the spot,' is in the National Art Library at the Victoria and Albert Museum.

⁴⁴ *County Express*, 12 January 1884.

⁴⁵ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1887 and *County Express*, 15 January 1887. See *Advertiser*, 17 December 1859 for Lord Ward's adverse criticism of MacCallum's teaching. During his career as a landscape artist, MacCallum completed many vividly realistic works inspired by Sherwood Forest, and he exhibited more than 50 pictures at the Royal Academy. Queen Victoria commissioned him to paint scenes near Balmoral. His works are in many public collections, including the Tate, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Nottingham Castle Art Gallery, the Manchester City Galleries, and the Guildhall Art Library; see B. S. Long, 'MacCallum, Andrew (1821-1902)', rev. Mary Guyatt, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn., May 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34675>, accessed 10 Aug 2013], James Dafforne, 'The Works of Andrew Mac Callum,' *Art Journal* (November 1877), pp. 321-324, and *The National Gallery British Art Catalogue*, 16th edition (London: HMSO, 1908), pp. 171-172.

⁴⁶ *Caledonian Mercury*, 31 January 1850 and 2 February 1852.

Exposition Universelle in Paris.⁴⁷ Yeats was a sculptor as well as a painter, and the *Brierley Hill Advertiser* praised his bust of a noteworthy Stourbridge School benefactor (the late Robert Scott) in March 1856 and mentioned thereafter that a class in modelling with clay had been started.⁴⁸ In 1859, he arranged a special exhibition of some 90 pictures in conjunction with the annual soiree of the Stourbridge Associated Institute (Mechanics' Institution and Working Men's Association), including one of his own, *The Artist's Children*.⁴⁹ At the Stourbridge School's annual meeting in 1860, student Joseph Northwood, who was employed as a glass decorator, spoke for his classmates and presented Yeats with a 'timepiece ... as a token of their respect for him.'⁵⁰ When Yeats left Stourbridge in October 1863 to become art master at Worcester, Stourbridge students presented 'a pier glass and two easy chairs' in appreciation.⁵¹ Remarks by Lord Lyttelton at the annual meeting in December 1864 suggest that the Stourbridge School had not wished 'to part with the previous master' but the Council was well satisfied with his successor, William P. Bowen.⁵²

Born in the St. Helens area of Worcester, William Plastons Bowen (1829-1909) was art master at Stourbridge from October 1863 to December 1881. A 'student and assistant teacher of elementary drawing' at the Worcester School of Art during 1852-1853, Bowen

⁴⁷ *Third Report of the Department of Science and Art* (London: HMSO, 1856), p. 216 (hereafter cited as *Third Report DSA*).

⁴⁸ *Brierley Hill Advertiser*, 22 March 1856 and 30 August 1856.

⁴⁹ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 27 November 1859.

⁵⁰ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 21 December 1860.

⁵¹ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 21 October 1863.

⁵² *Advertiser*, 24 December 1864; see also *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 24 October 1863.

was awarded a national medal in May 1853 and received training at the Head School in London during 1853-1854 prior to his return to Worcester as assistant art master, a position he held until coming to Stourbridge.⁵³ In 1855, Bowen submitted a design for a vase and was awarded a travel stipend to attend the *Exposition Universelle*.⁵⁴ Bowen held two Government art certificates, each of which entitled him to compensation of £10 annually.⁵⁵

In January 1864, Bowen informed those who attended the annual meeting of the Stourbridge School that he sought to ‘give greater prominence to colour’ and to painting as ways to ‘vary the course of study.’⁵⁶ At the next annual meeting, Bowen noted that he displayed ‘a few of the best works of the students constantly on view in the school’ because ‘these works are looked upon by the junior pupils as something like a standard to be reached.’⁵⁷ Bowen thought that ‘it would be of much service to the school if some standard works in colour could be obtained,’ and he expressed his wish that ‘gentlemen in the neighbourhood ... would lend pictures.’

In 1865, the art master’s report by Bowen called for ‘the study of flowers, fruit and plants from nature’ and asked for ‘the loan from greenhouses of specimens.’⁵⁸ At the annual meeting in 1866, the Council expressed its gratitude for Bowen’s teaching ‘not only in drawing but in the introduction of colour,’ and Bowen responded that he ‘should like to

⁵³ *First Report DSA* (London: HMSO, 1854), p. 356 and *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 24 October 1863. See also H. Jack Haden, *Artists in Cameo Glass: Incorporating Thomas Woodall’s Memoirs* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 1993), p. 24.

⁵⁴ *Third Report DSA*, p. 216.

⁵⁵ *First Report DPA*, p. 103 and *First Report DSA*, pp. 345-347.

⁵⁶ *Advertiser*, 16 January 1864.

⁵⁷ *Stourbridge Observer*, 24 December 1864.

⁵⁸ *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865.

see more works in outline of foliage from nature and coloured studies of the historical styles of ornament, such as may be found in Owen Jones *Grammar of Ornament*.⁵⁹

At the annual meeting of the school in 1867, Bowen spoke of his interest in ‘the study of flowers and foliage drawn from nature as the only true mode of arriving at facility for design,’⁶⁰ and such a remark likely reveals the essence of his teaching philosophy and the kinds of projects he encouraged among the students. In commenting on ‘outlines from nature drawn by Messers. T. Woodall and J. Hill’ (both of whom were glass etchers at the J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm), the *Stourbridge Observer* noted that art master Bowen ‘attaches much importance to this class of studies.’⁶¹ At this time, Bowen was also serving as art master at Bromsgrove, although enrolment there was small.⁶² At the annual meeting in 1870, Bowen said that ‘there are some branches of art that I should like to see taken up,’ and he advocated ‘drawing the human figure, modeling, &c.’⁶³ In 1874, Bowen said he ‘would like to see still more works in the stages of figure drawing, studies of plants from nature and historic styles of ornament.’⁶⁴ Bowen resigned in October 1881, with his departure set as the Christmas vacation time.⁶⁵ Like those who served before him, Bowen had been trained in the South Kensington curriculum, and he emphasised aspects of fine art in his teaching.

⁵⁹ *Advertiser*, 22 December 1866.

⁶⁰ *Advertiser*, 21 December 1867 and *County Express*, 21 December 1867.

⁶¹ *Stourbridge Observer*, 21 December 1867.

⁶² *Fifteenth Report of the Science and Art Department* (London: HMSO, 1868), p. 118.

⁶³ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1870.

⁶⁴ *Stourbridge Observer*, 31 January 1874.

⁶⁵ *Advertiser*, 12 October 1881.

Art masters were aided by pupil teachers or assistant masters who served at the Stourbridge School, although information regarding them is scant. Assistant masters and pupil teachers received a small salary so that they could continue their education for one or two years whilst assisting the art master.⁶⁶ In March 1873, the Stourbridge School placed a Public Notice in local newspapers, seeking an assistant art master.⁶⁷ The successful applicant was former Stourbridge School student John Alexander Service, who was also employed in the glass decorating industry of the Stourbridge district. His duties during 1873-1874 included teaching at 'several of the public schools in the neighbourhood.'⁶⁸

Soon after the Stourbridge School had been founded as a provincial school within the Department of Practical Art in 1851-1852, the Department began to encourage (and later mandated) that art masters and their assistants or pupil teachers offer lessons in basic drawing at local elementary schools and that those schools support such instruction with the payment of fees.⁶⁹ In a section entitled 'Local Schools of Art in Action,' the report of the Department of Science and Art for 1853-1854 reveals that the Stourbridge School was

⁶⁶ *Advertiser*, 18 December 1858. These pupil teachers are mentioned in 1860: William Orford, Walter Steele, and Samuel Danks; see *Advertiser*, 22 December 1860. Two pupil teachers, both of whom were employed in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, are listed in 1861, John Northwood and Thomas Guest; see *Advertiser* 14 December 1861. These pupil teachers are recorded in 1862: Charles Vaughan, William Davey, Richard Ryder, and Walter Steele; see *Birmingham Daily Post*, 16 December 1862. Glass etcher Edwin Grice was a pupil teacher in 1863-1864; see *Tenth Report of the Science and Art Department* (London: HMSO, 1863), p. 93. Glass etcher Thomas Woodall was a pupil teacher in 1866; see Christopher Woodall Perry, *The Cameo Glass of Thomas and George Woodall* (Somerset: Richard Dennis, 2000), p. 11.

⁶⁷ *Stourbridge Observer*, 3 March 1873.

⁶⁸ *Advertiser*, 24 January 1874.

⁶⁹ *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 26 September 1853. At the annual meeting in September 1853, Stourbridge art master Andrew MacCallum noted that the fee was £5 per year to be paid by each school.

providing two lessons per week in a nearby school for 65 students and three lessons per week in three other schools enrolling a total of 220 students.⁷⁰ By December 1858, the students in local elementary schools—such as St. James in Wollaston, Prestwood, Kinver Grammar, Forrest House, and the National schools in Amblecote and Wordsley—were being attended by art master George Yeats.⁷¹ This outreach was a typical feature of other provincial schools, most of which had larger student enrolments and additional instructional staff. The income generated by fees for this instruction was surely a welcome benefit to the Stourbridge School. For example, during 1863, the fees paid by 10 local schools amounted to £50, whilst the total income for the Stourbridge School from all other student fees was £113 13s.⁷² At the annual meeting in 1872, the Council expressed its hope that ‘those who acquire the necessary slight knowledge of art imparted in the elementary school’ would ‘be induced to attend the School of Art, where they will receive instruction in the higher grades from an art master holding high class certificates.’⁷³

Art masters MacCallum, Yeats and Bowen emphasised aspects and areas of fine art in their teaching of those students who progressed beyond basic drawing. The mentions of Yeats’s sculpture and painting in the local newspapers suggest such directions, and

⁷⁰ *Second Report of the Department of Science and Art* (London: HMSO, 1855), pp. 78-79 (hereafter cited as *Second Report DSA*).

⁷¹ *Barrow’s Worcester Journal*, 18 December 1858 and *Advertiser*, 18 December 1858. Yeats was also listed as ‘Drawing Master’ in advertisements for the Amblecote Training School in 1858; see *Birmingham Daily Post*, 6 January 1858 and *Barrow’s Worcester Journal*, 9 January 1858. At the annual meeting in 1865, these local schools were mentioned as having received art instruction from the Stourbridge school art master, assistant master or pupil teachers: Old Swinford Hospital School; St. James School, Wollaston; Wollaston-road British School; National School, Wordsley; Wesleyan School, Stourbridge; St. Thomas’ School, Beauty Bank; and National School, Oldswinford.

⁷² *Select Committee 1864*, p. 334.

⁷³ *Stourbridge Observer*, 20 January 1872.

Bowen's statements at various annual meetings reflect his interest in nature as inspiration for art and his interest in colour as an appropriate subject for students. Yeats and Bowen were art masters whose philosophies of art instruction and methods of teaching had been inculcated by their experiences whilst being educated at the Head School in London to become certificated teachers. They were thoroughly familiar with the twenty-three-stage curriculum, as reflected in the various prizes awarded to their respective students, and they were surely mindful of the rules and regulations of the Department of Science and Art, as evidenced by the lengths of their respective years of service within the Department.⁷⁴

Stourbridge School Students

With the exception of the handwritten *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874, there is no unified record of the hundreds of students who attended the Stourbridge School between 1851 and 1905, so it is challenging to generalise regarding the backgrounds and socio-economic status of these students. Some annual reports from the Department of Practical Art and its successor, the Department of Science and Art, contain information regarding ages and occupations along with enrolment numbers. Additionally, the reports name students who achieved national recognition for their work within the curriculum.

The *Register of Students* records, by name, students who enrolled from 1864 through 1874, and contemporary newspaper accounts typically list those who were awarded prizes. Moreover, the *Register of Students* often identifies students by age and records the occupations of students (or the student's father). Students of the 'Ladies Morning Class' and the 'Evening Male Class' from 1864-1874 can be described in detail.

⁷⁴ After leaving Stourbridge, Yeats was art master at the Worcester School of Art for about a decade; see *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 4 October 1873. In 1884, he authored a book entitled *The London Obelisk* that offered theories regarding the hieroglyphic inscriptions on the large monument near the Thames that is popularly known as 'Cleopatra's Needle.'

To encourage students, the Department of Science and Art created and maintained an elaborate system for achievements that embraced Government examinations (first grade, second grade, and the top rank, third grade) in art as well as national awards ranging from certificates, book prizes or medals to special designations such as the Queen's Prize, all of which were regarded as Government prizes (see Appendix Four, 'Awards to Stourbridge School Students, 1852-1905' for a listing of local and national awards to Stourbridge students). The Department also created 'prize studentship' awards to underwrite fees or to enable advanced students to attend courses at the Head School in London during summer periods when the provincial schools were not in session.

The Stourbridge School Council committee and the art master selected student works for potential recognition. An inspector from the Department of Science and Art then decided which works merited local medals or book prizes. The best works were submitted to the national level competition.⁷⁵ These awards, local or national, were usually announced at the annual meeting and prize-giving. The Stourbridge School also had awards in the form of local prize studentships, which allowed recipients to attend classes without paying fees.

The *First Report of the Department of Practical Art* records that during 1852, some 59 students were enrolled in the evening class at Stourbridge. Many of the evening class students had no occupations listed or were 'schoolboys,' but these occupations were detailed: glass engravers (9); glass painters (7); glass manufacturers (2); glass blowers (2); carpenters (3); engineers (3); and stonemasons (2).⁷⁶ During 1853, the total number of

⁷⁵ For a summary of procedures and changes in these competitions from 1852 to 1915, see Macdonald, *History and Philosophy of Art Education*, pp. 192-199.

⁷⁶ *First Report DPA*, p. 130. The 'Hospital boys class' (composed of boys age 11-14 from Old Swinford Hospital School) numbered 25. The Male Private Class counted eight, and the Female Private Class enrolled seven; the average attendance in the Female Public Class was seven. See *First Report DPA*, p. 120.

students at the Stourbridge School rose to 150 (compared to 104 in 1852), and income from student fees rose from £79 13s to £148 7s.⁷⁷ Of the 122 male students, 52 were listed ‘at school’ and another 57 were described as ‘artisans’ with glass engravers (9), glass manufacturers (4) and glass painters (7) among them.⁷⁸ The term ‘artisan’ suggests that the individuals possessed some measure of a specialized skill, but, since most (92 of 122) of these students at Stourbridge were between 13 and 20 years of age, these young men would have been apprentices with few years of experience in their occupations.

It is difficult to determine student enrolment levels in individual classes at the Stourbridge School between 1854 and 1863, because the annual reports from the Department of Science and Art typically enumerate the ‘Total Number of Persons receiving Instruction in Drawing’ and do not list enrolments in individual classes.⁷⁹ These totals include large numbers of children in elementary schools who received lessons in drawing. Neither the annual reports nor the newspaper accounts reflect a consistent measure from year to year (see Appendix Five, ‘Enrolment at the Stourbridge School, 1852-1905’).

During 1864, 30 individuals enrolled in the Ladies Morning Class; only 12 were present when the class began in January 1864, and the rest were added later. In 1866, the Ladies Morning Class numbered 28 at the close of January, and 10 more were added during February, March and April. In contrast, total enrolments in 1869 and 1870 were just 16 and 17, respectively, although enrolments grew to 29 in 1872 and 31 in 1874. The student fees from this class (21s per month for each student) comprised a substantial portion of the school’s income and were directly related to the salary of the art master.

⁷⁷ *First Report DSA*, p. xxxviii.

⁷⁸ *First Report DSA*, pp. 129 and 152-153.

⁷⁹ See, for examples, *Second Report of the Department of Science and Art* (London: HMSO, 1855), p. 74.

The *Register of Students* seldom records the ages of females, as only three students (ages 8, 10 and 13) are so noted during 1864-1870. Ages are given for a few students during 1871-1874, with the youngest 11 and the oldest 17. Places of residence are listed for many students, with most residing in Stourbridge or nearby (Amblecote, Cradley, Lye, Oldswinford, or Wollaston). A few resided in Brettell Lane, Brierley Hill or Wordsley.

The occupations of a student's parent (that is, father) allow one to make some inferences regarding the social strata from which the Female Morning Class drew its students. Five students in 1864 were daughters of clergymen, and the Blakeway sisters (Georgina, Amy and Ada) were the daughters of George Blakeway, a partner in Blakeway & Mansell, a Stourbridge firm described as 'grocers, tallow chandlers, hop merchants &c.'⁸⁰ The wife of leather works owner John Akroyd attended the class during 1864, as did daughters Kate and Nellie. Other occupations listed for the parents of students during 1864-1874 are these: surgeon, brick manufacturer, chemist and druggist, auctioneer, bank manager, professor of music, maltster, painter, stone mason, manager of gasworks, teacher, clerk, glass master, and doctor. One student, Annie Wood in 1873, was the daughter of a 'publican.' The only occupations listed for any of the numerous women students during 1864-1874 are 'governess' (two students) and 'teacher' (one student). Even from this limited data, it is evident that the great majority of these students were not employed and that they came from households headed by fathers who were clergymen, industrialists, professionals, business owners or tradesmen. Quite a few students enrolled in the Female Morning Class for years in succession.⁸¹

⁸⁰ *Jones's Mercantile Directory of the Iron District* (London: Jones and Proud, 1865), p. 157.

⁸¹ All three of the Blakeway sisters are listed for five consecutive years (1864-1868), and Ada Blakeway attended for a total of eight years. The two Akroyd daughters are recorded

According to the available records from 1852 to 1881, a number of students from the Female Morning Class were recipients of national and/or local prizes (for a complete list, see Appendix Four, ‘Awards to Stourbridge School Students, 1852-1905’). In 1861, sisters Annie Green and Fanny Green were recognized with local awards. Georgina Blakeway was awarded a local medal and a prize studentship in 1862, and she and Annie Green won Government medals in 1863. Harriet Skidmore received a Government prize in 1868, and she was recognized both locally and nationally in several subsequent years. Specific information regarding local book prizes for students is available only for 1872-1873 and for 1877 and 1880 (see Appendix Four). The prize books chosen by the art master and the committee of the Stourbridge School range from biography (*Lives of Celebrated Female Sovereigns* and *Memoirs of Celebrated Women*) and literature (*Moore’s Poems*, *Longfellow’s Poetical Works*, and *The Lansdown Poets—Wordsworth*) to natural history (*Sketches of Natural History*, *Country Walks of a Naturalist*, and *Ponds and Ditches Natural History Rambles*).

Regarding the Male Evening Class during 1864-1874, the handwritten *Register of Students* provides a wealth of information, especially in terms of ages and occupations.

from 1864-1867. Harriet Skidmore, Amy Jones and Lucretia Davis attended for at least six consecutive years each between 1864 and 1874, and Lucretia’s sister Ellen Davis probably did so as well. Class rosters from 1864-1874 reveal other groups of sisters (parent’s occupation in parentheses when known) as follows: Josephine and Rosa Bowen (art master); Annie, Ethel and Mary Bromley (clergyman); Alice and Margaret Giles (surgeon); Agnes and Eleanor James (bank manager); Fanny and Susan Maginniss (clergyman); Edith and Esther Oates (auctioneer); Esther and Louisa Pearson (brick manufacturer); Ann, Elizabeth and Minnie Simms (music teacher); Agnes and Jane Sproat (pawnbroker and clothier); and Clara and Helen Webb (glass manufacturer). A separate ‘Male Morning Class’ was offered in 1864, but only four students enrolled, including Willie Akroyd, Christopher Oates, and Abraham Grier, whose father was a clergyman. Beginning in 1866, some of these students were permitted to attend the Female Morning Class, and the occupations of their fathers (clergyman, wagon manufacturer, bank manager, school master, and doctor) reflect a social standing comparable to the women described above.

This class enrolled numerous students, with more than 70 on each roster from 1864 to 1867, along with 69 in 1868 and at least 55 in all years but one between 1869 and 1874. The places of residence are listed for most students, with Stourbridge and Wollaston often represented, along with others in Brettell Lane or Wordsley. Some students were younger than 13, but a few were 21 or older. Most were 13-20 and were employed. Some occupations recorded (and those of fathers) were in areas that required a specialised skill.

Many students had employment associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, but their work was typically in glass decorating rather than in the manufacture of glass. Among the 55 evening class students in 1864 for whom occupations are noted, 26 are recorded as glass cutter, glass engraver or glass etcher. Most were under the age of 20 and quite a few were between 13 and 17, indicating that they were apprentices and relatively inexperienced in the trade although having acquired some basic skills.⁸² A few student occupations are listed simply as 'glass trade' without elaboration. Other student occupations such as iron trade, engine fitter, machinist, smith (or blacksmith), painter, builder, or carpenter can be seen with some frequency in the class rosters spanning 1864 to 1874. The glass industry of the Stourbridge district is also reflected within the occupations recorded for some parents (glass cutter, glass manufacturer, manager in glassworks, or glass trade), but most were employed in other pursuits: publican, builder, iron trade, saddler, clerk, mine agent, machinist, timber dealer, painter, moulder, boat-maker, brickmaker, bootmaker, slater, chainmaker, or carpenter. From this data, it is clear that the

⁸² Similar conclusions regarding male students 1865 to 1874 can be drawn from the *Register of Students* class rosters, although the occupations of those attending in successive years are not always recorded, perhaps because they were well known to the art master (see Appendix Six).

great majority of these students were employed and their employment (and/or that of their parent) could be characterized as either a specialised trade or semi-skilled labour.

Quite a few students appear on evening class rosters for many successive years between 1864 and 1874 (see Appendix Six, 'Stourbridge School *Register of Students*, 1864-1874'). Glass etcher James Hill, 14, enrolled in the evening class on 9 May 1864, and his name appears on every roster thereafter through to 1874.⁸³ The names of some glass cutters (William Adey⁸⁴ and Cornelius Adey), glass engravers (John Chaloner, William Henry Perks and John A. Service), and glass etchers (Arthur Guest and Josh Pilsbury) appear often between 1864 and 1874, as do some whose occupations are given as 'glass trade,' namely, George Hingley, George Hipwood, James Marshall, Benjamin Robinson and Alfred Saunders. Other glass cutters, glass engravers or glass etchers that enrolled in typically remained for two or three years at most.

Between 1852 and 1881, many Stourbridge School students were the recipients of local or national awards such as medals, books or prize studentships (see Appendix Four). Macdonald mentions the zeal, patience, and 'remorseless exertion'⁸⁵ with which art school students pursued medals and other awards, frequently spending several months at the thrice-weekly evening class sessions on a single work project. Local and national medals awarded from 1856 to 1896 have a portrait of Queen Victoria (designed by W. Wyon,

⁸³ James Hill was employed at J. & J. Northwood, the glass decorating firm in Wordsley that was operated by brothers John Northwood I and Joseph Northwood, both of whom were former students at the Stourbridge School. A note on the 1864 class roster in the *Register of Students* indicates that Hill's fees were 'Paid for by Messrs. Northwood.' James Hill continued at the Stourbridge School until at least 1879.

⁸⁴ William Adey was age 20 on the 1864 class roster in the *Register of Students*, and his name appears among prize students at the Stourbridge School as early as 1858 (see Appendix Four).

⁸⁵ Macdonald, pp. 193-196.

R.A.) on the obverse, and embossed lettering on the reverse: 'FOR SVCCCESS IN ART.' The book prizes reflect interest in art, especially fine art from Classical times, as well as poetry, literature, or natural history. Books with uplifting moral qualities are also evident.

Stourbridge student Josiah Fairfax Muckley was recognized on four occasions during 1852-1854, and brothers John Northwood and Joseph Northwood claimed various national awards between 1854 and 1861.⁸⁶ Glass cutter William Adey had numerous awards between 1858 and 1864. Brothers Thomas Woodall and George Woodall had several awards between 1866 and 1870, and Thomas Woodall won a Government Queen's Prize in 1879 for his design for etched glass vases.⁸⁷ Glass etcher James Hill won many national and local prizes from 1866 to 1879. The Government Queen's Prize awarded to Hill in 1869 for the design of an engraved glass vase was a two-volume set of Sir Joshua Reynolds's literary works, 'elegantly bound in red morocco.'⁸⁸ James Gething and his brother William Gething, who were architect's assistants, won many awards between 1867 and 1880, and William Gething received a Government Queen's Prize in 1879 for a design for iron gates.

Specific information regarding national book prizes and local book prizes for the evening class students is available only for 1872-1873 and for 1877 and 1880 (see Appendix Four). The prize books cover a wide range of areas, and one must bear in mind

⁸⁶ Josiah Fairfax Muckley had a glass engraving business in Ivy Lane, Audnam, during the 1860s, and the Northwood brothers operated J. & J. Northwood, a glass decorating firm in Wordsley starting about 1860. Joseph Northwood's 1861 prize-winning work, a shaded drawing of architectural details, is at the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum).

⁸⁷ For illustrations of Thomas Woodall's vases, see *The Art Journal* (1880), p. 173. Prior to attending the Stourbridge School, the Woodall brothers received instruction through the Dudley School of Art, and they merited both certificates and medals; see *Birmingham Daily Post*, 19 February 1862, 19 October 1863, and 16 November 1863.

⁸⁸ *County Express*, 15 January 1870.

that these books were chosen by Council members and the art master and, as such, reflect their views of what art education should be as well as their aspirations for students.⁸⁹

Soon after the opening of the Stourbridge School in 1851, groups of boys age 11-14 from Old Swinford Hospital School began to receive instruction in basic drawing from the art master and/or an assistant master or pupil teacher. As mentioned in Chapter Two, industrialist Thomas Foley founded the Old Swinford Hospital School in the 1660s. During the 1850s and until his sudden death in November 1861, Stourbridge School Council member J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, was a key benefactor of Old Swinford Hospital School, and he also served as president of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution and was active in other philanthropic endeavors and membership organisations in the Stourbridge district.

The *Register of Students* contains class rosters of Old Swinford Hospital School boys for 1864-1872 (1873 is blank) and 1874. As noted earlier, admission to the Old Swinford

⁸⁹ As one would expect, some books were devoted to art instruction (George Barnard's *Drawing from Nature*, Aaron Penley's *Sketching from Nature in Water-Colours*, John Flaxman's *Anatomy*, or H. J. Dennis's *Third Grade Perspective*). Books devoted to art history emphasise aspects of fine art, often with illustrations of Classical art (William B. Scott's *Half-Hour Lectures on the History and Practice of the Fine and Ornamental Arts*, Richard Westmacott's *Handbook of Sculpture: Ancient and Modern*, John Timb's *Anecdote Lives of Painters*, Louis Viardot's *History of Painters of All Schools*, W. H. Adams's *Buried Cities of Campania*, *Marvels of Architecture*, and *Temples of Ancient Greece and Rome*). Other book prizes reflected good taste in English literature (*The Lansdown Poets—Coleridge*, *The Lansdown Poets—Shakespeare*, *Byron's Poetical Works*, *Longfellow's Poetical Works*, *1001 Gems of Poetry*, Johann Wyss's *Swiss Family Robinson*, or Charles Dickens's *Dombey and Son*). The frequent emphasis upon nature in art education was mirrored in some book prizes: William Kingston's *Great African Travellers*, W. H. Adams's *Animal Life throughout the Globe*, *Mountain and Moor Natural History Rambles*, *On the Banks of the Amazon*, and various selections from the popular *Half-Hours* series. Some book prizes had a religious flavour: *Wonders and Beauty of Creation*, *Moody's Lectures*, the Religious Tract Society's *Venice Past and Present*, and Rev. J. L. Porter's, *Giant Cities of Bashan and Syria's Holy Places*. The Rev. W. K. Tweedie's book employed biographical accounts of famous figures—such as DaVinci, Pascal, Alexander Pope, and Joshua Reynolds—to instill the moral values of persistence and pursuit of education and to instruct young people that 'their comfort and success in life' rests with them alone and that 'the manner in which they spend their season of youth must have a powerfully determining effect upon their whole future'; see William King Tweedie, *Youthful Diligence and Future Greatness: A Book for the Young* (London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1882), p. v.

Hospital School was granted to boys ages 7 to 11 whose parents were not ‘undeserving poor’ (that is, recipients of some form of poor relief). The occupations of parents, taken from records of the 1864 class, are indicative of the socio-economic status of Old Swinford Hospital School boys in the 1860s and early 1870s: blacksmith, domestic servant, grocer, publican, miner, coachman, carpet weaver, gamekeeper, roller, spade maker, silk dyer, wheelwright, and ironmonger. A few Old Swinford Hospital School boys listed in the *Register of Students* had a father whose occupation was in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district: 1864, Thomas Bate (glass maker); 1869, William Sedaway (glass maker); 1870, Thomas Sutton (glass cutter); and 1872, Henry Dunn (glass cutter).

In all of the class rosters on which ages are noted, the Old Swinford Hospital School boys were 10 to 13 years old. Writing in 1867, John Addison noted that the Stourbridge art master ‘attends ... once a week and gives the boys lessons in drawing’ and that ‘thirty of the most proficient go to the School of Art three times a week to receive more advanced instruction.’⁹⁰ As boys attained the age of 14, the Old Swinford Hospital School sought apprenticeships for them.⁹¹ Local newspapers mentioned Old Swinford Hospital School boys who passed Government art examinations, typically at first grade or second grade.⁹²

Although the Stourbridge School enrolled a number of young men who were employed as glass decorators in the Stourbridge district and some of them claimed local or national prizes, there is no indication that the Council or the art master undertook any special endeavours to attract such students in larger numbers. Nor is there any indication

⁹⁰ John Addison, ‘History of Stourbridge’ (undated clipping, Stourbridge Public Library).

⁹¹ The Stourbridge Public Library holds numerous copies of the annual *Account of the Old Swinford Hospital Charity* from various years between 1858 and 1905, and these contain lists of the boys who were apprenticed during the year covered by the particular *Account*.

⁹² *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865, 22 December 1866, and 15 January 1870.

that the Council or the art masters sought to establish relationships with employers in the glass decorating or glass manufacturing areas in the Stourbridge district. As noted later in this chapter, Council members often expressed the thought that more students should enrol in the evening class and that employers should encourage enrolment, but there were no concrete efforts in place during 1851-1881 to bring about such ends.

At least four former Stourbridge School students (Edwin Grice, Harriet Skidmore, Albert Gyngell and Francis 'Frank' Job Short) who attended between 1864 and 1874 achieved recognition in the world of fine art, and one certainly might suggest that some measure of their success can be attributed to instruction and inspiration from the Stourbridge art masters.⁹³ At age 14, Francis 'Frank' Job Short (1857-1945) was first

⁹³ Edwin Grice (1838-1917) was a student at Stourbridge in the 1850s when employed as a glass etcher, and he was recognized with various Government and local awards in 1858, 1859, and 1861. As noted earlier in this chapter, Grice was a pupil teacher at the Stourbridge School in 1863-1864. The *Register of Students* indicates that he attended the evening class as a 'local scholar' during 1865. Grice was employed at J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley for about 18 years, probably starting there when the firm began etching designs on glass in 1860 and, in the 1870s, working as an essential assistant to John Northwood I in cameo carving projects, including the celebrated Portland Vase and the Dennis Vase. Edwin Grice's interests in woodcarving and painting were likely avocations, although four of his pictures (*Stourbridge High Street 1897*, *Ham Dingle*, *Country Lane*, and *Kinver*) are in the Dudley Museum and Art Gallery collection.

Harriet Skidmore's name first appears in the *Register of Students* on 25 September 1866, and she continued in the Ladies Morning Class until 1872. She was recognized for success in art examinations in 1868 and 1869. At the annual meeting in January 1870, she was awarded a Government prize for freehand and model drawing and local prizes for painting fruit and flowers in watercolours as well as painting from nature. By early 1874, she was pursuing art studies at the Head School in London. She exhibited two oil paintings, *Youth* and *News from the War*, at the Royal Albert Hall in 1879. Her watercolour painting, *Near Spellow Hill Yorkshire in Harvest Time*, was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1887. In March 1889, under the headline 'A Local Lady Artiste,' the *County Express* mentioned responses to a half-dozen of Harriet Skidmore's pictures then on display at the Dudley Art Society Exhibition in London's Egyptian Hall. After quoting favourable remarks from art periodicals (*The Queen* and *Pictorial World*) and newspapers (*Stock Exchange*, *Daily News*, and *Graphic*), the *County Express* made mention of her training at Stourbridge whilst William Plastons Bowen was art master: 'Miss Skidmore, we believe, will be the first to acknowledge that her art received the first impulse and inspiration at the Stourbridge

enrolled in the evening class at Stourbridge on 2 October 1871, and his name also appears on the evening class list during 1872 but not thereafter. Early in the twentieth century, Short's biographer, Edward F. Strange, suggested that Short 'learned some poor sort of drawing at the Stourbridge School of Art,'⁹⁴ but contemporary records reveal that Short successfully passed the Government examination in drawing in 1871.⁹⁵ By the early 1880s, Short completed training as a civil engineer, but he embarked upon a career as an artist and teacher of etching and engraving. Martin Hardie compiled extensive catalogues of Short's works, and the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* provides a succinct account of Short's life and career.⁹⁶ Examples of Short's artistry were on display during the 50th year

School of Art. It was here her training in the *technique* of her work commenced, and the success she is achieving in the larger art world of London is the best testimony to the thoroughness and soundness of her early training' (see *County Express*, 23 March 1889).

Albert Gyngell (1841-1894) was employed as a glass etcher at the J. & J. Northwood firm, and he first enrolled in the evening class at Stourbridge on 17 January 1870. Gyngell also appears in the *Register of Students* for the evening class during 1871-1872 but not thereafter. He was the first Stourbridge School student to gain a national medal in the Department of Science and Art competitions. Gyngell's medal was awarded in 1870 for his design for a fan. Albert Gyngell and his family moved to Worcester sometime after 1872, and he pursued a career in fine art, acquiring a sound reputation for landscape pictures. During the Worcestershire Exhibition of 1882, Gyngell exhibited two paintings, *Autumn Afternoon on the Severn* and *Rustic Bridge--Beddgelert, North Wales*. In 1884, Albert Gyngell was active in the Worcester Pen and Pencil Club, exhibiting a watercolour painting, *Hay-stacking on the Banks of the Severn*, and three landscape oil paintings: *A November Evening*, *Oat Harvest in the Lledr Valley* and *View on the Llugwy*. In 1889, two of his works, *By the Brookside* and *The Sound of the Scythe*, were exhibited at the Royal Academy.

⁹⁴ Edward F. Strange, *The Etched and Engraved Work of Frank Short*, A.R.A., R.E. (London: George Allen & Sons, 1908), p. vii.

⁹⁵ *Advertiser*, 15 July 1871 and *County Express*, 15 July 1871.

⁹⁶ Martin Hardie, *The Liber Studiorum Mezzotints of Sir Frank Short* (London: Print Collector's Club, 1938), *The Mezzotints and Aquatints of Sir Frank Short* (London: Print Collector's Club, 1939), and *Etchings, Dry-points, Lithographs by Sir Frank Short* (London: Print Collector's Club, 1940) and Judy Crosby Ivy, 'Short, Sir Francis Job (1857-1945)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online

jubilee celebration of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution in January 1887, and he was the featured speaker at the annual meeting and prize-giving of the Stourbridge School in January 1898. Two of Short's etchings, *Wrought Nails* and *A Wintry Blast on the Stourbridge Canal*, are local scenes.⁹⁷ For many years, Short was a close friend of H. Watson Smith, a longtime Council member and benefactor. Smith organized an exhibition that included numerous works by Frank Short when the Stourbridge School moved into its new building in 1905 (see Chapter Five for details of this exhibition).

Relations with the Department of Science and Art

Although the Stourbridge School had been founded in 1851 and was functioning at the time the Government Department of Practical Art was created in early 1852, it was under that body's new title (Department of Science and Art) and expanded mission that the school operated during the remainder of the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century. Henry Cole and Richard Redgrave were the key administrators of this Government entity from the 1850s into the 1870s, and the Department established and maintained a series of policies, regulations, and procedures to ensure uniformity in the operation of the provincial schools. Macdonald characterises the 'national system of art education' under Cole and Redgrave as having 'such thoroughness and rigidity that it truly merited the name cast iron.'⁹⁸ The *First Report of the Department of Practical Art*, published in early 1853, is replete with specific instructions and lengthy lists of requirements, including minutiae such

edition, October 2007 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36074>, accessed 11 December 2013]. See also Hugh Chisholm, Hugh. 'Short, Francis Job,' *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 24 (New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica Co., 1910) p. 1007.

⁹⁷ <http://www.cradleylinks.org> (accessed 19 September 2014).

⁹⁸ Macdonald, *History and Philosophy of Art Education*, p. 157.

as the sizes of windows, the descriptions of student desks and drawing boards, the types and placements of gas lighting fixtures, and the appropriate drawing materials available for purchase from approved suppliers at prices quoted.⁹⁹

When the Department was charged to embrace instruction in science as well as art, Government funding was not increased, although there were numerous schools seeking monetary aid, including some recently established provincial schools. Additionally, the Department of Science and Art took steps to ensure the quality of the salaried art masters by requiring certificates of competency and to mandate the provincial schools to generate income by providing basic art instruction in local public and private elementary schools that would pay fees, as noted earlier in this chapter.

In the mid-1850s, the Department of Science and Art also changed important rules for Government monetary grants, and the result of this action was to reduce or eliminate funding to many provincial schools and to force them to become self-supporting. This first became a matter of concern to the Stourbridge Council in 1858, and, during the annual meeting of the Stourbridge School in 1859, Council chairman J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, spoke regarding the impact of this change. The Government grant of £150 per year had been received during 1852-1855, he noted, but it was then ‘unexpectedly withdrawn’ and ‘the affairs of the school got into great confusion.’¹⁰⁰ New Council members were able to deal with the financial situation successfully, however, and Foley expressed confidence that the necessary income from voluntary subscriptions would be forthcoming in 1859 because those assembled had ‘a sincere desire to encourage the working-classes and took a deep

⁹⁹ *First Report DPA*, pp. 66, 68-70 and 73-74.

¹⁰⁰ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 14 December 1859; see also *Advertiser*, 17 December 1859 and 18 December 1858.

interest in the trades and manufacturers of the neighbourhood.’ At the annual meeting in 1860, Lord Lyttelton reiterated that the situation had been righted and was then ‘most satisfactory,’ so the school had overcome a financial issue that had negative repercussions for provincial schools of art in Wolverhampton, Worcester and other locales.¹⁰¹

Like other provincial schools, the Stourbridge School was a site for annual Government examinations in drawing conducted by the Department of Science and Art. These examinations were open to all, not just to students who attended a school of art. Teachers from local elementary schools who were successful in ‘freehand and model drawing, geometry, perspective, and drawing from memory’ could receive certificates of competency, thereby enabling them ‘to teach drawing in their own schools.’¹⁰²

In 1863, the Council of the Stourbridge School confronted an important issue when the Department of Science and Art announced a new compensation scheme for the art masters that was described as ‘payment on results.’¹⁰³ This scheme eliminated the previous system of compensation that was based upon the number of competency certificates held by the art masters, who were paid £10 annually for each official certificate they had obtained by passing examinations administered by the Department of Science and Art. The

¹⁰¹ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 21 December 1860; see also *Advertiser*, 22 December 1860.

¹⁰² *Advertiser*, 31 August 1861. One such examination was scheduled for Saturday 12 October 1861 at the Stourbridge School, and those who wished to be examined were required to provide their names and addresses to the art master no later than 7 October. A few months after such examinations were held, reports of those from the Stourbridge area that were successful appeared in local newspapers. See for example, *Stourbridge Observer*, 24 June 1864; *Advertiser*, 24 June 1865, 3 August 1867, 11 July 1868, 31 July 1869, 15 July 1871, 15 August 1874, and 14 August 1875; and *County Express*, 17 August 1867, 2 July 1870, 15 July 1871, 22 August 1874, and 14 August 1875.

¹⁰³ For a discussion of this scheme and its antecedents, see Macdonald, *History and Philosophy of Art Education*, pp. 207-222 and Harry Butterworth, ‘The Science and Art Department 1853-1900’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1968), pp. 67-70.

provincial schools were mandated to employ only certificated teachers as their art masters, and the remainder of an art master's income was determined by student fees along with income from local elementary schools in which drawing instruction took place.

The new 'payment on results' scheme created a structure wherein success or failure by 'public examination' of individual students who were 'artisans, children of the labouring poor, scholarships, persons in training as art teachers, or employed as designers for manufacturers' would determine the cumulative compensation of the art master in question. The new scheme was formulated in February 1863 with the intentions of making the schools move toward self-support and of recruiting new students through art instruction in the National schools, and it went into effect on 1 October 1863.¹⁰⁴ This scheme quickly became an issue among many of the provincial schools, as most of the art masters opposed the scheme and the policy behind it. John Sparkes, art master at the Lambeth School of Art, championed the cause of the art masters of provincial schools, testifying before a Select Committee on Schools of Art that convened in March 1864 to look into the scheme and other concerns, such as Henry Cole's expenditures for the South Kensington Museum.¹⁰⁵

The controversy over payment on results did not extend to Stourbridge, however, as both the Council and art master William Bowen accepted the new arrangements. Only brief mention of the issue of 'payment on results' was made at the annual meeting and prize-giving in January 1864, and an editorial comment by the *Advertiser* praised the position of the school Council and the art master: 'It is a relief to find the Stourbridge School ... supporting the new system, which is based on the true principle of gradually making the

¹⁰⁴ *Select Committee 1864*, pp. v-vi.

¹⁰⁵ *Select Committee 1864*, pp. 54-71.

schools self-supporting and independent of all extraneous aid.’¹⁰⁶ At the annual meeting in 1867, ‘great credit’ was accorded to the Council for its acceptance of the scheme, as ‘payment to the school upon results had been larger than when the grants were made upon the number of certificates held by the master.’¹⁰⁷ Although the Stourbridge School had lower student enrolments than provincial schools in much larger cities (such as Coventry, Manchester, Sheffield, Wolverhampton or Worcester), the percentage of Stourbridge students who passed Government examinations was sometimes among the highest within the provincial schools. Thus, the Stourbridge School fared well under the payment on results scheme throughout the 1870s and into the early 1880s, and the Council credited art master William Bowen with maintaining or increasing enrolment levels as well as having a praiseworthy record of student successes in the Government examinations, even as the Department of Science and Art raised some standards to be met in order to obtain passing marks in various areas of the examinations.

With the exceptions of its acceptance of payment on results and the unsuccessful application for a building grant noted earlier in this chapter, the everyday experiences of the Stourbridge School were typical of other provincial schools in the decades between 1851 and 1881 period. Each school faced its particular challenges in terms of finances, and some fared better than others in fundraising. The Stourbridge School had continuity in administration and teaching, as art masters George Yeats and William Bowen served for nine and 18 years, respectively. Student enrolments varied from year to year with occasional upswings or downturns, but there is no evidence of concern to be found regarding other matters in the available documents or newspaper reports of annual public

¹⁰⁶ *Advertiser*, 16 January 1864; see also *Stourbridge Mercury*, 15 December 1865.

¹⁰⁷ *County Express*, 21 December 1867.

meetings. As noted earlier, Stourbridge School students were recognized regularly with local or national awards.

Maintaining Public Support: Meetings and Art Exhibitions

The Stourbridge School held annual meetings and prize-givings, and these evening occasions were usually accompanied by art exhibitions that were scheduled for a few days before and after the meeting, although several exhibitions spanned an entire week or more. The annual meetings of the Stourbridge School enhanced the visibility of the school and contributed to the civic culture of Stourbridge. These events were usually described in detail in local newspapers: mentions of those present by name, quotes or paraphrasing from the remarks of those who spoke, and lists of those students who were recognized for achievements.¹⁰⁸ The prize-givings served to recognize the achievements of those students who had produced works of a high standard and to encourage other students to do good work in future. Parents of some students probably attended these meetings.

The newspaper reporting of these events could spark interest in the affairs of the school among the public at large and might attract prospective students to the school. However, there was a wider purpose to these annual meetings and prize-givings, namely, the gathering together of individuals who were active in various aspects of the civic culture of Stourbridge. Representing different social strata, some of these gentlemen held leadership positions in Government, local politics or established churches, whilst others

¹⁰⁸ In the early and mid-1850s, the Worcester newspapers (*Worcester Herald* and *Berrow's Worcester Journal*) carried articles devoted to Stourbridge School annual meetings. Beginning in 1856, the *Brierley Hill Advertiser* (and its successor, the *Advertiser*) reported on the meetings, and, from 1867, the *County Express* provided coverage. Meetings and art exhibitions in the 1860s, 1870s and 1880s were also reported in the *Stourbridge Observer* newspaper.

were known publicly through their visible activities in local industries, businesses, professions or trades. Many of the gentlemen were involved in other philanthropic endeavours within the Stourbridge district, and some served on the school Council and contributed regularly to the financial wellbeing of the school.

As president of the Stourbridge School Council, Lord Ward presided over many of the annual meetings and prize-givings held during 1851-1881. Until his death in 1876, Lord Lyttelton was present at most annual meetings and sometimes occupied the chair to preside, and J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, was a frequent participant at the annual meetings until his sudden death in 1861. Other members of the Council during 1851-1881 included industrialists such as William Orme Foster and Charles Evers-Swindell and prominent business owners along with clergymen representing the largest church congregations in the Stourbridge district and members of the legal and medical professions. These annual meetings of the Stourbridge School afforded opportunities for Council members, benefactors and others to come together to review the school's development and to recognize the achievements of students. Such occasions served to reaffirm their individual commitments to the school, as remarks made by members of the Council often lauded the present status of the school and looked forward to a brighter future, whilst nearly always mentioning the need for continued financial support.

The annual meetings and art exhibitions also served to publicise the efforts of the Stourbridge School beyond those who were members of the Council or were financial benefactors. Printed documents containing the art master's report along with lists of financial benefactors and remarks by the school's Council were prepared for the annual meetings, and these documents were frequently quoted at length in the newspaper

reports.¹⁰⁹ The financial status of the school was reviewed, and the report from the art master usually mentioned enrolment figures. During these annual meetings, the chairman of the Council sometimes took the opportunity to review present successes or difficulties with the Department of Science and Art, especially regarding changes in policy that affected Government funding for provincial schools. Council members offered various resolutions in favor of art education or in general support of the Stourbridge School, and their remarks were noted in newspaper reports.¹¹⁰ Beginning in the 1860s, a guest speaker was sometimes invited to deliver an informative and inspiring speech (devoted to art generally and, often, to fine art) and to assist in presenting the local and national prizes to the students.

Drawings and other works by students of the Stourbridge School were always part of the art exhibitions, and some meetings were prefaced by an art exhibition that ranged from works of art loaned by Stourbridge district gentry, industrialists, business owners, professionals or tradesmen to glassware from local manufacturers. These art exhibitions were among the very few occasions during which examples of fine art were readily available for view by the general public in the Stourbridge area. As such, these exhibitions were in keeping with the mission of the provincial schools to elevate public taste.

The annual meetings and art exhibitions were foremost among the few times that local newspapers—*Brierley Hill Advertiser*, *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, *Birmingham Daily Post*, *County Express*, *Stourbridge Observer*, or *Worcester Herald*—provided

¹⁰⁹ These documents were often quoted or paraphrased in subsequent newspaper reports, but only a few have survived. A section from an 1852 document is used as an illustration in Nigel Perry's *History of Stourbridge* (West Sussex: Phillimore, 2001), p. 167. Documents from 1855-1856 are in the National Art Library at the Victoria and Albert Museum, and documents from 1862-1863 are in the local history materials at the Stourbridge Public Library. A document from 1883 is in the National Archives at Kew (file ED 29/176).

¹¹⁰ See for example, *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865, 22 December 1866, and 21 December 1867.

coverage of the Stourbridge School. During a typical year, local newspaper reports regarding the annual meeting and prize-giving or the results of Government examinations were the only mentions of the Stourbridge School. In addition to these annual meetings and art exhibitions, the Stourbridge School occasionally hosted other events, such as lectures delivered by representatives of the Head School in London, but these received only scant coverage, if any at all, in the local newspapers.

Meetings in 1852 and 1853 were held in the renovated theatre that housed the Stourbridge School, but some gatherings later in the 1850s and into the 1860s convened in the Corn Exchange where crowds reportedly as large as 900 were accommodated. From 1865 onward, the meetings and art exhibitions were held in the school, and the numbers of those attending were smaller. The remainder of this section is devoted to noteworthy annual meetings and art exhibitions between 1852 and 1881, in order to offer an analysis of events that reflect issues faced by the governing Council of the Stourbridge School.

In the previous chapter, brief reference was made to the ‘*Conversazione*’ held in September 1852 to mark the first anniversary of the Stourbridge School. Reported by *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, this event and a similar gathering in November 1853 reveal important information regarding the orientation of the Stourbridge School and the outlook of some of its earliest benefactors, who were interested in fine art and in improving the civic culture of the town.¹¹¹ The ‘*elite* of the town and neighbourhood’ who attended in September 1852 were able to view ‘models of ancient and modern architecture, sculpture, &c.’ that had been secured by the Stourbridge School from the Department of Science and Art ‘for the improvement of students.’ The report said that ‘valuable paintings’ owned by

¹¹¹ *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 9 September 1852 (quotations within this paragraph are from this source).

Lord Lyttelton, barrister Robert Scott and ‘other gentlemen,’ some of whom were surely Council members, were ‘placed round the walls.’ This report mentions specific paintings, such as *The Misers* (owned by Lord Lyttelton and attributed to a follower of Marinus Van Reymerswaele) and *The Baptism of the Eunuch* by artist John Linnell (1792-1882), along with two works by Stourbridge art master Andrew MacCallum, *Derwent Water* and *Morecombe Bay*. In remarks to open the meeting from the chair, Lord Lyttelton acknowledged the ‘zeal and energy’ of those Council members who gave their support to the school. He also expressed the view that public taste could be improved, as the school ‘was established for the benefit of all, and not one particular class, and that its leading object was to elevate and improve the mind, and promote the general well-being in the neighbourhood.’ Others who spoke included Lord Ward; J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP; glass manufacturer Benjamin Richardson; industrialist William Orme Foster; Stourbridge School art master Andrew MacCallum; and Rev. Charles Girdlestone. However, the report in *Berrow’s Worcester Journal* mentions only their ‘excellent speeches ... listened to with much interest’ without elaboration as to the substance of their remarks. Nonetheless, it is significant that this occasion planned by the Council was focused on fine art and featured remarks by prominent gentry and industrialists of the Stourbridge district, among others.

In November 1853, another ‘Conversazione’ was held at the Stourbridge School.¹¹² The newspaper report notes that ‘many fine pictures’ were displayed for the enjoyment of ‘a very good attendance of ladies as well as gentlemen and inhabitants of the town and the neighbourhood.’ These Stourbridge area residents loaned pictures: John Amery, manager of the Stourbridge and Kidderminster Bank; solicitor George Grazebrook; and glass

¹¹² *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 26 November 1853 (quotations in this paragraph are from this source). A brief report also appeared in the *Worcester Herald*, 26 November 1853.

manufacturer Philip Rufford. Lord Ward had promised to loan six pictures from his extensive art collection at Witley Court, but only Raphael's *Crucifixion* was on display 'owing to some delay' in rail transport. The strong interest of Council members in fine art is reflected in these pictures as well as those that were displayed a year earlier, as noted above. Lord Ward presented medals to student Thomas Adams and to student Josiah Fairfax Muckley, who was employed in glass decorating.¹¹³ Lord Ward, who had attended a similar meeting at the Worcester School of Art the previous evening, then discussed the prospects for the withdrawal of Government support for the provincial schools, a course he deemed 'most unwise.' Lord Ward said that the provincial schools were 'well calculated to be attended with beneficial results to the prosperity of the country.' Rev. William H. Lyttelton proposed a resolution stating that schools of design 'would be beneficial to the intellectual improvement and moral condition of the country,' and he suggested that 'a taste for the beautiful might be cultivated among the labouring classes' and such would refine 'their habits and desires' as well as their 'moral ... and religious condition.' Speaking in favour of this resolution, Rev. Melville said that schools of design were a 'great national object' that would be 'productive of a great national good.' After the resolution was adopted, J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, spoke at length about the economic need for improved design in manufactured goods to compete with foreign products, and he called the Government support for school of art 'a wise and prudent act.'¹¹⁴ He went on to emphasise 'the importance of such a school to the glass manufactories of the district' and to praise the work of the students of the Stourbridge School. In closing, Foley called for the 'co-

¹¹³ According to *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 25 June 1853, Adams' medal was awarded for the design of a pattern for carpet.

¹¹⁴ 'Art in the Provinces,' *The Art-Journal*, New Series, 6 (1854), p. 56.

operation of all the manufacturers of this district,' and he suggested that those manufacturers should 'enter into arrangements' with Stourbridge art master MacCallum 'to consider the set of workmen employed by each of them as an adult School, to pay the School price for them, and to give them opportunities for instruction.' The implications of Foley's statements are clear: local manufacturers, especially those in glass, ought to establish an ongoing relationship with the Stourbridge School so that their employees could avail themselves of opportunities for instruction in drawing and art.

A final resolution, offered by Mr. Blackwell of Dudley, called for the establishment of a museum in Stourbridge. This resolution was carried, with references made to the successful Crystal Palace exhibition and a need for encouraging 'the labouring classes of England' to develop 'a taste for art.'¹¹⁵ Such a resolution reflects the prevalent national view that the Stourbridge School, like other provincial schools, was charged with the responsibility for elevating public taste regarding the ornamental aspects of manufactured goods as well as providing the essential art education for designers of such goods.¹¹⁶

Thus, the evening *Conversazioni*s of September 1852 and November 1853, with many pictures loaned by gentry and others along with additional examples of fine art displayed for the local elite to view, reflected the interests of the Stourbridge School benefactors, namely, gentlemen who saw fine art and museums as valuable for all classes of society and who were earnest in their belief that the study of art had moral value as well as potential economic benefits to industries of the district. Among those in attendance were some of the leading local iron and glass manufacturers, several of which were recipients of

¹¹⁵ *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 26 November 1853. Favorable comments were made from time to time in the next few decades, but no real progress was achieved and it was more than three decades later that a serious effort to create a museum was launched.

¹¹⁶ See for example, *The Times*, 13 May 1852.

medals in the recent Great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace. As noted in the paragraphs above, remarks made in favour of resolutions reflected aspects of the prevalent national political, economic, social and cultural forces, ranging from concern about the design of manufactured goods from British industries to acceptance of Government involvement coupled with local philanthropy for educational efforts that could benefit the labouring classes and elevate public taste in general.

Reports of activities of the Stourbridge School during 1854-1857 are scant, although a Worcester newspaper reported that a special traveling exhibition of student works from Government schools of art in Birmingham, The Potteries, Sheffield and Wolverhampton attracted some 1,679 visitors to the Stourbridge School in December 1854.¹¹⁷ This exhibition was among several similar exhibitions organized by the Department of Science and Art in the 1850s. In addition to making the Department visible in the districts where exhibitions were held, the goals of such Department efforts were twofold: elevate public taste and inspire students. In 1855, the Stourbridge School held an art exhibition that included life drawings by William Mulready, R.A., as well as ‘paintings on porcelain, an admirable card tray, drawings of machinery, and designs for woven fabrics, paper hangings, &c.’¹¹⁸ In 1857, the Stourbridge School had an exhibition of ‘works of decorative art from the Government Museum at Marlborough House.’ In its description of these ‘rare and costly specimens of both ancient and modern art workmanship,’ the *Brierley Hill Advertiser* addressed ‘those who are engaged in the manufacture of articles requiring elegance and ornamentation’ and said that the ‘exhibition affords an opportunity which we

¹¹⁷ *Second Report DSA*, p. 225 and *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 9 and 16 December 1854.

¹¹⁸ *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 22 September 1855.

trust they will not fail to embrace.’¹¹⁹ This editorial remark suggests that the newspaper foresaw a mutually beneficial relationship between the school and manufacturers, and it also reflects the notion that examples of fine art could inspire improved design in manufactured goods.

Additionally, these art exhibition events at the Stourbridge School in the 1850s indicate that some of the Stourbridge School’s benefactors and supporters, such as Lord Ward and Lord Lyttelton, had personal collections of fine art pictures and that they willingly offered to share them with students and for public view. This willingness reflects one of the social forces at work nationally during this time, namely, a generally increasing public interest in art and a desire on the part of wealthy gentry and others who owned fine art to encourage such public interest. These art exhibitions also reflect the notion that the provincial schools of art had a responsibility to elevate public taste as well as the view that students in the schools would benefit from exposure to fine art as they were simultaneously engaged in their art education at various stages of the highly structured twenty-three-stage curriculum of the Department of Science and Art.

The Stourbridge School annual meeting presided over by Lord Ward on 13 December 1858 was attended by about 900 persons, ‘including the principal gentry and inhabitants of the surrounding district,’ and R. G. Wylde, a Government Inspector of Art from the Department of Science and Art, distributed the prizes.¹²⁰ In remarks from the chair to open the meeting, Lord Ward expressed displeasure that the appellation ‘school of design’ had been changed to ‘school of art’ a few years earlier, because he equated ‘art’ with fine arts

¹¹⁹ *Brierley Hill Advertiser*, 10 January 1857.

¹²⁰ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 15 December 1858; *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 18 December 1858; *Worcester Herald*, 18 December 1858; and *Advertiser*, 18 December 1858 (unless otherwise indicated, quotations are taken from the account in the *Advertiser*).

such as painting and sculpture. However, he commended the Stourbridge School for teaching ‘skill in drawing which designers ought to possess.’ The report of art master George Yeats detailed the cessation of Government grant monies but made note of enrolment increases at the Stourbridge School as well as the large numbers of young students in local elementary schools who were afforded lessons in drawing. After distributing the prizes, Lord Ward spoke again, and his remarks about the mission of the Stourbridge School reflect a prevalent view regarding design education. He said that the school was intended ‘to give the artisans of a large neighbourhood an insight into the first principles of Art’ and, through instruction in drawing, ‘carrying them on step by step till it was discovered whether they had that rarest gift of nature—the gift of design.’ Lord Ward noted the considerable history of government support for art education in European countries, and he said that such education in England would ‘kindle the sacred fire’ within a student and ‘would mark him by that which alone distinguishes man from man in the present day—a superior education of the intellectual faculties.’ A year later, in December 1859, Lord Ward again spoke to those who attended, and he said that ‘love for art’ was ‘essential to the working class’ and that public taste was being improved through the efforts of the provincial schools of art.¹²¹ He singled out the benefactors of the school for their philanthropy, praising both their ‘sincere desire to encourage the working classes’ and their ‘deep interest in the trades and manufacturers of the neighbourhood.’

In 1862, John C. Buckmaster of the Department of Science and Art came to the Stourbridge School for a public meeting to create plans for instruction in science.¹²² Classes

¹²¹ *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 17 December 1859 and *Advertiser*, 17 December 1859.

¹²² In keeping with the syllabus of the Department of Science and Art, Buckmaster later prepared textbooks in various subjects: elementary and advanced inorganic chemistry;

in geology and chemistry were instituted thereafter, but attendance soon dropped dramatically, despite support from Old Swinford Hospital School, and there are few mentions of science classes in the local newspapers.¹²³ At an annual meeting in January 1864, there was brief reference made to classes in science being held on Thursdays in the Stourbridge School, and the Council indicated that no rent would be charged to the organisers of the science classes until the classes became ‘well established ... thus making an addition to the income of the school.’¹²⁴ As it happened, nearly three decades would pass before the Stourbridge School, stimulated by Parliamentary legislation regarding technical education, began to offer opportunities for instruction in science. In contrast to their strong interests regarding drawing classes and art instruction, Council members of the Stourbridge School were slow to embrace the cause for education in scientific subjects.

In July 1862, the Stourbridge School was among the provincial schools that hosted a special traveling exhibition of student works from schools of art throughout Britain that were in competition for national recognition from the Department of Science and Art. Some 150 works were displayed, illustrating ‘the course of instruction given in Art Schools, viz.,

sound, light and heat; magnetism and electricity; principles of agriculture; animal physiology; and domestic economy and cookery.

¹²³ *Advertiser*, 27 December 1862 and *Birmingham Daily Post*, 27 March 1865 and 17 February 1866.

¹²⁴ *Advertiser*, 16 January 1864. Newspaper reports from this date through 1881 rarely mention science classes, and accounts always refer simply to the ‘Stourbridge School of Art.’ About 14 months later, the *Birmingham Daily Post*, 27 March 1865, reported that classes in geology and chemistry were being held in the King Edward VI Grammar School in Stourbridge. In other matters in 1864, honorary secretary William H. King recapitulated the history of the school and credited the Great Exhibition as a key influence for generating Government support for art education in provincial schools to improve design of manufactured goods and to counter foreign competition.

drawings, paintings and original designs,’ and the *Advertiser* described the items on display as ‘the best works the youth of this country can produce at the present time.’¹²⁵

A Public Notice for the annual meeting scheduled for 19 December 1864 appeared in several issues of the *Advertiser*, advising citizens that tickets for reserved seats were 6d and that unreserved seats could be had ‘without payment, upon application to the Master, at the school.’¹²⁶ A two-day art exhibition in conjunction with this meeting took place on 16-17 December, and the *Stourbridge Observer* newspaper mentioned some details about the ‘various drawings, sketches and paintings ... tastefully arranged round the room.’¹²⁷ In addition to commending a ‘fine painting’ of a Great Western Railway carriage by art master William Bowen, the reporter commended Mrs. Blakeway’s painting of camellias as well as two of Miss Fanny Green’s paintings that depicted fruit and a lobster, respectively. Miss Green’s painting of fruit from nature was described as ‘beautifully done, showing a considerable amount of power, the shading being particularly fine.’ Also in December 1864, the Council reported that enrolment in the Male Evening Class stood at its highest to date with 145 students and that endeavors would be made to increase the number of young lady students in the day art classes, which had higher fees. The Council promised to seek financial subscriptions from local benefactors, but there was no mention of any relationships with the glass or iron enterprises within the Stourbridge district.

¹²⁵ *Advertiser*, 26 July 1862.

¹²⁶ *Advertiser*, 10 and 17 December 1864; see also *Stourbridge Observer*, 10 December 1864.

¹²⁷ *Stourbridge Observer*, 24 December 1864.

The annual meeting in 1865 was accompanied by an exhibition of engraved glass from local manufacturers along with ‘paintings and drawings by the students.’¹²⁸ In taking the chair for this meeting, Lord Lyttelton noted a modest increase in the total number of students, but he called attention to those employed in local industries who had not enrolled in the school, remarking that there were ‘a good many persons engaged in the manufactures of the district ... who had not taken advantage of the school as they might have done.’ In December 1866, the exhibition of student drawings was attended by ‘upwards of 1,200 visitors,’ and H. W. Foley, MP, whilst presiding over the annual meeting, reflected upon the efforts of his late family member, J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, as he reiterated the view that ‘art should be applied to the manufactures of this country.’¹²⁹ H. W. Foley’s statement suggests that the application of art to industry was essential to the iron and glass industries of the Stourbridge district, a refrain that echoed the statements made by others at previous meetings and that would be voiced again by various Council members in subsequent years.

During the annual meetings in 1865 and 1866, the Council awarded a number of book prizes to students, and the local newspapers reported some descriptions of the students’ works.¹³⁰ The newspaper accounts reveal a decided emphasis upon aspects of fine art. Several works were ‘outline’ in form and done freehand, and other awards went to those who had completed watercolour or oil paintings of landscapes, flowers or the human figure (see Appendix Four, ‘Awards to Stourbridge School Students, 1852-1905’). For the 1866

¹²⁸ *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865 and *Birmingham Daily Post*, 11 December 1865.

¹²⁹ *Advertiser*, 22 December 1866.

¹³⁰ *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865 and 22 December 1866.

meeting, there was an exhibition of ‘richly cut glass ... lent for the occasion’ by several local glass enterprises, but no further details regarding the glassware were forthcoming.¹³¹

At the 1867 annual meeting, the report of the Council indicated concern about changes in its responsibilities for the administration of the annual Government examinations in drawing. The Stourbridge School wanted to maintain its longstanding connection with local elementary schools by continuing to be the centre for these examinations, but the examinations were now to be conducted in rooms within the individual schools. The Stourbridge School regarded the local elementary schools as ‘a nursery from which the students of the school of art are to a great extent supplied,’ so the Council vowed to redouble the teaching of basic drawing in those schools.¹³² Because the local elementary schools paid fees for regular art instruction, the Council surely wished to maintain a close relationship with these institutions.

In 1867, the exhibition of student work included paintings by Miss Gibson and Miss Price, ‘outlines from nature’ drawn by Thomas Woodall and James Hill (both of whom were then employed as glass etchers at J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley), as well as mechanical drawings by architect’s assistant James M. Gething.¹³³ There was no annual meeting in 1868 or 1869, and the gathering in January 1870 served primarily to summarize student achievements during 1868 and 1869. Glass etcher James Hill was awarded a Queen’s Prize from the Department of Science and Art, and three students received Government prize studentships that contributed monies to the Stourbridge School as well as

¹³¹ *Stourbridge Observer*, 22 December 1866.

¹³² *Advertiser*, 21 December 1867 and *County Express*, 21 December 1867.

¹³³ *Stourbridge Observer*, 21 December 1867.

to the individual students.¹³⁴ Student Albert Gyngell, another glass etcher at J. & J. Northwood, was awarded a national medal in mid-1870 for his design of a fan painted on silk, and he and James Hill also gained prize studentships.¹³⁵ In 1869, the Stourbridge School had borrowed a number of ‘original paintings, water colour drawings, &c.’ from the South Kensington Museum, and these examples of fine art were deemed to be ‘a great advantage to the students.’¹³⁶ In his remarks, Rev. William H. Lyttelton spoke of the adverse economic impact of foreign competition on manufactured goods, and he expressed his view that art education would enable students to appreciate the beauty in nature and also to inspire them to create ‘original designs’ of benefit to their employers.

During the 1874 annual meeting, Rev. William H. Lyttelton recounted national statistics regarding the enrolment totals at schools of art and concluded that ‘the great aim’ of art education ‘should not only be in teaching men to do their work, but to feel an artistic pleasure in doing it.’¹³⁷ In its report for this meeting, the members of the Council sought ‘to impress upon employers of workmen the necessity of their endeavouring to induce those in their employ to take advantage of these schools,’ a statement that reflects once more the Council’s apparent disappointment regarding the absence of efforts by local manufacturers to encourage or support their employees to enrol in classes at the Stourbridge School. At this time, the Stourbridge School had been operating for more than two decades, so this

¹³⁴ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1870 and *County Express*, 15 January 1870.

¹³⁵ *Advertiser*, 2 July 1870 and 15 July 1871. James Hill gained a Government award for ‘original design’ a few years later; see *Advertiser*, 24 January 1874.

¹³⁶ *County Express*, 15 January 1870.

¹³⁷ *Advertiser*, 31 January 1874 and *County Express*, 31 January 1874.

statement is indicative of a lack of development regarding relationships between the school and the industries of the Stourbridge district.

Lord Lyttelton presided at the annual meeting in January 1876, and Rev. Hugh Sherrard, a member of the Council, distributed the prizes. Rev. Sherrard spoke briefly about the ‘elevating influence of Art studies,’ saying that the school ‘was a very necessary institution to the neighbourhood’ and noting that the study of art has moral value for its ‘great effect on the ordinary life of the student, endowing him with habits of regularity and perseverance.’¹³⁸ In describing the exhibition of student works held in conjunction with the meeting, the *Stourbridge Observer* called special attention to several examples, ranging from Agnes Sproat’s watercolour painting of grapes and W. J. Thomas’s watercolour of a black and tan terrier dog to landscapes in oil by Miss Hughes and Miss Hammond.¹³⁹

Those gathered for the annual meeting in January 1877 paid tribute to the late Lord Lyttelton (George William, 4th Baron Lyttelton), who had passed away several months earlier. In presiding over the meeting, his son Charles Lyttelton (5th Baron Lyttelton, who came to the title when his father died) suggested that the Stourbridge School should attempt to organize an art and industrial exposition, with fine art objects being loaned by owners who resided in the Stourbridge district.¹⁴⁰ Such an exposition, he thought, should bring together ‘fine pictures, china and works of art’ as a ‘means to raise money’ and would ‘do good to the past and present members of the school.’ Much of the rest of the 1877 meeting was devoted to the mortgage debt of the Stourbridge School, as noted earlier in this chapter.

¹³⁸ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1876 and *County Express*, 15 January 1876.

¹³⁹ *Stourbridge Observer*, 15 January 1876.

¹⁴⁰ *Advertiser*, 13 January 1877 and *County Express*, 13 January 1877. Subsequent meetings do not mention this project, so it seems likely that the suggestion was not taken.

At the annual meeting in 1878, guest speaker Major Walker, who was associated with the Heath Glassworks near Stourbridge and was president of the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, commented generally on the application of art to manufacturing. He said that ‘the prosperity of England mainly depended on the amount of art that was infused into its manufactures.’ He noted that little progress seemed to have been made in the iron industry, and, somewhat surprisingly, he did not go into detail regarding glass.¹⁴¹ Council member Alfred W. Worthington agreed that ‘the system of art manufactures’ was not ‘applied to iron to the extent it might,’ and, whilst acknowledging ‘wonderful improvement’ in glass generally, he felt that current products of the Stourbridge district fell short of ‘the beauty of the Venetian glass to be seen in the Kensington museum.’

At the annual meeting in 1879, Sir Rupert Kettle, who had been associated with the school since its time within the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution in the 1840s, spoke in general terms about the relation between art and manufacturing, as he emphasised the need for aesthetic accomplishment. He said that ‘obtaining prosperity’ often took precedence over ‘cultivation of the amenities of life,’ whilst acknowledging the economic pressure from foreign competition in manufactured goods. Lastly, he spoke of the growing influence of Japanese art on the design of British goods, especially porcelain, and he noted that the Worcester School of Art enrolled numerous students who were employed in the porcelain manufactories there.¹⁴² Sir Rupert was aware of relationships between Worcester manufacturers and the school, but he did not make mention of the lack of similar relationships between the Stourbridge School and manufacturers of the Stourbridge district.

¹⁴¹ *Advertiser*, 12 January 1878 and *County Express*, 12 January 1878.

¹⁴² *Advertiser*, 11 January 1879 and *County Express*, 11 January 1879.

On 8 January 1880, featured speaker John Henry Chamberlain, in an address entitled ‘Right Work for Art Schools,’ extolled the virtues of learning to draw before the annual meeting. He compared basic drawing to writing as he demonstrated his statements by drawing a variety of forms that were integral to the South Kensington curriculum.¹⁴³ The accompanying art exhibition of student work included ‘sepia, crayon (from the flat and cast), freehand, human figure and water colour drawings’ as well as ‘good works in oil and some large crayon drawings,’ but there was no mention of any student projects at the design stages of the curriculum.¹⁴⁴

In summary, the annual public meetings and prize-givings and art exhibitions from the 1860s, 1870s and early 1880s that are described above brought a measure of public attention to the Stourbridge School. Although Council minutes are not extant, accounts in local newspapers preserve the substance of the reports presented at annual public meetings and, thus, permit some analysis of the remarks of both Council members and invited guest speakers in regards to various issues that confronted the Stourbridge School. Those remarks often mirror prevalent national trends regarding the potential economic impact or the anticipated social benefits of art education. The annual meetings of the Stourbridge School brought together leaders from various social strata who were active contributors to the civic culture of Stourbridge, whether through their philanthropy in the form of financial contributions or their positions in national or local government or their activities in local churches, industries, businesses, professions or trades.

In keeping with the purpose of this thesis, it must also be noted that, although the various art exhibitions held during the 1852-1881 period contained numerous

¹⁴³ *Advertiser*, 10 January 1880.

¹⁴⁴ *County Express*, 10 January 1880.

representations of fine art, there were few examples of design that could be associated with local manufacturing in iron or glass. Those designs associated with glass were almost always the work of longtime student James Hill, who attended the Stourbridge School for many years whilst he was employed as a glass etcher at the glass decorating firm of J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley.

Conclusions

From its founding in 1851 until the early 1880s, the Stourbridge School of Art strived to establish itself as a provincial school under the auspices of the Government Department of Practical Art and its successor, the Department of Science and Art. Housed in a renovated theatre building and burdened by a mortgage debt, the Stourbridge School was supported by benefactors from different levels of society who had various motivations, and it enrolled female and male students from distinctly separate social strata.

Several of the initial Stourbridge School benefactors— including Lord Ward, Lord Lyttelton, barrister Robert Scott and J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP—were supporters of various educational endeavours well before the school was founded in 1851. Along with other gentry, industrialists, business owners, professionals and tradesmen, they were involved with the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution. Since its inception in the mid-1830s, that organisation sought to provide both educational opportunities and a place for social interaction. Shortly after the advent of drawing classes at the Mechanics' Institution in the late 1840s, Foley helped secure the initial funding for a Government school of design. A public meeting in Stourbridge in early February 1851 to garner support for this provincial school sparked public enthusiasm, although the results of subsequent financial contributions were disappointing. However, those who supported the Stourbridge School

revealed their economic motivation in statements reflecting confidence that the students of the fledgling institution would be of ultimate benefit to local manufacturing interests, particularly iron and glass. During 1851-1881, remarks by various benefactors and Council members at annual meetings indicated their acceptance of Government involvement in art education as well as their motivations to improve the labouring classes, to elevate public taste, and to encourage philanthropy. Also manifest in such remarks were an economic interest for aesthetic improvements in British manufactured goods to compete with foreign products and a sense of popular enthusiasm for art.

Financial issues impacted the development of the Stourbridge School. Income varied from contributions by a small number of benefactors, and policy changes from the Department of Science and Art regarding grants or other payments affected the balance sheet, so funds were often barely sufficient for daily operations. When the Department of Science and Art eliminated grants in favour of 'payment on results,' both the Stourbridge School Council and the art master responded to this issue by embracing the Department's scheme, in contrast to the adverse reaction from other provincial schools. As a result, the financial picture of the school improved somewhat, although the mortgage debt remained. The mortgage debt was an omnipresent concern, and unsuccessful fundraising attempts to liquidate this debt were sources of frustration for the school Council, especially when plans for building renovations were thwarted in the 1870s.

After the short-lived tenures of two young art masters (Henry Alexander Bowler and Andrew MacCallum), art masters George P. Yeats and William P. Bowen served the Stourbridge School for nine and 18 years, respectively, and hundreds of students came under their instruction. Both Yeats and Bowen had attended the Head School in London and were certificated as art masters by the Department of Science and Art. However,

neither Yeats nor Bowen had experience with design or manufacturing relating to the iron or glass industries, and it is difficult to assess the influence of their teaching upon local enterprises in these areas. Both men were talented artists whose approaches to art education were rooted in the fine arts as manifest in the highly structured twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum. Drawing was the foundation of this curriculum, and elementary and advanced drawing exercises were mandated for the various classes at the Stourbridge School and for instruction in drawing at various local elementary schools, including the Old Swinford Hospital School.

Students at the Stourbridge School came from distinct social strata. The Female Morning Class enrolled daughters of local gentry, clergy, industrialists, professionals, business owners or tradesmen, whilst the Male Evening Class ‘for artisans’ consisted almost entirely of employed young men, including many working in the local glass decorating industry, but few from iron or glass manufacturing. Despite relatively steady or increasing student enrolments, Council members and others often expressed their view that the school ought to attract greater numbers of students from local industries, and their remarks were directed at manufacturers as well as potential students. Nonetheless, the Stourbridge School neither offered special classes nor sought to build relationships with representatives of the iron or glass industries within the Stourbridge district.

Many students attended the Stourbridge School for successive years, passing various levels of Government art examinations and working on drawing or painting projects within the well-defined twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum. Student achievements were recognized with local or national awards at yearly public meetings. The best works merited medals or book prizes, and students who were employed in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district often secured recognition, including some awards for designs in glass

decorating. Book prizes chosen by the art master and a Stourbridge School committee typically reflected aspects of fine art, natural history or literature. Some former students of the school, such as Harriet Skidmore and Frank Short, had noteworthy careers in fine art, and a measure of their successes can probably be attributed to instruction received at the Stourbridge School.

The annual public meetings of the Stourbridge School were often accompanied by special art exhibitions of student work as well as pictures or other fine art loaned for the occasions from the personal art collections of Council members. Attended by benefactors and other supporters who came from the ranks of gentry, clergy, industrialists, professionals, business owners and tradesmen, these annual meetings and art exhibitions were an important means of generating public support and extending the visibility of the institution. These events were usually reported in detail in one or more of the local newspapers, as were the results of Government art examinations. Despite a location that was somewhat isolated from the centre of the town, the Stourbridge School of Art, through the actions of its governing Council and other supporters, endeavoured to become an integral part of the civic culture of Stourbridge during the years 1851-1881, but its impact upon the industrial activity of the Stourbridge district is less clear.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL OF ART: HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT, 1882-1905

From the time of its founding in 1851 and throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century and into the early years of the twentieth century, the Stourbridge School Council, like that of other provincial schools, confronted a variety of management issues as it sought to further its educational offerings and to continue to establish itself as a contributor to the civic culture of the town. This chapter focuses upon the history and development of the Stourbridge School during 1882-1905, a period of considerable change in Britain regarding the specialised instruction that was termed ‘technical education.’ In January 1882, the Stourbridge School began its classes with a new art master, Edward John Simms, and, soon thereafter, it was free from its longstanding mortgage debt and could embark upon an ambitious building renovation project. A decade later, the school again welcomed a new art master, George Henry Cromack, but found its remodeled building increasingly inadequate for the growing numbers of students seeking instruction in various technical subjects. By late 1904, Stourbridge School benefactors and supporters, aided greatly by sources of funding made possible through national legislation, were preparing to relocate the Stourbridge School of Art to the newly constructed Free Library and Technical Institute, a building that was destined to be an important addition to the civic culture of Stourbridge.

This chapter addresses the following research questions: Who were the key benefactors and supporters of the school and what were their motivations? What impact did the elimination of the mortgage debt have on the development of the school? What was the nature of the curriculum and how did it seek to meet the needs of local industry? How did the art masters’ methods of teaching affect the direction of the school? What social strata were represented by the students and what future successes of the students should be

credited to the school? What was the relationship between the Stourbridge School and art education efforts at Brierley Hill and Wordsley? How did the growth of technical education and the roles of responsible political bodies affect the Stourbridge School? What was the perceived impact of the new Free Library and Technical Institute building upon the civic culture of Stourbridge? Based upon the available evidence, the resolutions of these research questions reveal the various factors that shaped the history and development of the Stourbridge School. These factors range from the interests and activities of the members of the governing Council of the school and the instructional practices of its art masters to the development of the civic culture of Stourbridge and impact of national legislation relating to technical education. Other important factors include the responses of the Council in addressing local concerns, such as the retirement of the mortgage debt, or in dealing with broader issues that were raised by the Government Department of Science and Art.

In answer to the questions posed above, this chapter examines and analyses a variety of interrelated areas that pertain to the history and development of the Stourbridge School over approximately a quarter century. Some subjects, such as the consideration of building renovations in the 1880s, are descriptive in nature so that one may view a sequence of events. Other areas, such as the retirement of the mortgage debt, the continuing quest for financial benefactors and the opportunities made possible by legislation regarding technical education, are worthy of interpretation and analysis, as is the place of the new Free Library and Technical Institute in the civic culture of Stourbridge.

During 1882-1905, as issues came to the fore, the Stourbridge School was able to sustain its purpose: providing art instruction by a qualified art master to students through a regular schedule of classes, most of which were open to both women and men. Annual meetings and art exhibitions enabled the Stourbridge School to maintain its public profile.

When the Stourbridge School relocated to the new building at the prominent intersection of High Street, Hagley Road and Church Street in April-May 1905, those associated with the school, along with residents of the Stourbridge district, witnessed the most ambitious exhibit in the history of the school, the ‘Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition.’

Among the few surviving documents from the Stourbridge School is a printed annual report from 1883, listing the current Council officers and members, several of whom had then served for a decade or more. Many of these Council members (and those who came before or after) were benefactors through regular or occasional monetary donations, and it is noteworthy that these benefactors came from various social strata: gentry, clergy, industrialists, business owners, professionals, and tradesmen. Lord Ward (Earl of Dudley) was president, and there were four vice-presidents: Lord Lyttelton; H. J. W. Hodgetts Foley, MP; and industrialists William Orme Foster and Charles Evers-Swindell. Members of the Council were: Rev. David Maginnis, chairman; retired banker Thomas Davies Thomas, treasurer; Alfred W. Worthington, honorary secretary; Rev. John S. Boldero; Rev. T. Bishop; Rev. Hugh Sherrard; Rev. Lionel B. Penley; Rev. W. Wallace; newspaper publisher/editor John Addison; retired grocer Henry Billingham; bookseller/printer Robert Broomhall; High Bailiff Charles Evers; surgeon Dr. Alfred Freer; solicitor Gainsborough Harward; solicitor George Perry; solicitor John B. Shepherd; industrialist H. Watson Smith; solicitor William Waldron; Dr. Henry Walker, JP; and glass manufacturers James Harry Walker, Charles Webb, and Joseph Silvers-Williams.¹ During the 1880s, Silvers-Williams led the Stourbridge School to establish links with art schools in Brierley Hill and Wordsley,

¹ Stourbridge School of Art, *Annual Report*, 10 October 1883 (National Archives at Kew, file ED 29/176).

and, in the 1890s, Smith's abiding interest in fine art influenced the employment of a new art master and the shaping of the curriculum of the school.

Mortgage Debt and Building Renovations

The mortgage debt that first loomed over the Stourbridge School in the mid-1850s was still present in the early 1880s, the legacy of unsuccessful fundraising efforts by the school Council. As mentioned in the previous chapter, guest speaker John Henry Chamberlain of the Birmingham School of Art had addressed the need for funds in blunt terms in 1880, saying that the Stourbridge School 'was not supported by the inhabitants of Stourbridge and district as it ought to be.'² Calling the situation 'a disgrace,' he suggested that Council members should 'see the rich men and ask their support.' In January 1882, the debt was described as a 'millstone' during the annual meeting.³ However, during the remainder of 1882, Frank Evers, brother of industrialists Charles Evers-Swindell and James Evers-Swindell, headed a successful fundraising campaign to retire the mortgage debt. In its 1883 *Annual Report*, the Stourbridge School Council recognized 'the active exertions of Mr. F. Evers in collecting subscriptions' as well as 'the liberal response with which those exertions were met.'⁴ In May 1883, Council member George Perry sent a printed congratulatory letter to those who subscribed to retire the mortgage debt, thanking the benefactors 'for the generous aid they have conferred upon the institution' and listing the twelve business organizations and more than two dozen individuals who had donated to the

² *Advertiser*, 10 January 1880.

³ *County Express*, 14 January 1882.

⁴ Stourbridge School of Art, *Annual Report*, 10 October 1883.

‘Sinking Fund.’⁵ The business enterprises included several from the glass industry of the Stourbridge district (Thomas Webb and Sons; Boulton and Mills; Stevens & Williams; and Guest Brothers) as well as the Birmingham Banking Co. and the Birmingham and Midland Bank. Along with Frank Evers, H. J. W. Hodgetts Foley, MP, and industrialist James Evers-Swindell, the following individuals contributed £20 each: brick manufacturer George K. Harrison; leather works owner William J. Turney; ironmaster William Orme Foster; and coal and iron master James Holcroft, JP. Among the other donors listed were William Webb and Edward Webb, who were associated with a glasshouse in Wordsley, and former glass manufacturer Philip Pargeter, who was retired after many years in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district.

The names of the various benefactors were not included in the Stourbridge School Council’s 1883 *Annual Report*, but the total amount raised (£350 11s), combined with Charles Evers-Swindell’s earlier contributions totaling £200 and £50 from Sarah Scott (widow of benefactor Robert Scott who had died in 1856), along with other income, allowed the school to retire its mortgage debt of £650 3s 4d. At long last, the debt was deemed ‘extinguished.’⁶ The payment of this debt enabled the Council to address the need for building renovations, but, more importantly, the fundraising campaign brought the Stourbridge School to the attention of several prominent individuals (such as George Harrison, James Holcroft, Isaac Nash, and William Turney) who had not been active previously in the affairs of the school. Some of these gentlemen were to undertake significant roles in the Stourbridge School later on.

⁵ A copy of this letter, dated 21 May 1883, along with an envelope addressed to ‘P. Pargeter, Esq., Coalbournbrook, Stourbridge’ is in the Stourbridge Public Library.

⁶ *Advertiser*, 12 January 1884 and *County Express*, 12 January 1884; see also *Birmingham Daily Post*, 9 January 1884.

During 1884, the Council began to prepare its application for a building grant, as the financial circumstances were positive since payment of the mortgage debt. More than a year earlier, the Exhibition Surplus Disposal Committee of the Worcestershire County Council prepared to distribute monies derived from the financial success of the Worcestershire Exhibition, and the Stourbridge School was scheduled to receive £135 towards a fund ‘for the repair and better adaptation’ of the school.⁷ This grant of £135 carried stipulations, however, as the mortgage debt must be satisfied, and the additional funds required had to be raised ‘either by local subscription or Government grant.’⁸ The Council was not optimistic about the prospects for a Government grant, but the mortgage debt was paid, so secretary A. W. Worthington began the application process and completed the various forms required by the Department of Science and Art. The grant requested £410 1s for building renovations.⁹ Rather than seeking funds from benefactors to retire a longstanding debt, the Stourbridge School Council was now looking forward to improvements for the school that would contribute to the civic culture of the town. The renovations were completed in December 1884, and the Stourbridge School held a lengthy

⁷ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 18 January 1883 and *County Express*, 20 January 1883.

⁸ Stourbridge School of Art, *Annual Report*, 10 October 1883.

⁹ Information regarding this grant is from file ED 29/176 (National Archives at Kew); see also *Furniture Gazette*, 21 (19 April 1884), p. 314. In March 1884, architect James M. Gething, a former Stourbridge School student who had won prizes in 1868-1870, prepared notes and plans for the building renovations. His proposed alterations did not alter the floor plan of the school, and some changes (reconstructing the slate roof, replacing lavatory fixtures, and installing new flooring) were essential because of damage from damp and decay. Windows were to be replaced, and the existing skylights were to be enlarged and made vertical to admit north light. To accommodate displays, Gething planned to construct a gallery level in the largest existing room, and he estimated the total cost for repairs and remodeling at £450. In due course, the Department of Science and Art approved the plans that had been submitted, granting an amount not to exceed £410 1s. Whilst the Stourbridge School building was being renovated during 1884, the scheduled drawing and art education classes were held at the nearby Mechanics’ Institution.

public art exhibition in conjunction with its annual meeting and prize-giving in January 1885. Local newspapers noted that the changes made to the school building were a contribution to the civic culture of Stourbridge. The *Stourbridge Observer* said that ‘the ugly and dingy theatre’ interior was ‘vastly improved and enlarged,’ and proclaimed that the renovated building ‘forms a school of art in every way fitted for its requirements.’¹⁰ The *Birmingham Daily Post* also praised the alterations, saying ‘they have effected a great transformation in the building and given the students at last a comfortable and convenient place in which to work,’ and the *County Express* had a favourable note regarding ‘the improvement of the heating, gas lighting and ventilating apparatus.’¹¹ A year later, the *Advertiser* reported that additional Government funds had been secured to pay most of the costs for ‘new desks and other fittings.’¹² The renovated building was to serve the Stourbridge School well for about a decade. As discussed later in this chapter, technical education initiatives brought increasing numbers of students to Stourbridge for instruction in various subjects, especially science, and the need for a larger building soon became evident. In early 1896, an editorial column in the *Advertiser* carried this headline: ‘The Need of More Commodious Buildings,’¹³

The successful fundraising effort in 1882 that brought about payment of the mortgage debt and the subsequent remodeling of the Stourbridge School building contributed to an uplifting of the institution and, in a general sense, to a strengthening of the civic identity of Stourbridge. Some individuals who donated monies to retire the mortgage debt were active

¹⁰ *Stourbridge Observer*, 24 January 1885.

¹¹ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 21 January 1885 and *County Express*, 24 January 1885.

¹² *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886.

¹³ *Advertiser*, 1 February 1896.

in the affairs of the school. Others—such as recently elected Council members Joseph Silvers-Williams and H. Watson Smith or donors George K. Harrison, James Holcroft, Isaac Nash, and William J. Turney—were newly enlisted supporters of the institution. Many of the individuals who helped to retire the mortgage debt also became benefactors several years thereafter to the most ambitious building project that took place in nineteenth-century Stourbridge, namely, the construction of the Stourbridge Town Hall, the focal point for local celebrations of the Golden Jubilee of Queen Victoria during 1887.¹⁴

Art Masters

During the period from 1882 to 1905, the Stourbridge School was served by two art masters: Edward John Simms, whose tenure was from January 1882 to mid-1893, and George Henry Cromack, whose service commenced in the fall of 1893 and extended well into the twentieth century until his death on 2 March 1924. Both Simms and Cromack attended Government schools of art, including the National Art Training School (formerly Head School) in London prior to their appointments, and both were popular teachers whilst at Stourbridge. Like their predecessors, however, neither gentleman had specific training in design for manufactured goods nor direct experience with the Stourbridge glass or iron industries. During their respective times at Stourbridge, each was aided by one or more assistant masters and/or pupil teachers, but information about them is difficult to find.¹⁵

¹⁴ Charles Evers-Swindell and William J. Turney contributed £1000 each for the Town Hall project. William Orme Foster (£300) and William Webb and Edward Webb (£200) were also prominent donors. For a full list of contributors, see *County Express*, 2 April 1887.

¹⁵ Former student Louis Muckley was assistant art master in early 1886; see *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886. In the fall of 1886, Ludwig Kny was appointed second assistant pupil teacher; see *County Express*, 2 October 1886. Francis R. Grice and Samuel C. Phipps were pupil teachers in 1891, and Herbert Sershall was assistant art master from September 1892 to October 1893, when Joseph D. C. Burley was appointed to succeed him; see *County*

After ‘great care’ in the hiring process by the school Council, Edward Simms was ‘unanimously selected’ in January 1882, succeeding art master William P. Bowen, and Simms took up residence at Hanbury Hill, not far from the Stourbridge School.¹⁶ In the early 1860s, Simms was a student at the newly founded Bromsgrove School of Art, where he won two medals for outline drawings. He was recognized in 1863 with a medal and prize studentship for ‘historic styles of ornamentation’ and again in 1865 with two medals.¹⁷ In 1867 at Bromsgrove, Simms was recognized for his ‘study in coloured chalk of the human figure after Mulready,’ and he also designed an ornamental border for an illuminated address that was presented to the president of the school.¹⁸ When Simms obtained his art master’s certificate in 1870, Stourbridge art master William P. Bowen was also teaching at Bromsgrove.¹⁹ Simms served at Bromsgrove from 1870 to 1881 as assistant art master to Bowen until he was employed at Stourbridge as Bowen’s successor in 1882.

About two years after Simms came to Stourbridge, art instruction was offered at the Bent Street School in Brierley Hill as a ‘branch’ of the Stourbridge School, as discussed later in this chapter. Simms was in charge of this effort as well as a short-lived ‘modelling’

Express, 28 October 1893. Herbert Sershall later became art master at Devon. Kny, Grice and Phipps were employed in the glass decorating industry of the Stourbridge district.

¹⁶ *Advertiser*, 14 January 1882 and *County Express*, 14 January 1882.

¹⁷ *Worcester Herald*, 14 December 1861, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 12 December 1863, and *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 28 October 1865. Simms was successful in passing art examinations in 1866; see *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 18 August 1866.

¹⁸ *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 9 November 1867. The border was described as ‘a conventional treatment of foliage as applied to decoration and introduced the arms of the school, the arms of the town, and the monograms of [school president] Dr. and Mrs. Collis.’

¹⁹ *Advertiser*, 2 July 1870.

class at Stourbridge.²⁰ In 1884, Council secretary A. W. Worthington informed those attending the annual meeting that Simms ‘worked with very great energy and persistent effort not only to do the work of the school but to extend its operations.’²¹ In 1887, the Council reported that the annual income of the school from student fees and Government grants awarded for passing marks on examinations was £20 higher than at any previous time. Council member Rev. W. Wallace remarked that this was ‘a matter for congratulation’ and that ‘it spoke a great deal for the diligence and zeal of the master.’²²

During the annual meeting in January 1888, Simms was again praised for his ‘conscientious devotion,’ and the Council noted that income from fees and grants had increased substantially because of his success in teaching.²³ At the annual meeting in 1889, Simms ‘stated that when he came to Stourbridge he determined to raise the standard’ and he thought that ‘he had done something towards that.’²⁴ Unfortunately, no specific information has yet come to light regarding the teaching methods employed by Simms, but his background suggests that his emphasis beyond the teaching of drawing was in areas of fine art.

Beginning in September 1891, Simms was responsible for much of the teaching when the Stourbridge School first offered its ‘Penny Class’ on Tuesday and Thursday evenings.

²⁰ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 9 January 1884; *Advertiser*, 12 January 1884 and 24 January 1885. The modelling class was suspended in 1885-1886 whilst the Stourbridge School building was being renovated; see *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886.

²¹ *County Express*, 12 January 1884. At this same meeting, Worthington said ‘he had asked Mr. Simms to notice what kind of work was being done in the glassworks of the district and ... to adapt the teaching of the school.’

²² *Advertiser*, 15 January 1887.

²³ *County Express*, 14 January 1888.

²⁴ *Advertiser*, 12 January 1889.

As its name implies, the class had a fee of just 1d per session, and those who attended were to receive a drawing lesson from the art master. The modest fee was intended to attract new students, although students enrolled in any other class could also attend if they desired. In 1892-1893, Simms was instrumental in the formation of drawing and art classes in nearby Lye as a result of legislative initiatives for technical education. He served the Stourbridge School until the start of the summer vacation in 1893, when he became 'visiting Drawing Master' at the Old Swinford Hospital School and returned to teach at Bromsgrove, where he had begun his art education more than three decades earlier.²⁵

George Henry Cromack, aged 29, was named art master in May 1893, and he was scheduled to take up his post at the start of classes in September 1893, after the six-week summer vacation. The *County Express* published a lengthy account of his background.²⁶ A native of Nottingham, Cromack studied at the Stroud School of Art for eight years and was assistant art master at Stroud when he was awarded a Government scholarship of £350, enabling him to attend a series of specialised training classes at the National Art Training School in London from 1887 to 1892. These classes included painting and shading from life, antique work, modelling, and design as well as painting in watercolour or oil. He won several medals in the national competitions of the Department of Science and Art, and he held various certificates, including the Art Class Teacher's Certificate and the Art Master's Certificate. Cromack had considerable experience in teaching aspects of art at South

²⁵ *Account of the Old Swinford Hospital Charity, December 31, 1894* (Stourbridge: Mark & Moody, 1895), p. 29 and *Calendar, History and General Summary of Regulations of the Department of Science and Art* (London: HMSO, 1900), p. 46.

²⁶ *County Express*, 27 May 1893. Stourbridge School Council member H. Watson Smith, who had great interest in fine art and classical music, journeyed to London to interview Cromack and another candidate for the art master position. The full Council accepted Smith's recommendation that Cromack should be hired; see *County Express*, 8 March and 15 March 1924 for Smith's recollections of the circumstances of Cromack's appointment.

Kensington and the West London School, and, during 1892-1893, whilst instructing art classes under the auspices of the Sheerness Technical Instruction Committee.

At Stourbridge in 1894-1895, art master Cromack instituted the 'Life Class' as an opportunity for students to sketch or paint from a live model, although only male students could sketch or paint the full human figure whilst female students were restricted to studies of the head. Cromack was responsible for instruction in the Life Class, so the General Evening Class, which met at the same hours as the Life Class, was probably taught by assistant art master Joseph D. C. Burley and/or pupil teachers.

The addition of the Life Class to the curriculum was certainly one in the direction of advanced education in fine art and was welcomed by Council member H. Watson Smith, who lauded the class in a letter to the *County Express*. Smith expressed great pride in the fact that the Stourbridge School was the only such institution in Worcestershire in which drawing 'the undraped human figure' was practised, and he credited art master Cromack with giving 'a meaning and a purpose to the school.'²⁷ In early 1898, at a special art exhibition held in Stourbridge by the Worcestershire County Council, Cromack displayed 'very pretty water colour sketches, one ... being a sketch with Oldswinford church in the background and another a study of some trees in Oldswinford churchyard.'²⁸

In early 1898, the *Advertiser* mentioned that Cromack often took his students outdoors 'to draw,' a practice that elicited strong affirmation from artist Frank Short, who suggested that the Black Country had many areas of interest such as industrial sites and that

²⁷ *County Express*, 30 January 1897. When artist Frank Short addressed the annual meeting in 1898, he also approved, saying he was 'very glad ... there was a life class in the Stourbridge school—they could not do without a life class.' See *County Express*, 15 January 1898.

²⁸ *County Express*, 15 January 1898.

students ‘should make an effort to record some of them on paper.’²⁹ In its review of the Stourbridge School art exhibition of January 1898, the *Advertiser* made favourable mention of art master Cromack’s departures from previous teaching practices that were rooted in the rigid twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum:

Mr. Cromack, who has now been four years the headmaster of the school, has gone upon somewhat new lines in the management and has reason to be highly gratified with the results obtained. Discarding altogether the old method of drawing from copies, he has substituted for it the more interesting and stimulating process of working directly from nature or from objects, and has been rewarded by the increased originality and power displayed in the efforts of the students.³⁰

In the mid-1880s and throughout the 1890s, the focus of the Government examinations in art was changed from evaluations of finished works (drawings, paintings or models) that required weeks or months for completion to an emphasis upon ‘time studies,’ a mode of examination in which an art student created a drawing or a painting from still life, nature or life within a specified time frame that might range from 30 minutes to five hours, depending upon the skill being tested and the level of difficulty addressed.³¹ Since art masters Simms and Cromack were preparing students for these time studies examinations, their teaching methods probably consisted of exercises designed to increase both the proficiencies and the confidence of their respective students.

²⁹ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1898.

³⁰ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1898. William ‘Bill’ Pardoe, 10, attended the Stourbridge School in 1914, and he recorded this memory: ‘I used to attend the Stourbridge School of Art, the head of which was a Mr Cromack, for three nights a week from 7.30 to 9.00 pm. First work was designing circles with repeating borders which later we had to colour with a kind of tempera paint made with coloured powder, water and glue. Later on I learnt shading of models (of vines, plaques etc.) with a black powder (charcoal). It was horribly boring stuff which I never liked doing’ (see <http://www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~pardos/MemMain.html>).

³¹ Department of Science and Art, *Calendar, History and General Summary of Regulations* (London: HMSO, 1900), pp. xxiii.

Both Simms and Cromack found measures of success at Stourbridge. Although the specific details of his teaching methods cannot be ascertained, Simms's popularity and ability as a teacher both enhanced student enrolment and increased the financial revenue of the Stourbridge School through student fees and Government payments linked to enrolment numbers and passing marks in Government examinations. Trained and talented in fine art, Cromack was an innovative teacher who invested much effort in his approaches to art education, including emphasis upon life studies and nature studies.

Curriculum and Class Schedules

Throughout the 1880s, the Stourbridge School of Art continued to follow the twenty-three-stage art education curriculum that was established in 1851-1852 by the Department of Practical Art and continued in place by its successor, the Department of Science and Art. When technical education came to the forefront in the early 1890s, the full appellation 'Stourbridge School of Science and Art' was used with greater regularity in local newspapers, and the institution began to offer instruction in science, mechanics and manual training as well as some domestic subjects, such as dressmaking and cookery. As noted above, art masters Edward Simms and George Cromack adapted teaching methods and class offerings in keeping with new forms of student examinations such as time studies.

Regarding class schedules and student fees for art education, the Stourbridge School retained its flexibility to adjust class offerings in keeping with local circumstances and to set student fees accordingly (see Appendix Three, 'Stourbridge School Classes and Fees, 1852-1905,' for a summary of class offerings and fees). During the last few decades of the nineteenth century, the Department of Science and Art continued to encourage the

provincial schools to be self-supporting from student fees and donations from benefactors and by adhering to the strict guidelines for Government grants.

From 1852 through 1884, just three classes were offered at the Stourbridge School. The Ladies Morning Class (fee 10s 6d per quarter) met from 10 a.m. to noon on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The General Evening Class (fee 2s per month), which enrolled boys and men who were employed, met from 7 to 9:30 p.m. on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.³² A class for older boys (ages 11-13) from the Old Swinford Hospital School met at the Stourbridge School in the evening on Tuesday and Thursday, and this institution paid £50 per year for the instruction received, which included this class as well as weekly sessions for the younger boys (ages 7-10) that were held at the Old Swinford school.³³ From time to time, the yearly printed reports of the Old Swinford Hospital School in the 1880s mentioned that ‘the usual drawing lessons, both at the School of Art and at the Hospital, have been given by Mr. Simms.’³⁴ In 1890, Herbert Edward Newnham, a schoolmaster at Old Swinford Hospital, became responsible for the drawing lessons for ‘the lower boys’ at the school.³⁵ In September 1893, the feoffees of the Old Swinford Hospital School decided to cease sending the older boys to the Stourbridge School for the Tuesday and Thursday

³² *Advertiser*, 15 October 1870 and 15 August 1874.

³³ Government grants were not available to support students from an endowed school such as Old Swinford Hospital, so this compensation provided needed revenue for Stourbridge School.

³⁴ *Account of the Old Swinford Hospital Charity, December 31, 1882* (Stourbridge: Mark & Moody, 1883), p. 24. Similar reports are in issues of this yearly report during the 1880s.

³⁵ *Account of the Old Swinford Hospital Charity, December 31, 1890* (Stourbridge: Mark & Moody, 1891), p. 32.

evening classes, and Edward Simms, the former art master at Stourbridge, was then engaged by Old Swinford Hospital to teach basic drawing 'four afternoons per week.'³⁶

Beginning in 1885, the General Evening Class at the Stourbridge School was open to women as well as men, and two new classes were scheduled. An 'Afternoon Class' for 'young Ladies and Gentlemen, attending Private Schools' convened on Wednesday from 3:15 to 5:15 p.m. (fee 7s 6d per quarter).³⁷ A 'Modelling' class met on Saturday afternoon (fee 2s 6d per quarter).³⁸ The Afternoon Class was 'not well attended' and was discontinued two years later.³⁹

In 1890, just prior to the start of classes on 1 September, this overall description of the Stourbridge School curriculum and classes appeared in a Public Notice: 'Instruction is given in Drawing, Shading, Painting, and Modelling of Ornament, Flowers and Still Life; the Human Figure from Copies, Casts and from Life; Practical Plane and Solid Geometry; Drawing from Solids; Architectural, Mechanical, and Perspective drawing; Designing and other Branches of Art.'⁴⁰ This statement reflects both the subject areas and the hierarchy within various levels of the twenty-three-stage curriculum that was developed by Richard Redgrave nearly four decades earlier. A student entering the school could expect to spend considerable time, perhaps even a few years, on aspects of drawing and shading in the

³⁶ *Account of the Old Swinford Hospital Charity, December 31, 1893* (Stourbridge: Mark & Moody, 1894), p. 31.

³⁷ *County Express*, 22 August 1885.

³⁸ *County Express*, 28 August 1886.

³⁹ *County Express*, 8 October 1887. A 'Life Class' began about this time, and the seven students who enrolled met with art master Simms on two evenings per week until February 1888, when the class was discontinued; see *County Express*, 20 October 1888.

⁴⁰ *County Express*, 23 August 1890. The 'Human Figure from Life' was restricted to studies of the head; see *County Express*, 14 January 1893.

evening classes before moving to painting or modelling. To be sure, ‘design’ was far afield for most students.

As noted earlier in this chapter, a ‘Penny Class’ began in September 1891. Initiated by art master Edward Simms, this class afforded students a drawing lesson for 1d, payable to the art master before the start of a session on Tuesday or Thursday evening. Students enrolled in any other scheduled class could also come to the Penny Class on one or both evenings. During 1893-1905, both the Ladies Morning Class and the General Evening Class were continued under art master George Cromack, and the Penny Class for drawing was also available.

In 1894, the Stourbridge School began to offer a morning class from 10 a.m. to noon on Mondays for boys and men only in an effort to attract those employed in the manufacturing of glass. The fee was 5s per quarter, and students who enrolled in this class could also attend any of the various evening classes for a small additional fee.⁴¹ Art master George Cromack first offered the new ‘Life Class’ (drawing the human figure from a live model) in 1895, with sessions from 7 to 9 p.m. on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.⁴²

With the exception of the Monday morning class, all of the class sessions offered at the Stourbridge School between 1882 and 1905 were reflections of the hierarchical structure of the twenty-three-stage curriculum originally developed by Richard Redgrave that had been in place since the early 1850s. Although some students were recognised locally or nationally for works relating to glass or iron that were done whilst Edward

⁴¹ Students could attend any evening classes for 3s per quarter; see *County Express*, 25 August 1894 (the Monday morning class was discontinued in 1897).

⁴² *County Express*, 7 September 1895. For class schedules (1896-1901), see *County Express*, 29 August 1896, 28 August 1897, 27 August 1898, 1 September 1900, and 24 August 1901.

Simms or George Cromack occupied the post of art master, most student awards were in areas related to drawing, outlining, modelling or painting rather than for design (see Appendix Four, 'Awards to Stourbridge School Students, 1852-1905').

Stourbridge School Students

As noted in Chapter One of this thesis, there is no comprehensive, unified record of those individuals who attended the Stourbridge School of Art, so Government records, newspaper reports, and the handwritten *Register of Students* that covers 1864 to 1874 offer the best evidence from which to develop an understanding of the many students who enrolled. In the previous chapter, those records and reports from 1851 to 1881 were examined, and the *Register of Students* was scrutinised to determine student enrolment in classes and, most importantly, to yield details about the ages and occupations of students along with the positions or employment of their parent (that is, father).

In order to describe the students who attended during the 1882-1905 period that is the focus of this chapter, the best available sources are the annual publications of the Department of Science and Art and the local newspaper accounts, especially the *County Express* and *Advertiser*. These primary sources report enrolment numbers from year to year, and the newspapers record the names of students who received awards. The Public Record Office (PRO) Census rolls from 1881, 1891 and 1901 and various directories are useful sources in determining the occupations of students and parents (that is, father).

In terms of enrolment levels, the Stourbridge School experienced moderate shifts and changes between 1882 and 1905, although it is sometimes difficult to ascertain consistent reporting in the available sources (see Appendix Five, 'Enrolment at the Stourbridge School, 1852-1905'). There were 99 students in the evening classes in 1882, and between

1883 and 1900, the numbers of students in the evening classes ranged from a low of 79 (reported for 1895) to a high of 118 (reported for 1898), and most other years had enrolment levels that averaged about 100. Totals for the combined enrolments of students in day and evening classes are as follows: the highest total was 189 (reported for 1887), whilst the lowest total was 132 (reported for 1900). The average enrolment in the day and evening classes combined was about 145. There were 10 students in the modelling class in 1883. Separate figures for the Life Class are not to be found, but enrolment was likely similar to that of the modelling class, as such instruction was intended for advanced students, probably at the invitation of art master George Cromack.

Although hundreds of students attended art classes at the Stourbridge School between 1882 and 1905, the only individuals whose names are a matter of record are the students who were mentioned in the local newspapers as having won local or national awards. Insofar as can be determined from these limited groups, the women students were typically not employed and came from families headed by clergymen, professionals or business owners.⁴³ Only a very few students were found to be employed: the 1901 PRO Census lists Laura E. Simpkins, 19, as ‘school teacher,’ Florence Yeomans, 28, as ‘art teacher

⁴³ Using the website *ukcensusonline.com*, student names and parent occupations were checked within the Public Record Office Census records for 1881, 1891 or 1901, as appropriate. These students were listed as local and national prize winners between 1882 and 1905 (father’s occupation as indicated in parentheses): Mary Kidson (cashier at gas company); Eliza Gething (architect); Kate Penley (clergyman); Helen Stuart (flint glass manufacturer); Ada Cartwright (glass, china and earthenware dealer); Kate Simms (art master); Elizabeth Richardson (flint glass manufacturer); Florence Yeomans (iron works manager); Lizzie Holland (shoe and boot manufacturer); Effie Penley (clergyman); Elsie Boden (journalist/author); Gertrude Grice (glass designer); Violet Wall (superintendent water/sewerage); Mildred Jones (clergyman); Grace Purkis (wholesale and retail clothier); Margaret D. Folkes (iron manufacturer); Flora Wooldridge (frost stud horseshoe manufacturer); Isabella Harrison (fire brick manufacturer); Esther G. Penn (ironmaster); Gwendoline B. Selway (officer, inland revenue); Alice Hicklin (solicitor’s clerk); Jessie Ford (printer/stationer); Kathleen Hatton (iron plate worker); Elsie Douglas (watchmaker); Winifred M. Goodyear (solicitor’s clerk); and Amy L. Greenfield (schoolmaster).

school/artist,' and Ada E. Sharp, 18, as 'pupil teacher.' Students from the classes for ladies claimed numerous prizes.⁴⁴

The boys and men who were students were usually employed and came from families in which the father was employed in some area of local industry. Some students during 1882-1905 had fathers who were employed in various businesses or trades (for example: pottery manager, brassfounder, tailor, cattle dealer, grocer, cabinet maker, forgerman, spade tool manufacturer, commercial clerk, or house painter), and the great majority of the students who were age 12 or older were employed. The individual nature of their work was quite varied (for example: auctioneer's clerk, spade finisher, assistant schoolmaster, engine fitter, agent in iron works, bath and sink maker, or surveyor's clerk), but it is important to note here that many of these students during 1882-1905 who had employment were working in the glass decorating trade in the Stourbridge district, as the PRO Census rolls from 1881, 1891 and 1901 identify numerous students with these occupations: glass cutter, glass engraver or glass etcher (see Appendix Four, 'Awards to Stourbridge School Students, 1852-1905,' where the names of students known to be employed in the glass industry are set in bold type). Additionally, students working in glass decorating often had

⁴⁴ Katherine Penley and her younger sisters Effie and Mary were the daughters of Church of England clergyman Lionel B. Penley, who was a member of the Stourbridge School Council. The Penley sisters won many local and national prizes, and Katherine Penley's prizes between 1884 and 1893 provide insights into the progressive levels within the twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum: outline drawing from flat (1884 and 1885); outline drawing from cast and outline of ornament from cast (1886); shading from model and shading from cast (1889); shading head from life (1892); and perspective (1893). Florence Yeomans also claimed multiple prizes that reflect the curriculum: shading from models (1890); outline drawing from cast and shading from models (1891); drawing the head from life and design coloured (1893); principles of ornament (1895); drawing from antique and decorative flower studies (1897). Florence Yeomans was awarded a free studentship in 1897, and she won a national book prize in that same year for her 'studies of flowers for design.' In 1900, she won five national prizes: design; life studies; head from life in oil; applied design; and modelled design. She claimed national prizes in 1901, 1903 and 1904 that included awards for drawing the antique from memory, advanced modelled applied design; and advanced applied design with specimen.

fathers whose occupations were in glass decorating. For example, here are five of the eight students who won local prizes in 1883: glass engraver Thomas A. Guest (father Thomas Guest, glass engraver); glass etcher Charles Northwood (father Joseph Northwood, glass ornamenteer); glass engraver Frederick Guest (father Harry Guest, glass engraver); glass engraver Ludwig Kny (father Frederick Kny, glass engraver); and apprentice glass cutter Alfred Nash (father Charles Nash, glass cutters foreman).

The students who were closely allied with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district after their time at the Stourbridge School are discussed in detail in the next chapter of this thesis, but it should be noted here that others embarked on successful careers in various endeavours after their time at the Stourbridge School. James M. Gething, a prize student in the late 1860s and early 1870s (when he was an assistant to his father Josiah, who was an architect and builder), became a successful architect, and he prepared plans for the renovations to the Stourbridge School building in the early 1880s. His brother, William Gething, was also a prizewinning student at the Stourbridge School, gaining a Queen's Prize in 1879 for 'design for iron gates' as he began a career in architecture and design. By 1901, William Gething resided in South Wimbledon, Surrey, with another brother, Thomas Gething, who was a stone merchant.

At age 24 in 1901, architect Edward R. Gammon was awarded a King's Prize for advanced architectural design. Frederick J. Robinson, who was employed as an architect's clerk, also won a national prize in 1901 for architectural drawing. Frank Porter, who was born in 1864, won numerous local and national prizes between 1879 and 1890, and many of his awards were for designs for carpet. In 1887, he won a Queen's Prize for a design for Brussels carpet. He gained free studentships for several years and passed all of the examinations needed for the 'Full Art Teacher's Certificate.' Frank Porter found

employment in the carpet industry, and his occupations were listed as ‘carpet dealer’ in the 1891 PRO Census and ‘designer for carpet’ in the 1901 PRO Census. Hugh B. Newland, whose father was a watchmaker, had several local prizes beginning in 1896, and he won a national bronze medal in 1898 for his ‘drawing of drapery on the antique.’ In 1899, he had another national award for ‘drawing antique from memory.’ Newland’s occupation is given as ‘artist, sculpt[or]’ in the 1901 PRO Census.

In the preceding chapter of this thesis, the volumes selected as book prizes by the Council committee of the Stourbridge School and the art master during the available years (1872-1873, 1877 and 1880) were discussed, and the subject matter of the chosen books ranged from art instruction and art history to biography, literature (including poetry) and natural history. Unfortunately, for the 1882-1905 period, specific records of book prizes are available for just one year (1893).⁴⁵

Relations with the Department of Science and Art and Political Bodies

During the years from 1882 to 1890, the Stourbridge School continued to be under the oversight of its own governing Council and was subject to the various policies, rules and regulations of the Department of Science and Art.⁴⁶ Although some supporters of the

⁴⁵ *County Express*, 13 January 1894 and *Advertiser*, 13 January 1894. The books selected for awards fall into similar categories as those discussed earlier: art instruction (Penley’s *Sketching from Nature*; *Artistic Anatomy*; *Anatomy of Pattern*; *Planning of Ornament*; Day’s *Some Principles of Everyday Art*; *Application of Ornament*; and Day’s *Nature in Ornament*), art history (Meyer’s *Handbook of Ornament*; *Modern Painters and Their Works*; and *Persian Art*), biography (*Treasury of Modern Biography* and *Worthies of the World*); literature (*Milton’s Poetical Works*; *Book of the Poets*; *Treasury of English Literature*; and *Longfellow*), and natural history (*Anecdotes of Animal Life*). The art master and a committee of Council members chose the books to be awarded to the students, so the emphasis upon fine art likely reflects their interests as well as their aspirations for students.

⁴⁶ See, for example, *Calendar and General Directory of the Science and Art Department for the Year 1885* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1885), pp. 20-24 and *Calendar*,

Stourbridge School were active in local political circles or held an elected or appointed office, the school itself was not particularly affected by the evolution of local government in the Stourbridge district between 1850 and 1890. However, in the late 1880s and early 1890s, national legislation regarding technical education and funding brought the Council of the Stourbridge School into contact with such political bodies as the Stourbridge School Board, the Stourbridge and District Technical Board, and the Stourbridge Urban District Council as well as various committees of the Worcestershire County Council.

In terms of its interaction with the local political bodies associated with technical education, the Stourbridge School fared quite well. As noted later in this chapter, the Stourbridge School Council was responsible for devising a 'scheme of amalgamation' to garner funds for technical education, and the Council secured approval for this scheme from the Department of Science and Art in the early 1890s. The ensuing amalgamation merged the Council of the Stourbridge School of Science and Art with the Stourbridge and District Technical Board to form a combined board to oversee the school.⁴⁷

As noted earlier in this chapter, the Stourbridge School received a Government grant of £410 1s from the Department of Science and Art in 1884. This grant was used to fund renovations to the aged school building in Theatre Road. The application process was begun in 1883, and it involved much correspondence between the officers of the Stourbridge School Council and the Department of Science and Art.⁴⁸ In order for the application to be successful, the Stourbridge School was required to submit detailed

History and General Summary of Regulations of the Department of Science and Art 1900 (London: HMSO, 1900), pp. xx-xxix.

⁴⁷ Support for this scheme was voiced in an editorial by the *County Express*, 6 June 1891.

⁴⁸ This correspondence is preserved in file ED 29/176 (National Archives at Kew).

architectural plans and other specifications relating to the intended renovations along with numerous documents relating to the financial condition of the school. The success of this application suggests that the Council was able to establish and maintain good relations with the Department of Science and Art.

Under the auspices of the Department of Science and Art, the Stourbridge School continued to fare well under the ‘payment on results’ scheme during much of the 1880s until the Department imposed a limitation regarding examinations. In early 1888, art master Edward Simms was praised for his teaching that produced increases in income for the Stourbridge School in both student fees and various Government grants.⁴⁹ These grants were contingent upon student attendance numbers, the total production of works by students, and passing marks in yearly examinations. Later in 1888, however, the Department of Science and Art imposed limits on the numbers of successful third grade level papers that a student of art (three papers) or science (two papers) could attain in the yearly Government examinations. Previously, there were no such limits, and each passing mark brought Government grant monies to the school. Stourbridge School Council members anticipated some reduction in revenue as a result of this change in policy, and there was cause for concern. Frustration was evident at the January 1889 annual meeting in Stourbridge, as George W. Grosvenor, Deputy Lieutenant of Worcestershire, spoke derisively of the ‘awe-inspiring and somewhat domineering authority’ of the Department of Science and Art, calling the new limits on third grade achievements ‘most irritating and vexatious.’⁵⁰ Grosvenor felt that such changes in the rules by the Department of Science and Art made it difficult to compare the yearly records of student achievements. He

⁴⁹ *County Express*, 14 January 1888.

⁵⁰ *Advertiser*, 12 January 1889 and *County Express*, 12 January 1889.

suggested that the new limits might have an unintended consequence, namely, ‘a temptation to masters to rush their students from stage to stage ... rather than to encourage quiet, steady work, especially in the elementary stages.’ The full impact of this policy change is difficult to ascertain, but it may be significant that there was no further mention of these limits in newspaper reports of subsequent annual meetings of the Stourbridge School and that Stourbridge students continued to do well in the Government examinations.

Because of the legislation regarding technical education in 1889-1890, members of the governing Council of the Stourbridge School were in frequent contact with the officers and members of various committees of the Worcestershire County Council. As noted in the next section of this chapter, representatives from the Worcestershire County Council or the Stourbridge and District Technical Board were often present at public events of the Stourbridge School, and some of these gentlemen were featured speakers or otherwise participated in an annual meeting and prize-giving at the Stourbridge School. In 1895, the cooperation among these bodies led to a major exhibition of student works from the Worcestershire art and technical schools that is discussed in the next section of this chapter. The interactions of the members of the Stourbridge School Council with the representatives of the Worcestershire County Council reflect a change in the Stourbridge Council, which heretofore had been content to manage its affairs within the Stourbridge district and did not seek to establish relationships with political bodies in Stourbridge or elsewhere.

Maintaining Public Support: Meetings and Art Exhibitions

As noted in the previous chapter, the annual meetings and art exhibitions served an important purpose, namely, the establishment and maintenance of a positive public profile for the Stourbridge School in order to foster enthusiasm from benefactors and others. As

detailed below, statements made by Council members or invited speakers at various annual meetings are reflective of various national political, economic, social and cultural forces that were manifest during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, ranging from concern about the quality of design and foreign competition in manufactured goods to a desire to elevate public taste and the growing need for education in science. Moreover, the annual meetings afforded an occasion for Council members and other supporters representing various social strata to come together as a group to review the school's progress.⁵¹ In the 1890s, the Stourbridge School Council often welcomed officials from the Worcestershire County Council or others associated with Governmental bodies responsible for the development of technical education.

During the annual meeting in 1882, Council member J. B. Shepherd spoke in general terms about 'intellect and imagination' as he suggested that these 'might be applied to drawing and painting just the same as they were to literature.' Rev. David Maginnis expressed disappointment that few persons were 'interested in schools of this class as a means of utilitarian advantage,' yet another indication of the Council's ongoing concern to increase student enrolment from local industries. In 1883, Sir Rupert Kettle presided at the annual meeting, and his address reflected some of the economic and social forces that were manifest in the founding and development of Government schools of art more than three decades earlier and remained relevant decades later. Sir Rupert expressed concern about

⁵¹ In 1882, the Council of the Stourbridge School of Art consisted of 23 gentlemen, 21 of whom had been re-elected to their positions: president, Lord Ward (Earl of Dudley); vice-presidents: the Earl of Stamford and Warrington, H. J. W. H. Foley, Lord Lyttelton and William Orme Foster; treasurer, Thomas Davies Thomas; hon. secretary, George Perry. Others were: Rev. David Maginnis, Rev. C. S. Wordsworth, Rev. John S. Boldero, John B. Shepherd, R. J. Collis, Gainsborough Harward, Thomas Wall, William H. King, Robert Broomhall, William Blow Collis, Henry Billingham, Dr. Alfred Freer, Thomas Bland, and Frank Evers. In October 1881, the Council had added two members, Alfred W. Worthington and H. Watson Smith; see *County Express*, 29 October 1881.

economic pressures from foreign manufactured goods, particularly regarding ‘stern competition’ in ‘articles of taste.’⁵² He noted that ‘tides or waves of taste’ change from time to time, and he thought that it was incumbent upon schools of art to offer the ‘requisite training’ for those engaged in manufacturing and to encourage a general improvement in public taste. Sir Rupert also urged that special prizes be awarded to students of the Stourbridge School for ‘original designs suitable for glass manufacture,’ a remark that harkens back to one of the initial motives for founding the school in 1851.⁵³

The annual meeting in January 1885 was an especially auspicious occasion, indeed, and the *County Express* reported that ‘the building was filled to overflowing by a fashionable audience’ and mentioned ‘very limited seating space.’⁵⁴ This was the first annual meeting to be held in the newly renovated Stourbridge School quarters, and it was accompanied by an ambitious art exhibition. The short-lived art exhibitions in previous years had typically consisted of works by the Stourbridge School students, but the exhibition in 1885 featured numerous items loaned by the South Kensington Museum as well as many articles of ‘glass ... the staple product of the immediate neighbourhood.’ A Public Notice in the *Advertiser* newspaper described the event as follows: ‘A LOAN EXHIBITION, including Specimens of Glass, Pottery, Carpets, &c., from the South Kensington Museum as well as articles contributed by the Glass Manufacturers of the

⁵² *County Express*, 13 January 1883; *Advertiser*, 13 January 1883; *Architect*, 13 January 1883; *British Architect*, 11 January 1883; and *Building News and Engineering Journal*, 44 (19 January 1883), p. 64.

⁵³ As reported in the *County Express*, 25 October 1884, the Midland Flint Glass Manufacturers’ Association offered £10 in prizes to ‘pupils at the school from local glassworks.’ The prizes continued until the association dissolved; see *County Express*, 4 October 1902.

⁵⁴ *County Express*, 24 January 1885.

District, will be on view the same Evening and continue for a Fortnight.’⁵⁵ In its reporting, the *County Express* said that the exhibition ‘is one of the most interesting and important that has been got together in Stourbridge’ and described the ‘glass ... liberally contributed by local firms,’ including Thomas Webb and Sons (‘magnificent specimens of every kind of English glass’); Stevens & Williams (‘brilliant ruby and opalescent colouring ... a beauty of design’); and ‘lovely specimens of cameo glass ... amongst them being an exceedingly successful imitation of the celebrated Portland vase’ executed by John Northwood I and loaned by retired glass manufacturer Philip Pargeter, who was a supporter of the Stourbridge School.⁵⁶ Former Stourbridge School student Josiah Fairfax Muckley, who had won prizes in the 1850s, loaned examples from his glass decorating firm, including ‘a large loving cup, having figures and flowers engraved upon it.’ The *Birmingham Daily Post* reported that ‘some 5,000 or 6,000 persons’ attended this exhibition and that the foreign glassware on display from the South Kensington Museum garnered much attention, especially from local glassmakers who studied items to determine the techniques used to produce them. This exhibition closed on 16 February 1885 with a celebratory soiree and musical entertainment.⁵⁷ Sir Philip Cunliffe Owen, director of the

⁵⁵ *Advertiser*, 10 January 1885.

⁵⁶ *County Express*, 24 January 1885; for other reporting on this exhibition, see *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 February 1885 and *Caledonian Mercury*, 7 February 1885. On the relationship of Philip Pargeter and John Northwood I, see *The Reliquary*, 17 (April 1877), pp. 241-243; *The Reliquary*, 18 (July 1877), pp. 57-58; and *The Reliquary*, 19 (April 1879), plate XXIV and p. 243. In November 1881, ‘Mr. Northwood’ was awarded a silver medal by the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufacture and Commerce ‘for glass cutting and engraving’ that was shown at a ‘recent Exhibition of Art Furniture held at the Royal Albert Hall’ in London; see *Journal of the Society of Arts*, 30 (18 November 1881), pp. 24-25 [this medal is on display at Oglebay Institute’s Carriage House Glass Museum in Wheeling, West Virginia, USA].

⁵⁷ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 18 February 1885.

South Kensington Museum, spoke to the annual meeting in 1885, recalling the Stourbridge glass on hand at the Paris Exposition of 1878. Sir Philip was particularly interested in the state of glass manufacturing near Stourbridge, and he acknowledged the competitive nature of design as well as the importance of Government involvement in art education that would aid manufacturing.⁵⁸

Glass manufacturer Major Walker of the Heath Glassworks near Stourbridge spoke at the annual meeting in 1886, stating that training in art was becoming increasingly important to many different occupations and suggesting that art education improved manufacturing and, thus, elevated public taste in a more general way.⁵⁹ In 1887, guest speaker Andrew MacCallum, who was art master at Stourbridge in 1852-1854, said that ‘the study and practice of art and the cultivation of true taste are a great and increasing factor in the progress of a great nation.’⁶⁰ MacCallum noted the economic pressure of foreign goods as well as the availability of art education in European countries, and he urged the students to apply themselves to their studies and to look to the roles they might play in the future.⁶¹

Annual meetings in the late 1880s and the early 1890s often featured remarks or resolutions regarding art and technical education, an understandable circumstance in view of national legislation that generated great interest within county and local political

⁵⁸ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 21 January 1885; *Advertiser*, 25 January 1885; and *County Express*, 25 January 1885.

⁵⁹ *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886 and *County Express*, 16 January 1886. Lord Ward (Earl of Dudley) had passed away on 7 May 1885, and there were many remarks in his memory at the annual meeting in January 1886.

⁶⁰ *County Express*, 15 January 1887.

⁶¹ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1887.

bodies.⁶² In 1888, carpet manufacturer John Brinton of Kidderminster presided at the annual meeting of the Stourbridge School, and he expressed the opinion that technical education ‘was far behind in this vast industrial hive of ours’ and that ‘it was our duty to see that our national manufacturing supremacy should be stimulated.’ In response to Brinton’s address, the *County Express* said that ‘the cry for better technical education gets louder every day’ and suggested that Government should create a ‘well-matured scheme for supplying this missing link in our system of national education.’⁶³ At the annual meeting a year later, George W. Grosvenor, Deputy Lieutenant of Worcestershire, recalled the influence of the Great Exhibition of 1851 in ‘the awakening of our nation’ to the need for art education, and he wondered aloud whether ‘we have been neglecting the cultivation of science as applicable to manufacture.’⁶⁴

Viscount and Viscountess Cobham attended the annual meeting in 1890, and Viscount Cobham delivered a lengthy address on the history of art that focused on the need for appreciation of the best works in fine art by the great masters, such as Michelangelo.⁶⁵ Viscount Cobham felt that the nation was just now ‘emerging from a very dark and melancholy period of depression and decline in art and taste,’ and he suggested that ‘the commercial spirit of the present day’ hindered appreciation of fine art. He concluded that students should be surrounded with ‘the best works of the best masters and study them in

⁶² As early as 16 July 1887, a *County Express* editorial column, ‘The Looker-On,’ advocated that technical education be associated with the Stourbridge School of Art, suggesting that such education could benefit the glass decorating enterprises in the Stourbridge district.

⁶³ *County Express*, 14 January 1888.

⁶⁴ *County Express*, 12 January 1889 and *Advertiser*, 12 January 1889.

⁶⁵ *Advertiser*, 11 January 1890 and *County Express*, 11 January 1890; both newspapers employed the phrase ‘Stourbridge School of Science and Art’ in article headlines, a change from previous reports in which just ‘Stourbridge School of Art’ was used.

the deepest manner but at the same time with an independent spirit.’ Later in this meeting, those assembled approved a resolution asking the Stourbridge School Council to ‘consider the best means of promoting technical education,’ and a supporter called for the Stourbridge Board of Improvement Commissioners ‘to levy a halfpenny rate or a penny rate for the benefit of the school.’

The subject of technical education was again paramount in 1891, as Edward M. Taylor, headmaster of the Birmingham Municipal School of Art, welcomed the recent progress that had been made towards providing specialised education as reflected in the passage of the Technical Education Act and in the increasing willingness of county councils to appropriate funds for such education. Taylor recalled the positive impact of the 1851 Great Exhibition upon the movement for art education to benefit manufacturing, and he also lauded public support of free libraries as a sign of favourable political and public sentiment toward education generally. He spoke of the manufacturer, the workman and the educationist, concluding that ‘they must try and take a little of the views of each, and then they would get the right thing.’⁶⁶

Near the close of the 1891 annual meeting, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams proposed a resolution in support of the Stourbridge School’s recent application for funding technical education to the Worcestershire County Council, and this resolution was met with immediate ‘applause’ from those assembled. About two months thereafter, a public meeting was held in Stourbridge to consider a ‘united application’ on the part of interests representing Stourbridge, Lye and Upper Swinford. After much discussion, those assembled resolved to apply to the Worcestershire County Council for £650 to support technical education by securing a science teacher, a ‘labour master’ to provide instruction

⁶⁶ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 8 January 1891 and *Advertiser*, 10 January 1891.

in manual trades such as woodworking, and a ‘trained cookery instructor’ as well as the requisite equipment, appliances and supplies needed for education in these areas.⁶⁷

George Green, who had recently been chosen as president of the newly formed Stourbridge and District Technical Education Board, was a guest at the Stourbridge School’s 1892 annual meeting, which was accompanied by an art exhibition of student works. During his address, Green mentioned the classes in chemistry and mathematics that were currently meeting at the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institute and at a location in Lye.⁶⁸ A Public Notice in the *County Express* a few months earlier listed the following classes: elementary chemistry, theoretical mechanics, applied mechanics, mathematics (first stage), magnetism and electricity, geometry, machine construction and drawing, building construction, cottage cookery and household cookery.⁶⁹ A *County Express* editorial described the class offerings in Stourbridge and Lye as ‘not ... very ambitious,’ but conceded that ‘it includes subjects the study of which will be of the greatest service to a large number of persons in this neighbourhood.’⁷⁰

George W. Grosvenor, who had addressed the Stourbridge School’s annual meeting in 1889, returned to Stourbridge as guest speaker at the annual meeting in 1894. Grosvenor

⁶⁷ *County Express*, 28 March 1891; some months thereafter, the first Public Notice headed ‘Stourbridge School of Science and Art’ appeared in the *County Express*, 29 August 1891. The forthcoming grant from the Worcestershire County Council was for £500, but £460 went to science instruction, and only £40 to art; see *County Express*, 9 January 1892.

⁶⁸ *Advertiser*, 9 January 1892. A class in machine construction and drawing was begun in mid-1891, and classes in woodworking were soon in session at Stourbridge; see *County Express*, 10 October 1891, and a retrospective article in the *Advertiser*, 21 January 1893.

⁶⁹ *County Express*, 12 September 1891. Fewer classes were offered in subsequent years; see *County Express*, 10 September 1892, 25 August 1894, 7 and 28 August 1897, but enrolments were increasingly larger in the classes that were offered. Shorthand proved to be popular, and French was offered in 1901; see *County Express*, 24 August 1901.

⁷⁰ *County Express*, 10 September 1892.

was the chairman of the Technical Committee of the Worcestershire County Council, and he began his address with words of support for a new building to accommodate the art and technical classes of the Stourbridge School. Grosvenor expressed concern regarding foreign competition in manufactured goods and the current depression in trade, but he held the view that technical education would alleviate these conditions over time.⁷¹ Near the close of this meeting, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams voiced his support for technical education once again.

George Green, president of the Stourbridge and District Technical Education Board, took the chair once again at the annual meeting in 1895, and Viscount Cobham was also on hand to offer remarks and to distribute the prizes. Viscount Cobham voiced his pleasure at the potential for monetary support of the Stourbridge School by the Worcestershire County Council, and he spoke at length regarding the general value of technical education.⁷² Over the next few months, Viscount Cobham and others from the Stourbridge area worked with George Green and James Mason, who was ‘organising secretary for technical education’ in Worcestershire, to bring a special exhibition to Stourbridge under the auspices of the Worcestershire County Council.⁷³ Held during 17-21 June 1895, this exhibition at the Town Hall in Stourbridge featured the works of students from all of the art and technical schools in Worcestershire: Bromsgrove, Droitwich, Hagley, Halesowen, Kidderminster, King’s Norton, Lye, Malvern, Oldbury, Pershore, Stourbridge, and Redditch. The *County Express*

⁷¹ *County Express*, 13 January 1894.

⁷² *Country Express*, 26 January 1895.

⁷³ *County Express*, 15 June and 22 June 1895. Stourbridge and Lye classes did not participate in the previous exhibitions at Redditch in 1893 and Kidderminster in 1894, both of which were organised by the Technical Instruction Committee of the Worcestershire County Council.

began its lengthy review of this event by noting that ‘the Stourbridge and Lye classes are well represented, both being strong in models of a technical character, illustrating the principles of construction.’⁷⁴ In his remarks at the opening of the exhibition, George W. Grosvenor regretted that the Stourbridge School building was neither large enough nor suitable to accommodate the displays, but he was optimistic that a new building would be in the future for Stourbridge. In his speech, Viscount Cobham called for united action by adjoining counties regarding technical education, and he asserted that ‘manufacturers’ and ‘residents generally and the working classes’ would benefit from such instruction if it were supported by the manufacturers. In an editorial statement, the *County Express* said that ‘the dry bones are beginning to move’ and hoped that the future would ‘see a great and important advance in the work of the technical classes established in the country.’⁷⁵

The annual meeting in 1896 was held during the evening of Monday 27 January, and an exhibition of student works was available for public view throughout the week. The *County Express* said that the student works were of ‘considerable merit’ and that ‘there is an all-around excellence.’⁷⁶ However, in its review of the many works displayed, the newspaper observed that ‘there is an absence of original works and designs which could be utilised in local manufactures.’ This statement reflects the longstanding disconnect between the mission of the Stourbridge School and local manufacturing interests. The school was founded some 45 years earlier with the expectation that benefits would accrue to the iron and glass industries in the Stourbridge district, and Council members and others often

⁷⁴ *County Express*, 22 June 1895.

⁷⁵ *County Express*, 22 June 1895.

⁷⁶ *County Express*, 1 February 1896.

remarked that such should be the case. However, one is hard pressed to discern the impact of instruction in art upon the design and manufacturing capabilities of local industries.

On 10 January 1898, former Stourbridge School student Francis (Frank) Job Short, who was enrolled in the General Evening Class at the Stourbridge School during 1871-1872, presided over the annual meeting and prize-giving. A close friend of Council member H. Watson Smith, Short was a well-known artist in 1898, and his talent and works were highly regarded. He was head of the engraving school at South Kensington, and he had been elected to the Royal Society of Painters, Etchers and Engravers in 1885.⁷⁷ Short's presence at Stourbridge was announced in advance with a large Public Notice.⁷⁸ After the meeting, lengthy accounts appeared in both local newspapers.⁷⁹ In his address, Short expressed pleasure at seeing familiar surnames among the present students who were prize-winners, and he talked of 'bringing the artist and the craftsman together,' suggesting that the current interest in technical education was to be praised for this effort. In its editorial comment, the *County Express* commended Short's address to its readers, hoping that it would both 'move the students to increased efforts' and 'have some effect on the manufacturers and employers of labour in the district.'⁸⁰

The local newspaper reports of the annual meetings and prize-givings of the Stourbridge School in the latter 1890s and the first few years of the twentieth century are

⁷⁷ 'Short, Francis Job,' *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed. (New York: Encyclopedia Britannica Co., 1911), vol. 24, p. 1007. See also Judy Crosby Ivy, 'Short, Sir Francis Job (1857-1945),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn., Oct 2007 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36074>, accessed 14 July 2013].

⁷⁸ *County Express*, 25 December 1897 and *Advertiser*, 8 January 1898.

⁷⁹ *Advertiser*, 15 January 1898 and *County Express*, 15 January 1898.

⁸⁰ *County Express*, 15 January 1898.

clear indications that technical education had taken firm hold. Whilst student enrolment in the Stourbridge School's traditional art education classes employing the twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum was steady enough, it was becoming overshadowed by the increasing numbers of students in the science and technical classes. The listings of students who gained prizes or other distinctions occupied many column inches in the newspapers.⁸¹

At the annual meeting and prize-giving in 1901, Joseph Silvers-Williams, executive manager of the Stevens & Williams glass manufacturing firm in Brierley Hill, gave the main address. In attendance at most annual meetings in the 1880s and 1890s, Silvers-Williams was a member of the Council of the Stourbridge School as far back as the fall of 1882, and he was actively involved in the movements to establish art schools at Brierley Hill and Wordsley. At Stourbridge in 1901, he expressed concern that the student work of the time was not connected with the industries of the Stourbridge district. Nonetheless, Silvers-Williams was enthusiastic regarding the recently revived Victoria Institute project, and he was confident that the authorities would be careful in planning and funding this ambitious undertaking that had been a subject of discussion since the mid-1880s.⁸²

During the annual meeting in 1902, Council member George H. Timmis, a mining engineer and firebrick manufacturer, expressed his view that the Stourbridge School did not yet have adequate facilities for proper instruction in science, but he looked forward to the erection of the new building, although the question of rates remained both difficult and controversial.⁸³ When George W. Grosvenor, who was chairman of the Technical Instruction Committee of the Worcestershire County Council, addressed the annual meeting

⁸¹ See, for example, *Advertiser*, 11 January 1902.

⁸² *County Express*, 19 January 1901.

⁸³ *County Express*, 11 January 1902.

in 1903, the new building project was assured, so he took the opportunity to speak in general terms of the elevation of public taste that he thought had been attained over the past few decades by the schools of art and their influence on manufactured goods of all sorts, from furniture to personal clothing.⁸⁴ The annual meeting and prize-giving in 1904 featured a speech by Council member H. Watson Smith, former student and longtime benefactor of the Stourbridge School. An avid art collector, Smith praised the student works that were displayed, but the major sections of his address dealt with his high regard for the traditional value and utility of drawing, ranging from the careful copying of objects to freehand drawing which imbued one with a 'sense of all that is useful for crafts as well as a sense of feeling for beauty.'⁸⁵

The final annual meeting and prize-giving taking place in the Stourbridge School building in Theatre Road was held on the evening of Monday 9 January 1905. William Wickham King, son of longtime school benefactor William King, presented the prizes and gave an address. His remarks focused generally on the advantages of 'moral, physical and intellectual education,' and he called upon parents and all others to support the technical education classes offered by the Stourbridge Higher Education Committee.⁸⁶

The annual meetings and accompanying art exhibitions described above were the primary means through which the Stourbridge School maintained its visibility in the public eye beyond its benefactors and other supporters, for the meetings and exhibitions were frequently reported in the local weekly newspapers. Moreover, statements made by Council members or invited speakers (including past art masters or former students) at annual

⁸⁴ *County Express*, 10 January 1903.

⁸⁵ *County Express*, 9 January 1904.

⁸⁶ *County Express*, 14 January 1905.

meetings reflected various political, economic, social or cultural forces that were at work during the nineteenth century, such as concern about the aesthetics of design and foreign competition in manufactured goods or a general desire to elevate public taste. As interest in science and technical education came to the fore in the late 1880s and early 1890s, elected representatives from the Worcestershire County Council or officials from other official bodies responsible for the development of technical education were often present at annual meetings of the Stourbridge School.

Proposals for a Museum become a Scholarship

From time to time during the latter half of the nineteenth century, some supporters expressed the desire to found a museum to benefit the Stourbridge School and the town at large, but such a proposal did not receive serious consideration until the 1880s. However, this interest spanning decades reflects an important nineteenth-century trend, characterised by benefactors who sought support from local political bodies and from Government in their quests to establish museums that would emphasise art and culture.⁸⁷

The initial idea for a museum in Stourbridge came in response to an enquiry posed by the Department of Practical Art to the provincial schools in 1852. The following query was part of the Department's series of questions directed to the provincial schools: 'Is any Museum, containing objects of art for study, attached to the school? And if not, is it desirable there should be one?' The answer from the Stourbridge School Council was this: 'No. The school is only just opened, but a museum is very desirable.'⁸⁸ Many other

⁸⁷ Kate Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums, 1850-1914* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2005).

⁸⁸ *First Report DPA*, p. 108.

provincial schools, including Belfast, Cork, Coventry, Manchester, Norwich, Paisley, Sheffield and York, also thought a museum ‘desirable,’ and The Potteries school was particularly enthusiastic that ‘a museum of pottery should be placed within the reach of students.’⁸⁹ However, only a few provincial schools had taken any steps to form a museum, and The Potteries mentioned ‘want of adequate funds,’ a situation that likely confronted many other such institutions. Nonetheless, the expressed desires for a museum at Stourbridge and elsewhere are indicative of the national trend noted earlier. At the annual meeting of the Stourbridge School in November 1853, a resolution in favor of a museum was proposed and carried, and those who supported it made reference to the success of the Great Exhibition and a need for ‘the labouring classes of England’ to be encouraged to develop ‘a taste for art.’⁹⁰

Although further favourable comments were made from time to time in the 1860s and 1870s regarding a museum, no real progress was achieved until the mid-1880s. The stimulus came at the annual meeting in January 1885 from Sir Philip Cunliffe Owen, who succeeded Henry Cole as head of the South Kensington Museum in 1873. After expressing pleasure in coming to Stourbridge, the epicentre of glass manufacture in Britain, Sir Philip said that he ‘had an earnest of what Stourbridge was going to do for the future—it would have a museum of its own’ with an emphasis upon local manufactures, especially glass.⁹¹

Soon after the January 1885 annual meeting, longtime Stourbridge School supporter Charles Evers-Swindell contributed £50 toward the establishment of a permanent museum. Two other benefactors—business owner Edwin Stringer and glass decorator Josiah Fairfax

⁸⁹ *First Report DPA*, p. 108.

⁹⁰ *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 26 November 1853.

⁹¹ *Advertiser*, 24 January 1885.

Muckley, a former Stourbridge School student—donated ‘suitable articles,’ and a bank account was opened to receive monetary contributions.⁹² The *County Express* favoured the idea for a museum, suggesting that such a facility would enhance the civic culture of Stourbridge by ‘quicken[ing] the art and intellectual life of the town.’⁹³

During the fall of 1887, the matter of a museum remained ‘under consideration’ but the project soon stalled, and the Council began to discuss other ways to use the financial contributions to benefit the Stourbridge School and its students.⁹⁴ A year later, in October 1888, the museum effort had not moved ahead, and the Council thought ‘the way of carrying out the plan on a proper scale seem almost insuperable,’ perhaps because some desired a separate building that would need to be constructed. Soon thereafter, the idea of using the donated funds for an endowed scholarship was put forward.⁹⁵

Charles Evers-Swindell accepted the notion of creating a scholarship fund instead of a museum, and ‘two scholarships for pupils of elementary schools’ were put in place beginning in 1891.⁹⁶ During the 1890s, yearly Public Notices in local newspapers invited applications for the Swindell scholarships, and this example is typical: ‘A FREE SCHOLARSHIP (founded by C. E. Swindell, Esq.) is offered for COMPETITION to Pupils (Male and Female) in Public Elementary Schools in the Parish of Pedmore and the Ancient

⁹² *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886.

⁹³ *County Express*, 8 October 1887.

⁹⁴ *County Express*, 8 October 1887.

⁹⁵ *County Express*, 20 October 1888. In 1890, art master Edward Simms expressed the thought that a museum would enhance the civic culture of Stourbridge, and he suggested that the Council ought to seek the assistance of the ‘Town Commissioners [as] they might establish good hopes of securing so desirable an addition to the town.’ See *Advertiser*, 11 January 1890.

⁹⁶ *Advertiser*, 10 January 1891.

Parish of Oldswinford.’⁹⁷ Candidates were required to have passed the Government examination in elementary art prior to making their application. Second year student William Lavender and first year student Albert E. Sharp were recipients of the Swindell scholarships in 1891,⁹⁸ and these awards continued to be available yearly throughout the 1890s and into the early twentieth century. Perhaps stimulated by the Swindell scholarships, the Stourbridge School of Science and Art and Technical Education Board used its funds to create ‘Stourbridge and District Higher Education Scholarships’ for students ages 12-15 who were enrolled in art classes. By 1905, as many as ten students were recognized annually with scholarship awards.⁹⁹

The desire for a museum in Stourbridge was in keeping with the national enthusiasm favouring such institutions in the latter half of the nineteenth century, when numerous cities and towns founded museums of various kinds. Although the Stourbridge School Council sought to establish a museum devoted to local industries such as glass, lack of funds and limited interest on the part of the glass industry precluded progress on such a project.

Branches at Brierley Hill and Wordsley

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, schools of art were begun in Brierley Hill, Bromsgrove, Dudley, Kidderminster, Worcester, and Wordsley. These areas are near Stourbridge, and the relationships between the Stourbridge School and the efforts at

⁹⁷ *County Express*, 2 July 1898.

⁹⁸ *County Express*, 10 October 1891. William H. Richards and Herbert Timmins were selected for 1892; see *County Express*, 29 October 1892. In 1893, Richards and Albert Sharp were selected; see *County Express*, 28 October 1893. Frank Robinson and Charles Sewell were selected in 1895; see *Advertiser*, 26 January 1895.

⁹⁹ *County Express*, 19 August 1905.

Brierley Hill and Wordsley are particularly significant for the present study. Like the Stourbridge School, all of these institutions were supported by benefactors who expressed their interests in improving the design of locally manufactured goods (such as ceramics in Worcester, carpet in Kidderminster, and glass in Brierley Hill and Wordsley) as well as elevating public taste in a general sense. There was no connection between the administrative or instructional efforts at the Stourbridge School with institutions in Dudley, Kidderminster or Worcester, but William P. Bowen was responsible for drawing and art instruction at Bromsgrove in the late 1860s whilst also serving as art master at Stourbridge. Most importantly, the Stourbridge School was in close association with the development of art instruction in both Brierley Hill and Wordsley during the 1880s.¹⁰⁰

Efforts had been undertaken to establish art education at Brierley Hill in the 1870s. Art and science classes were held in the Albion House School as early as 1871.¹⁰¹ Sessions in drawing and in science were held at the Moor Street School in 1877, and, by 1880, some 24 students were enrolled. In 1882, about 50 students, including two young men employed as glass cutters, were enrolled in the art classes, and the school held a prize-giving on 30 September 1882.¹⁰² In September 1883, Stourbridge School art master Edward Simms and some representatives from the Stourbridge School Council met at the Bent Street School in Brierley Hill with several individuals who were interested in forming drawing and art classes in conjunction with the Stourbridge School. Two important members of the Stevens & Williams glass enterprise were present: executive manager Joseph Silvers-Williams, who

¹⁰⁰ When a new building for the Stourbridge School was being erected in 1904, prominent Stourbridge businessman Isaac Nash called the Stourbridge School the ‘parent’ of the institutions at Brierley Hill and Wordsley; see *County Express*, 27 February 1904.

¹⁰¹ *County Express*, 6 May 1871.

¹⁰² *County Express*, 7 October 1882.

was also a member of the Stourbridge School Council, and glass works manager and art director John Northwood I, who had been a prize-winning student and pupil teacher at the Stourbridge School in the 1850s.¹⁰³

The accounts of the meeting held on 25 September 1883 suggest that prior sessions had taken place and that the real purpose for the gathering was a public announcement that drawing and art classes would begin at Brierley Hill ‘in connection with the Stourbridge School of Art.’¹⁰⁴ Sometime earlier, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams had secured an agreement with the Brierley Hill School Board for the use of rooms in the Bent Street School, and he mentioned that ‘the distance that students from Brierley Hill had to go to attend art classes to Dudley or Stourbridge had proved a hindrance’ in the past, concluding that ‘a school of art for Brierley Hill was just the thing required.’ Silvers-Williams and others, including John Northwood I, spoke in favour of the value of art education for those employed in various occupations, especially within the various branches of the decorative glass industry of the Stourbridge district. Northwood’s remarks reflected the economic motive often heard in the nineteenth century:

Mr. J. Northwood wished success to the classes, and promised to do all he could to encourage them. He was quite certain that unless they, in this district, get a better art education local industries would suffer a great deal. Foreigners were ahead of us in the way of artistic skill for decoration, and the only way he could see of remedying this state of things was by giving people a better art education. Classes like those now formed were a means to that end. The classes, therefore, had his hearty sympathy and support.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ Along with his brother Joseph Northwood, also a prize-winning student at Stourbridge, John Northwood I founded the glass decorating firm of J. & J. Northwood at Wordsley about 1860. The Northwood enterprise decorated glassware manufactured by Stevens & Williams, among others, and John Northwood I became works manager and art director at Stevens & Williams in April 1882.

¹⁰⁴ ‘Formation of Art Classes,’ *Advertiser*, 29 September 1883; see also ‘A School of Art for Brierley Hill,’ *County Express*, 29 September 1883.

¹⁰⁵ *Advertiser*, 29 September 1883.

In the *Annual Report* of the Stourbridge School issued in October 1883, the Council characterised the classes at Brierley Hill an ‘experiment’ and acknowledged ‘the great assistance ... received in the formation of these classes from the exertions of Mr. J. S. Williams.’¹⁰⁶ Due to the efforts of Stourbridge art master Edward Simms, the art instruction at Brierley Hill was well received and soon prospered, with some 74 students reportedly attending the night classes in October 1884.¹⁰⁷

In January 1885, the annual meeting and prize-giving held at the Stourbridge School of Art included recognition and awards for students from the Brierley Hill classes, and student John Northwood II, age 14, was among them.¹⁰⁸ The close relationship of the schools at Stourbridge and Brierley Hill continued, and similar occasions were hosted by the Stourbridge School in 1886, 1887, 1888 and 1889. Public Notices in the *Advertiser* or *County Express* newspapers announcing these meetings and prize-givings were headed ‘Stourbridge and Brierley Hill Schools of Art’ in large type.¹⁰⁹

From 1890 onward, however, there is no mention of the art classes or the students at Brierley Hill in conjunction with the Stourbridge School. In early 1890, the *County Express* noted that ‘the branch school at Brierley Hill is now closed, as other classes have been

¹⁰⁶ Stourbridge School of Art, *Annual Report*, 10 October 1883 (National Archives at Kew, file ED 29/176).

¹⁰⁷ *County Express*, 25 October 1884 and *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 25 October 1884.

¹⁰⁸ *Advertiser*, 24 January 1885 and *County Express*, 24 January 1885.

¹⁰⁹ See, for example, *County Express*, 7 January 1888 and *Advertiser*, 5 January 1889. The classes and fees at Brierley Hill were as follows: evening class for males and females, 7-9 p.m. on Tuesday and Saturday (5s 6d per quarter) and morning class for ladies, 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. on Saturday (15s per quarter); see *County Express*, 22 August 1885.

established, which provide the town with instruction in science and art.’¹¹⁰ This closure surely had some financial impact upon the Stourbridge School because student fees from Brierley Hill were no longer part of the income of the school. For its part in the 1890s, the Brierley Hill school looked to the Staffordshire County Council for funding under the provisions of the recent national legislation regarding technical education.

The early development of art education in Wordsley was also associated with the Stourbridge School. As early as December 1859, a ‘Mr. [Henry] Newnam,’ who won medals whilst a student at the Stourbridge School in 1858, was teaching drawing in a National elementary school in Wordsley.¹¹¹ Some years later, the Wordsley Board School began to host various classes under the auspices of the Department of Science and Art with art teacher Owen Gibbons and science teacher Benjamin F. Mason, who had an interest in the chemistry of glassmaking.¹¹² In the mid-1880s, the art classes were being conducted under the auspices of the Department of Science and Art, whilst the City and Guilds of London Institute oversaw the science classes.¹¹³ The nature of the connexion between the Stourbridge School and these classes in Wordsley is not at all clear, although there is some

¹¹⁰ *County Express*, 4 January 1890. Subsequently, citizens at Brierley Hill, led by newspaper editor and publisher John Addison, who had served on the Council of the Stourbridge School in the early 1880s, petitioned the Brierley Hill Local Board for funds and proceeded to offer both art instruction and technical education classes in the Albion House School in early February 1892. By the fall of 1893, the school at Brierley Hill was offering a variety of art classes, including modelling, taught by art master Owen Gibbons along with instruction in French, physiography, and machine construction and drawing. A few years thereafter, a new building was erected to house the Brierley Hill School of Science and Art; see *County Express*, 6 February 1892 and 23 September 1893.

¹¹¹ H. Jack Haden, *Artists in Cameo Glass: Incorporating Thomas Woodall’s Memoirs* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 1993), p. 24.

¹¹² *County Express*, 25 September 1886.

¹¹³ *County Express*, 24 October 1891.

record of an unsuccessful attempt in 1885 by the Stourbridge School to establish a class for glass design on Saturday afternoons at the Wordsley Board School.¹¹⁴ A later statement by the Stourbridge School Council indicated that the ‘proposal for affiliating the art class at Wordsley ... was found to be attended with difficulties which prevented its adoption.’¹¹⁵ These ‘difficulties’ were, at least in part, the desire of Wordsley interests to found an independent technical school for the purpose of instruction in science and art, both of which would be related closely to glassmaking.

By the fall of 1887 and continuing for the next few years, the classes at Wordsley and those at Brierley Hill led to a decline in enrolment at the Stourbridge School, and the Council of the Stourbridge School took notice of this circumstance.¹¹⁶ In 1888, the Council expressed itself quite strongly, mentioning two former Stourbridge students:

One cause of the diminished attendance of students may be found in the establishment of art classes at Wordsley and Brierley Hill.... Your committee has conferred with the managers of the class at Brierley Hill, but without succeeding in devising any plan for its co-operation with your branch school at that place. The Wordsley school especially continues to attract pupils who used to attend formerly at your school, and who owe at least some of their success to instruction received from your master. Thus, Frederick Carder, who has recently gained a silver medal as a student at Wordsley, studied eight or nine years at the Stourbridge school, which he left in April, 1887, and T. A. Guest, who has gained a third grade prize in that school, left the Stourbridge school at the same time, having been a student for several years. Your committee hopes a little friendly competition of this sort may be eventually beneficial.¹¹⁷

On 15 January 1891, the Wordsley interests forwarded an application to the Staffordshire County Council, requesting funds to build a technical school at Wordsley.

¹¹⁴ *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886.

¹¹⁵ *County Express*, 10 October 1891.

¹¹⁶ *County Express*, 8 October 1887.

¹¹⁷ *County Express*, 20 October 1888.

During a meeting at the Wordsley Institute building on 19 October 1891, those assembled learned that the Staffordshire County Council had granted £150 and that additional grant monies from the Department of Science and Art could be obtained, so the group adopted a resolution in favor of a ‘permanent building’ for classes in ‘art, science, technology, cookery and manual instruction.’ About seven months later, an illustration of the proposed building appeared in the *County Express*, and donations were solicited.¹¹⁸ Fundraising proceeded very slowly for the next several years, but enthusiasm for the 1897 Diamond Jubilee boosted efforts, especially among firms and individuals associated with the local glass industry. Construction of the Wordsley School of Art building was completed in 1898, and an elaborate grand opening ceremony was held on 6 February 1899. An extension to the original building was completed in 1907.¹¹⁹ Many of those who were involved in the Wordsley efforts were manufacturers or decorators in the glass industry, and several had been students at Stourbridge, as discussed in the next chapter of this thesis, which examines the relationship of the Stourbridge School to that important local industry.

Technical Education and Relocation

As noted in the above discussions of the emerging art and technical schools at Brierley Hill and Wordsley in the 1890s, Parliamentary legislation regarding technical education and Government grants or funds from county councils generated interest and had considerable impact upon the Government schools of science and art. The situation that emerged in Stourbridge was more complex than that of others, although both legislation

¹¹⁸ *County Express*, 9 April 1892.

¹¹⁹ For details of the further history of the art school at Wordsley, see *County Express*, 14 and 21 September 1907 and Stan Hill, ‘Wordsley School of Art,’ *The Blackcountryman*, 34 (Winter 2000), pp. 73-82.

and grants were involved. The Technical Instruction Act of 1889 and the Local Taxation Act of 1890 were most significant. The Technical Instruction Act empowered county councils to set a penny rate for technical education, and the Local Taxation Act resulted in considerable funds (the so-called ‘whiskey money’) for technical instruction.¹²⁰ To be sure, there were important antecedents to these two pieces of legislation, ranging from the advocacy for science education by chemist Dr. Lyon Playfair and others (Thomas H. Huxley, A. J. Mundella, John Scott Russell, and Sidney Webb) to exhaustive enquiries and lengthy reports from Royal Commissions (the Taunton Report, 1868; the Devonshire Report, 1872-1875; and the Samuelson Report, 1882-1884) and the founding of the National Association for the Promotion of Technical and Secondary Education in 1886.¹²¹

¹²⁰ The Stourbridge School looked to the Worcestershire County Council for funding, whilst the schools in Brierley Hill and Wordsley looked to the County Council of Staffordshire. This political division was an important factor that contributed to the separation of the Stourbridge School from its counterparts in Brierley Hill and Wordsley.

¹²¹ Drawing upon key primary sources such as the diary of Henry Cole, Harry Butterworth traces the development of the Department’s growing interest in science and technology beginning in the mid-1860s, and he argues that it was not until the trade depression of the 1880s that political support for science education was sufficiently strong to pass legislation authorising Government grants for technical education, although deficiencies in this area had been generally acknowledged at least since the Paris Exhibition of 1867; see Harry Butterworth, ‘The Science and Art Department 1853-1900’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1968), pp. 76-77, 108-109, and 144-145. For additional background on the development of technical education in Britain, see Stephen F. Cotgrove, *Technical Education and Social Change* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1958); Michael Argles, ‘The Royal Commission on Technical Instruction, 1881-4: Its Inception and Composition,’ *Journal of Education & Training*, 11 (1959), pp. 97-104; M. E. Hipwell, ‘A Survey of the Work of the Science Division of the Department of Science and Art, 1853-1899’ (MEd thesis, University of Nottingham, 1964); M. D. Stephens and G. W. Roderick, ‘The later Victorians and Scientific and Technical Education,’ *Annals of Science*, 28 (1972), pp. 385-400; Christine M. Heward, ‘Industry, Cleanliness and Godliness: Sources for and Problems in the History of Scientific and Technical Education and the Working Classes, 1850-1910,’ *Studies in Science Education*, 7 (1980), pp. 87-128; Bill Bailey, ‘The Technical Education Movement: A Late Nineteenth Century Educational Lobby,’ *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 7 (1983), pp. 55-68; and J. F. Donnelly, ‘The Origins of the Technical Curriculum in England during the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,’ *Studies in Science Education*, 16 (1989), pp. 123-161.

In short, these Royal Commissions and the National Association accomplished for science what the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures had done in the 1830s, that is, assemble testimony and evidence to demonstrate that science education in Britain lagged behind that of other European nations and that the negative economic result and the potential future impact combined to require action and intervention on the part of Government. In mid-1887, an editorial in the *County Express* asserted that ‘the necessity of improving and extending technical education in this country’ was so apparent that ‘it is now unnecessary to say one word in favour of technical education.’ The editorial praised the Stourbridge School Board for efforts in technical education with the glass and iron industries in mind, for ‘there is perhaps no district in the country in which more good might be done in this direction than here.’¹²²

In 1890, those attending the annual meeting of the Stourbridge School approved a resolution calling upon the Council to ‘consider the best means of promoting technical education.’ The Stourbridge School Council was soon operating in cooperation with the ‘Stourbridge and District Technical Board,’¹²³ and Public Notices in the local newspapers during 1891 described the technical classes to be held at the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution (ranging from chemistry, mechanics and mathematics to cottage and household cookery) as well as the art classes that convened at the Stourbridge School.¹²⁴

Over the next several years, the Stourbridge School Council had much communication with the Department of Science and Art. The correspondence was initially generated by the Council in order to secure approval for an important scheme that altered

¹²² *County Express*, 16 July 1887.

¹²³ The *Committee Minute Book* of the Stourbridge and District Technical Board that covers 1891 to 1906 is available at The Hive in Worcester.

¹²⁴ See, for example, *County Express*, 12 September 1891.

the structure of the governing body of the Stourbridge School of Science and Art. The result of the correspondence was a 'scheme of amalgamation' through which the Stourbridge School of Science and Art and the Stourbridge and District Technical Board acted separately to choose representatives to serve on a combined board.¹²⁵ After the Department of Science and Art received favourable legal opinions regarding this proposal, the scheme of amalgamation went forward, and the combination of the two bodies officially became the 'Stourbridge School of Science and Art and Technical Board,' although it was usually truncated to 'Stourbridge Technical Board' in local newspaper reports. This new mode of governance must be credited to the foresight and initiative of the leadership of the Council of the Stourbridge School, and the result of the amalgamation was to increase the visibility of the Stourbridge School beyond the district into the entirety of Worcestershire.

By 1894-1895, technical education for both men and women in Stourbridge and Lye was, by all accounts, flourishing. Classes in inorganic chemistry, geometry, dressmaking, and shorthand were held in the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution, and a location on Worcester Street was the site for classes in manual trades and woodworking. The Stourbridge School building in Theatre Road was home to classes in building construction, machine construction and drawing, physiography, and geometry as well as the usual day and evening class offerings within the longstanding art education curriculum. At various locations in Lye, there were classes offered in elementary drawing, geometry, machine drawing and construction, woodworking, dressmaking, cottage cookery, and various science subjects such as geology, chemistry, metallurgy, and agriculture. The fees for the technical education classes ranged from 1d per class meeting to 2s 6d for thirty sessions,

¹²⁵ Support for this scheme was voiced in an editorial by the *County Express*, 6 June 1891.

and the fees for classes in the drawing and art education curriculum at the Stourbridge School were reduced from earlier levels by a few shillings.¹²⁶

The numerous classes and the increasing numbers of students using the Stourbridge School building in Theatre Road soon led to calls for a new structure, and such sentiments voiced by Viscount Cobham at the annual meeting in January 1895 were echoed by the *County Express* when the newspaper pronounced tersely that ‘the erection of new buildings for the institution ... are clearly much needed.’¹²⁷ In 1895, five members (Rupert Deakin, George Green, Philip Pargeter, H. Watson Smith, and Alfred W. Worthington) of the Stourbridge School of Science and Art and Technical Board began a local initiative, pledging a total of £160 toward a goal of £600 for a building fund. They ‘proposed to call upon the manufacturers and wealthy people in the district’ starting with William Orme Foster, ‘one of the largest owners of works in the district.’¹²⁸ Although this fundraising effort proved to be unsuccessful, it is significant that this initiative involved three gentlemen representing the Stourbridge School Council (Pargeter, Smith and Worthington) and two gentlemen from the Worcestershire County Council (Deakin and Green).

As noted in Chapter Two of this thesis, discussion had taken place in Stourbridge in the 1890s regarding the construction of a new public building to be named Victoria Institute in anticipation of the Queen’s 1897 Diamond Jubilee. The Stourbridge Urban District Council favored this scheme to enhance the civic culture of the town, but financial support from benefactors was not forthcoming. In an editorial comment in late 1900, the *County Express* said that the ‘Diamond Jubilee memorial is slumbering and sleeping at

¹²⁶ *County Express*, 25 August 1894 and 7 September 1895.

¹²⁷ *County Express*, 26 January 1895.

¹²⁸ Stourbridge and District Technical Board, *Committee Minute Book*, p. 105.

Stourbridge,’ and voiced the thought that the Victoria Institute for technical education, which was hoped to be the first building constructed, ‘will be the last to be realized.’¹²⁹

In 1902, the Stourbridge Urban District Council revived the Victoria Institute plan, but this body enhanced the vision by proposing that the new building should have quarters for a free public library as well as all the classrooms and other facilities need for the Stourbridge School of Science and Art.¹³⁰ Because the library was an important part of the anticipated project, philanthropist Andrew Carnegie was induced to pledge £3000 toward construction costs. For a time, the cooperation of interests at Lye in the proposed building for Stourbridge was in question. Potential building sites in Stourbridge were under consideration, and their respective merits were discussed and debated. Both matters were finally resolved, but not without difficulty and delay.¹³¹ The building in Theatre Road, home to the Stourbridge School for more than half a century, was purchased by industrialist H. Watson Smith, a Council member who was a longstanding supporter of the institution.¹³²

¹²⁹ *County Express*, 10 November 1900.

¹³⁰ For a recapitulation of key events and details of the various political bodies involved, see the lengthy article in the *County Express*, 15 April 1905.

¹³¹ *County Express*, 29 June 1901, 19 July 1902, 4 October 1902, 29 November 1902, 13 December 1902, 27 June 1903 and 4 July 1903. The editorial ‘A Free Library for Stourbridge’ in the *County Express*, 29 May 1886, pointed out that no progress had been made for a public library since the Free Libraries Act of 1850 and called for Stourbridge to secure ‘an institution under whose roof would be collected treasures of mute instruction.’

¹³² After longtime Stourbridge School Council member and benefactor H. Watson Smith purchased the building for £500 in November 1904, it was known locally as the ‘Music Rooms’ because of his efforts to host concerts and musical activities as well as art exhibitions. Smith died in 1926, and the site was purchased a decade later by the Stourbridge Old Edwardian Club for future development of the nearby club premises (personal correspondence, John Sanders to Roger Dodsworth, Broadfield House Glass Museum, 12 September 2007).

In October 1903, the *County Express* said that construction of the new building at High Street, Hagley Road and Church Street was ‘proceeding apace.’¹³³ As the project moved forward, the name ‘Victoria Institute’ was put aside in favour of ‘Free Library and Technical Institute.’ The building, designed by architect Frederick Woodward and erected by the building firm of John Guest and Son, was estimated to cost nearly £10,000. Plans were discussed regarding a formal stone laying ceremony, although there was disagreement among members of the Stourbridge Urban District Council as to whether such a ceremony was desirable.¹³⁴ Some thought it best to wait until the building was completed for a grand opening. Those who favoured a stone laying ceremony asserted that the building would be the most important edifice in Stourbridge ‘since the Town Hall was erected [in 1887]’ and that such an occasion would be a good opportunity to seek financial supporters who were ‘prominent men with a long pocket.’

Construction was well along when the stone laying ceremony took place during the afternoon of Thursday 25 February 1904, and the *County Express* carried a full account of the event and named many persons who attended, including the numerous benefactors, many of which were longtime associates of the Stourbridge School. Isaac Nash, chairman of the Stourbridge Urban District Council, laid the stone, and he hosted a dinner party to celebrate the event at the Talbot Hotel in Stourbridge in the evening.¹³⁵ In an address at the ceremony, Nash recalled that the first proposal for such a building was made ‘a long way back in the nineties,’ and he noted that Stourbridge local authorities had undertaken the construction of other facilities (public baths and a recreation ground) that contributed to the

¹³³ *County Express*, 31 October 1903.

¹³⁴ *County Express*, 31 October 1903.

¹³⁵ *County Express*, 20 February and 27 February 1904.

civic culture of the town in the intervening years. Nash concluded by saying that the district should take 'legitimate pride' in the new Free Library and Technical Institute building, and he expressed the hope that 'the fullest advantages would be taken of the institution by those for whose benefit it was intended.'

The formal opening of the Stourbridge Free Library and Technical Institute took place on Easter Monday in 1905. Just prior to the occasion, the *County Express* published two lengthy articles recounting the history of the Stourbridge School of Science and Art, with mentions of the numerous individuals who were benefactors of the school at times over the past 55 years as well as the various bodies of local and county government that were involved with technical education since the early 1890s.¹³⁶ The first article in the *County Express* revealed great pride in the fact that the missions of such educational endeavours as the Mechanics' Institution and the Stourbridge School of Science and Art, previously supported primarily by private or philanthropic efforts, were now being assumed by county government in a 'Technical School and Free Library ... which might be an ornament to the town.'¹³⁷ This article further described the new building that 'crowns the junction of High Street, Hagley Road and Church Street' as one 'which any locality of similar size would be justly proud.' The second article offered tribute to the 'generous enterprise and self-sacrificing work on the part of many gentlemen in Stourbridge and its district' before acknowledging the philanthropy of Andrew Carnegie and describing the physical features and dimensions of the new building in great detail.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ *County Express*, 15 April 1905 and 22 April 1905.

¹³⁷ *County Express*, 15 April 1905.

¹³⁸ The *County Express*, 22 April, 1905, described the building as 'a most handsome and imposing pile, its ornamentation being of best red bricks, buff terra-cotta facings and green Westmoreland slates.' A plaque inside reads as follows: 'These library buildings were

From the perspective of this study, these two articles capture that which the Stourbridge School had come to mean to those who supported it and, more generally, to the inhabitants of the Stourbridge district. The first article mentioned the ‘struggles and vicissitudes’ of the early years of the Stourbridge School of Art and asserted that the new building ‘will prove a *rendezvous* for visitors from many miles around.’ Credit was given to the ‘indefatigable’ efforts of individuals in fundraising as well as to the alliance of the Stourbridge School Council and the Worcestershire political bodies that made the new building possible. The second article recounted the ‘struggle and upward progress’ of the institution and lauded the many financial benefactors and other supporters ‘who have the educational progress of Stourbridge and its district at heart.’ Taken together, these two articles from the *County Express* constitute vivid evidence of the sense of civic pride that was manifest in the Stourbridge district at the time the new Free Library and Technical Institute was completed and ready for occupancy.

At the opening ceremony at 2:30 pm on 24 April 1905, Mr. Joseph Edward Jones, chairman of the Stourbridge School Council, welcomed Viscount and Viscountess Cobham as the guests of honour, and Lady Cobham proceeded to proclaim the building open. Both H. Watson Smith and Joseph Silvers Williams-Thomas (formerly Joseph Silvers-Williams) offered remarks.¹³⁹ The exhibition described immediately below began on the same day.

provided for the inhabitants of the urban district of Stourbridge by the munificence of Andrew Carnegie who gave a sum of three thousand pounds for their erection & who has thereby earned & secured the gratitude of Stourbridge 1905.’ In 2016, the Free Library and Technical Institute, a three-storey Grade II listed building, stands at the junction of Hagley Road and Church Street near the Ring Road, and the tympanum over the main entrance, with figures representing Art and Literature below a Cupid, is essentially unchanged from the time the library and school opened more than 110 years ago.

¹³⁹ *County Express*, 29 April 1905 and *Advertiser*, 29 April 1905.

Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition April-May 1905

In conjunction with the opening of the new building, an extensive ‘Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition’ was on view from 24 April to 27 May 1905. Because this undertaking required a great deal of preparation, a General Committee was formed several months beforehand, with Viscount Cobham serving as president and Isaac Nash as chairman. The ‘Art and Curio Committee’ was headed by longtime Council member H. Watson Smith, with art master George Cromack in charge of art and Herbert Nield Collis in charge of curios. Retired glass manufacturer Philip Pargeter headed the Industrial Committee with former Stourbridge School student Edwin Grice as secretary.¹⁴⁰

The Art and Curio section was the major component of the exhibition, and Smith and Cromack, who were friends since Cromack’s appointment as art master in 1893, worked together on all the details. A diary kept by Smith indicates that preparations for the exhibition began in December 1904, as ‘loans of pictures and art work’ were sought.¹⁴¹ Smith and Cromack collaborated to arrange the watercolour pictures and the various works by artist Frank Short, which included aquatints, mezzotints, engravings, and pictures in watercolour or oil. Smith carried out the arrangements for the rest of the pictures in oil, which occupied what would be the main room for the school of art, ‘a fine room some ninety by twenty-two feet.’ Smith described the work for the exhibition as ‘enormous,’ writing that ‘night after night Cromack and I were in the Buildings till one or two in the

¹⁴⁰ Letterhead stationery preserved in the Stourbridge Public Library names the members of various committees for the Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition.

¹⁴¹ This entry from H. Watson Smith’s diary regarding the 1905 exhibition is quoted in Elliot Evers, *Butterflies in Camphor: A Family Chronicle* (London: Research Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 191-192.

morning.’ Posters announcing the exhibition heralded the various attractions to entice visitors, and the emphasis upon objects of fine art, especially pictures, is quite evident:

GRAND COLLECTION OF PICTURES ... BRITISH AND FOREIGN ARTISTS OF 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES ... INTERESTING & UNIQUE CURIOS FROM MANY LANDS ... JAPANESE & INDIAN ART TREASURES... FRANK SHORT’S MEZZOS, ETCHINGS, ETC. ... ART INDUSTRIES, GLASS, CHINA, DOULTON WARE, ETC.¹⁴²

The *County Express* described many exhibits in detail, mentioning that the cameo glass Milton vase and Portland vase, both executed by the late John Northwood I, were loaned by owner Philip Pargeter and that decorative glassware produced by the Stourbridge firm of Thomas Webb and Sons was on display, along with numerous glass articles that were made in other nations over several centuries.¹⁴³

For two pence, visitors to the exhibition could purchase a catalogue comprising more than 50 pages, and an extant copy of this document affords a detailed look at the exhibits along with a great deal of information regarding those who supported the exhibition or the construction of the new Free Library and Technical Institute building.¹⁴⁴ For example, the *Exhibition Catalogue* lists some 91 individuals, each of whom ‘have become Guarantors of Five Guineas each.’ The surnames of numerous longtime supporters of the Stourbridge School are within this list, including some representing two generations, and the others include many prominent and well-known industrialists, professionals, holders of political office, business owners and tradesmen as well as clergy from the Stourbridge district.

¹⁴² One of these posters is preserved in the Stourbridge Public Library.

¹⁴³ *County Express*, 22 April 1905.

¹⁴⁴ *Exhibition Catalogue: Stourbridge Art and Industrial Exhibition* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, Ltd., 1905); a copy of this catalogue is preserved in the Stourbridge Public Library. Unless indicated otherwise, quotations regarding the exhibition are from this source.

The 'Industrial Section' of the *Exhibition Catalogue* lists the exhibits in the basement and on the ground floor, ranging from an extensive explanation of various printing processes by Mark & Moody to 'artistic glass ware' from the Stevens & Williams firm and ceramic products from Royal Worcester Porcelain and Doulton & Co. Former Stourbridge School student William Northwood's design in wax for a cameo glass plaque, 'Cupid inviting Venus to dance,' was on display next to a stand featuring engraved glassware.

The 'Art Section' of the *Exhibition Catalogue* is spread over 21 pages, beginning with a list of more than 70 photographs from the Brierley Hill Camera Club, nearly one-third of them by William Northwood. More than 100 'Oil Paintings' are listed, along with some 91 'Water Colours [and] Engravings.' Several pages are devoted to 60 'Engravings & Water Colours' by former Stourbridge School student Frank Short. His longtime friend H. Watson Smith loaned more than 50 of Short's works for this exhibition.

On the first floor, Room No. 18 contained more than 200 examples of 'Works of Past and Present Students of [the] Stourbridge School of Science and Art and Woodwork Class.' Unfortunately, not a single student work is described or pictured in the *Exhibition Catalogue*. Some students were responsible for many works, as Frederick Noke was credited with 12 and Florence Yeomans with 13, whilst numerous other students were listed for two to seven works each. About 90 students are listed by name in the *Exhibition Catalogue*, and, for purposes of this study, those named have been compared with the listing of students who were recognized with local or national awards (see Appendix Four, 'Awards to Stourbridge School Students, 1852-1905') as well as with those whose names appear in the handwritten *Register of Students* (see Appendix Six, 'Stourbridge School *Register of Students*, 1864-1874). This comparison shows that most of the student work on display was produced by students who had attended the school in recent years (1890-1905),

although examples from William Northwood (6 works) date from the 1870s or early 1880s, whilst those by Ludwig Kny (11 works) date from the 1880s.

Although a few examples of fine art came from museum collections such as the Corporation of Wolverhampton or the Victoria and Albert Museum, almost all of the many watercolour or oil pictures and the engravings on display were borrowed for the exhibition from the art collections of owners who lived in the Stourbridge area. As noted above, Council member H. Watson Smith loaned more than 50 engravings by artist Frank Short from his personal collection. The oil pictures included a portrait, *Frances Stuart—Countess of Portland* by Van Dyck (loaned by Viscount Cobham), as well as works by members of the Royal Academy, such as John Constable, Alfred East, William Etty, William Firth, Joshua Reynolds, J. M. W. Turner, and Edmund Wimperis. There were works by Constable and Wimperis among the approximately 60 watercolour pictures along with many by artists who were Associates of the Royal Academy. Retired glass manufacturer Philip Pargeter attended the opening ceremony and viewed the art exhibition before recording a brief observation in his diary: ‘Exhibition open by Lady Cobham ... a fairly large attendance and the proceeding went off very well, the largest room being hung all round with a very good lot of Pictures, some of them of great value.’¹⁴⁵

Both Viscount Cobham and Lord Dudley loaned several pictures, and many other items of fine art were from the collections of those who were longtime benefactors of the Stourbridge School (Herbert Neild Collis, Frank Evers, Frank Percival Evers, George Evers, Dr. Alfred Freer, Gainsborough Harward, Philip Pargeter, H. Watson Smith, M. B. Walker, and A. W. Worthington) or those who were strong supporters of the effort to build

¹⁴⁵ Entry dated 24 April 1905 (the Pargeter diary is in the Stourbridge Public Library).

the Free Library and Technical Institute (Joseph Cochrane, Rupert Deakin, [Mrs.] George Green, William Wickham King, William J. Levi, and Isaac Nash).

The *Exhibition Catalogue* listing of those who loaned fine art, especially pictures by noteworthy artists, reveals that ownership of such items by residents within the Stourbridge district was not confined to the gentry or to industrialists of great wealth. On the contrary, medical and legal professionals as well as business owners, shopkeepers and tradesmen were interested in acquiring examples of fine art.

Conclusions

At the start of 1882, the Stourbridge School of Art was headquartered in an aged theatre building that needed renovation and was encumbered by a longstanding mortgage debt. Less than a quarter century thereafter, in April 1905, supporters of the Stourbridge School opened the doors of a newly constructed, purpose-built structure, the Stourbridge Free Library and Technical Institute, located in the Stourbridge High Street where it intersected with Hagley Road and Church Street. The mission of the Stourbridge School had long been focused on art, but it now embraced an emphasis upon science as well.

The mortgage debt was paid in early 1883 after a concerted fundraising campaign headed by Frank Evers, and the lifting of this debt made possible the successful application for a Government grant that was specifically intended for extensive, much needed building renovations. An active Council member for more than two decades, Frank Evers was among a group of benefactors and supporters—including Charles Evers-Swindell, William Orme Foster, Isaac Nash, H. Watson Smith, William J. Turney, and Alfred W. Worthington—who were determined to see the Stourbridge School advance. Industrialists Foster, Nash and Turney likely adhered to the view that education in art and science could

be of benefit to manufacturing in particular, whilst Evers-Swindell and Smith were surely interested in art education for its own sake and in advancing public appreciation of the fine arts. Those who supported the Stourbridge School came from various social strata: gentry, clergy, industrialists, business owners, professionals and tradesmen. In remarks at annual meetings, Council members, benefactors and invited guests alike often cited key concerns as their rationale for supporting the school, namely, the pressure of foreign competition in manufactured goods and the desire to improve public taste.

In early 1885, the students at the Stourbridge School were enjoying the improved accommodations when attending the Ladies Morning Class or the General Evening Class to continue their work within the twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum, which had been in place since the 1850s. The nature of the curriculum and the sequential levels within it focused first upon the attainment of proficiency in drawing before students could begin to try their hands at various aspects of fine art, including painting and modelling. Design was at the apex of the curriculum, and relatively small numbers of students reached this level. In terms of the local iron and glass industries, a small number of student awards were for designs in these areas, and those awards for decorated glass went to a few students, although some individual students won many awards over a span of years.

Although little can be ascertained about his specific teaching methods, art master Edward Simms increased both student enrolment numbers and revenue from Government grants. In the 1880s, Simms was instrumental in establishing relationships in nearby Brierley Hill and Wordsley with fledgling art schools that later became independent under the auspices of the Staffordshire County Council. Art master George Cromack's tenure beginning in 1893 was noteworthy for the introduction of the Life Class, and he was surely both talented in aspects of fine art and an engaging and popular teacher.

The students at the Stourbridge School were of much the same social strata as in previous years, with the General Evening Class populated by boys and men employed in various trades such as glass decorating and the Ladies Morning Class enrolling the daughters of local clergy, industrialists, and business owners and professionals. Many students remained enrolled for lengthy periods of time, as quite a few students were recognized with local or national awards over periods of years. Most awards were for student works in drawing or in traditional areas of fine art, although there were some noteworthy efforts in design, including designs for decorated glassware. Although the Department of Science and Art continued its policy of ‘payment on results’ and changed some regulations regarding examinations, the Stourbridge School fared well in terms of the financial return from Government grants that reflected the policies and regulations.

The growth of interest in technical education and the passage of Parliamentary legislation for such instruction had a strong impact upon the Stourbridge School. For the first times in its history, the institution came into contact with political bodies whose jurisdiction included oversight of the school, and representatives of those political groups were often present at the meetings and prize-givings of the Stourbridge School. These annual meetings and accompanying art exhibitions generated coverage in local newspapers, and such reports were the primary means of maintaining the public profile of the school.

Increasing student enrolments in the science and other technical education classes led influential persons and local newspapers to begin to call for a new building in the 1890s. Other building projects to enhance the civic culture of Stourbridge diverted attention for a time, but the desire for a library and technical school within the same building eventually took hold. The availability of funds from the Worcestershire County Council and a substantial donation from philanthropist Andrew Carnegie stimulated successful local

fundraising. The Free Library and Technical Institute building was completed in April 1905, and a local newspaper called the new Stourbridge edifice a ‘crown,’ this appellation reflecting the importance of the building as an integral element in the civic culture of the town. The grand opening of the Free Library and Technical Institute also marked the start of a month-long ‘Stourbridge Art and Industrial Exhibition’ that was planned and carried out with the help of longtime benefactors and supporters of the Stourbridge School. Numerous past and present student works were displayed, but the main emphasis of the exhibition was fine art, with many examples of valuable pictures loaned for this event by members of the Stourbridge School Council or by others who were benefactors or supporters of the institution.

CHAPTER SIX

THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL OF ART: RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE GLASS INDUSTRY

In 1851, the Stourbridge School was among several newly constituted provincial schools that soon came under the administrative control of the Department of Practical Art and, by 1853, its successor, the Department of Science and Art. During the decade of the 1840s, increasing public interest in education, including instruction in drawing and art, was concomitant with growing Government involvement in education and with general public acceptance of this expanding role for Government. Several Select Committees sought to articulate the anticipated relationships between the provincial schools in various cities and their respective local manufacturing industries. Each new provincial school, including Stourbridge, was expected to impart instruction in drawing and art that would train designers for local industries and elevate public taste generally, especially regarding the aesthetics of manufactured goods. The relationships actually developed by these institutions, insofar as such can be determined from nineteenth-century records, have been of interest to scholars who focused upon particular provincial schools as well as those who addressed national trends. This study of the Stourbridge School, although limited to the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century, further illuminates this area of historiography.

From the initial drawing classes at the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution in the late 1840s and the public meeting at the Stourbridge Corn Exchange in February 1851 to its relocation to a new building in 1905, the Stourbridge School, as evidenced in the remarks of Council members and other supporters, desired to establish and maintain relationships with local industries, especially iron and glass. The iron industry is not a focus of this thesis, but it should be noted that industrialist James Foster was a financial contributor to

the Stourbridge School, and, after Foster's death in 1853, his nephew and heir, ironmaster William Orme Foster, was a Council member and financial supporter of the Stourbridge School for many years, as were industrialists Frank Evers, Charles Evers-Swindell, and James Evers-Swindell, all of whom were associated with the iron industry.

During much of the latter half of the nineteenth century, the glass industry of the Stourbridge district consisted of several major glass manufacturing interests (Richardson; Joseph Webb; Thomas Webb; Davis, Greathead and Green; Stuart; Stevens & Williams; and the Heath Glassworks) and various smaller glass manufacturing firms along with numerous enterprises that decorated glass by cutting, engraving, or etching.¹ The latter half of the nineteenth century has been termed the 'golden age' of glassmaking in Britain, although this time was not a period of unbroken progress.² The repeal of an excise tax in 1845 benefited the flint glass manufacturers economically, and the Great Exhibition sparked public interest in decorative glassware. From 1851 to 1881, flint glass manufacturers in the West Midlands employed 40% of the nation's glassworkers in that segment of the industry, and exports of flint glass increased steadily from 1850 to the mid-1870s. Many individual flint glass firms in the Stourbridge district prospered, even as they

¹ Because of changes in ownership and the dissolution of partnerships as well as the retirements or deaths of principals, it is challenging to document the chronology of the glass manufacturing and glass decorating industry in the Stourbridge area and to identify the key individuals involved. Two sources with extensive indices are particularly useful: Charles R. Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914* (Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 1991) and Jason Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002* (Harrogate: by author, 2002). Other helpful sources include D. N. Sandilands, 'Thesis on the history of the Midland (Stourbridge) glass industry: with special reference to the flint glass section' (unpublished thesis, University of Birmingham, 1927); D. R. Guttery, *From Broad-Glass to Cut Crystal: A History of the Stourbridge Glass Industry* (London: Leonard Hill, 1956); and H. J. Haden, *The Stourbridge Glass Industry in the 19th Century* (Halesowen: Reliance Printing Works, 1971) and *Notes on the Stourbridge Glass Trade* (Dudley: Dudley Public Libraries, 1977).

² Takao Matsumura, *The Labour Aristocracy Revisited: The Victorian Flint Glass Makers 1850-80* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983), pp. 12-24.

endured a strike in 1859 and weathered occasional national economic crises. By the late 1870s, however, foreign competition had adversely impacted the flint glass trade, and the golden age of glassmaking in Britain began to wane.³ Some glass manufacturers—such as Edward Webb (Whitehouse Glass Works), Thomas Webb & Sons (Dennis Glass Works), Stuart and Sons (Red House Glass Works), and Stevens & Williams—continued to strive to produce innovative products in order to remain viable, whilst others closed for good or reorganised to face financial hard times.

From the start of drawing classes at the Mechanics' Institution in 1848 and the founding of the Government school in 1851 to its development over decades as the Stourbridge School of Art and its metamorphosis into a technical school in the 1890s, the Stourbridge School depended upon the voluntary donations of financial benefactors as well as the efforts of Council members and other supporters. Lord Ward (Earl of Dudley) was a generous contributor until his death in May 1885, and other gentry, including Lord Lyttelton, J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, and barrister Robert Scott, were important donors during the early years of the institution. Industrialists William Orme Foster, Charles Evers-Swindell, and James Evers-Swindell and were longtime benefactors, and business owners Isaac Nash and William J. Turney were active supporters in the 1890s and the early twentieth century, as was glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams. Council members Alfred W. Worthington and H. Watson Smith were important participants in the affairs of the Stourbridge School from the time of their election to the Council in the early 1880s. Worthington served as honorary secretary for more than two decades, and Smith was instrumental in the hiring of art master George Henry Cromack in 1893.

³ Various issues of *The Pottery & Glass Trades' Journal* (1878) and its successor, *The Pottery Gazette* (1879 and thereafter) document the economic difficulties facing the flint glass trade and contain frequent mentions of the situations at glass manufacturing plants and glass decorating establishments in the Stourbridge district.

Because provincial schools such as the Stourbridge School were expected to impart instruction in drawing and art to train designers for local industries, it is useful to note here that remarkably little is known about the identities of those who were responsible for the design of glassware produced in the Stourbridge district during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Interestingly, the elaborate lithographed membership certificates dating from the 1850s for the Flint Glass Makers' Friendly Society depict 'the alliance of art with manufacture,' as a designer/artist clad in formal frock coat with palette, brushes and drawing paper behind him shows his drawing of a jug and a drinking glass to a glass maker attired in shirt sleeves with tools and glass objects behind him whilst the two men shake hands below the goddess of fame, who is poised to crown them with laurel wreaths.⁴

Several authors have compiled information about glassware produced during the last half of the nineteenth century in the Stourbridge district, especially regarding glassmaking techniques and methods of glass decorating, such as cameo glass and various cut or engraved glass products.⁵ Whilst these sources are particularly valuable for cameo

⁴ Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914*, frontispiece and p. 8.

⁵ In addition to Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914*, see D. R. Guttery, *From Broad-Glass to Cut Crystal: A History of the Stourbridge Glass Industry* (London: Leonard Hill, 1956); Geoffrey W. Beard, 'XIX Century Cameo Glass,' *Apollo*, 63 (1 February 1956), pp. 51-53 and *Nineteenth Century Cameo Glass* (Newport: Ceramic Book Co., 1956); John Northwood II, *John Northwood: His Contributions to the Stourbridge Flint Glass Industry 1850-1902* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1958); H. J. Haden, *The Stourbridge Glass Industry in the 19th Century* (Halesowen: Reliance Printing Works, 1971); H. W. Woodward, *Art, Feat and Mystery: The Story of Thomas Webb & Sons, Glassmakers* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody Limited, 1978); R. S. Williams-Thomas, *The Crystal Years: A Tribute to the Skills and Artistry of Stevens & Williams Royal Brierley Crystal* (Brierley Hill: Stevens & Williams, 1983); H. Jack Haden, 'The Woodall Brothers: Cameo Glass Artists,' *Glass Technology*, 27 (October 1986), pp. 151-158 and *Artists in Cameo Glass Incorporating Thomas Woodall's Memoirs* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 1993); Christopher Woodall Perry, *The Cameo Glass of Thomas and George Woodall* (Somerset: Richard Dennis, 2000); and Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002*.

glass designed by the Woodall brothers or engraved glassware executed by William Fritsche or Joseph Keller, there is little documentation of those individuals who were responsible for the design of ranges of glassware from Stourbridge district manufacturers in the last half of the nineteenth century, except for some Stevens & Williams products by John Northwood I or by Frederick Carder.⁶

When queried about its practices for glass design in the late 1840s, the Richardson firm told a Select Committee that ‘we design ourselves,’⁷ a statement suggesting that this function was a collaborative internal effort among veteran glassworkers and experienced managers who were aware of the marketplace sales trends of current products as well as domestic and foreign competitors.⁸ In a lecture to the International Congress of Glass, James Humphries Hogan, who created designs for stained glass windows and utilitarian tableware for Whitefriars in the early twentieth century, discussed British glass design 1835-1935, concluding that the latter nineteenth century was a time when good taste was ‘woefully lacking’ and glassware ‘took the form of over-decorated shapes, either with

⁶ Audrey Whitty, ‘Frederick Carder’s Years at Stevens & Williams,’ *Journal of Glass Studies*, 56 (2014), pp. 370-374 and Alexander Silverman, ‘Frederick Carder, Artist and Glass Technologist,’ *American Ceramic Society Bulletin*, 18 (1 January 1939), pp. 343-349.

⁷ *Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design* (London: HMSO, 1849), p. 445. In the 1880s at Stevens & Williams, Frederick Carder ‘found that the glassblower could not read a drawing and insisted upon having a model or similar object so that he could duplicate it. I found that the only way for them to understand a drawing was for them to draw from an object such as a vase or wine glass.’ See Frederick Carder, ‘The Autobiography of an Englishman in the United States of America (typescript 1957, Rakow Library, Corning Museum of Glass), p. 7.

⁸ Lesley Jackson (ed.), *Whitefriars Glass: The Art of James Powell & Sons* (Somerset: Richard Dennis, 1996).

heavy prismatic cutting ... or with elaborate engraving of lace-like patterns of fern leaves and flowers.’⁹

This chapter considers the following research questions: To what extent were representatives of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district involved in founding and sustaining the Stourbridge School during its first decade? Which Council members, benefactors and other supporters of the Stourbridge School were associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district and what was the nature and extent of their relationships with the school? What relationships existed between the various art masters or other instructors such as pupil teachers and the glass industry of the Stourbridge district? What factors encouraged or discouraged enrolment by students who were employed in the various segments of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, especially glass manufacturing and glass decorating? What do the reports of annual meetings or other events at the Stourbridge School reveal regarding relationships with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district? What impact did the advent and development of art schools in Brierley Hill and Wordsley have upon support from the glass industry of the Stourbridge district for those schools and for the Stourbridge School?

⁹ James H. Hogan, ‘The Development in the Design of English Glassware during the last Hundred Years,’ *Journal of the Society of Glass Technology*, 20 (December 1936), pp. 736. In her consideration of the influence of the glass collection at South Kensington upon nineteenth-century glassmaking, Barbara Morris found that Venetian glass was much admired and replicated, especially by glassmakers Apsley Pellat and James Powell, who was associated with Whitefriars; see Barbara Morris, *Inspiration for Design: The Influence of the Victoria & Albert Museum* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1986), pp. 164-170 and David C. Watts, *A History of Glassmaking in London* (London: Watts Publishing, 2009), pp. 120-128. The history of Powell’s glass design at Whitefriars is documented by Lesley Jackson, and Simon Cottle’s account of glass design at Sowerby in the North-East of England is comprehensive; see Jackson, *Whitefriars Glass* and Simon Cottle, *Sowerby Gateshead Glass* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Tyne and Wear Museums Service, 1986.)

The Glass Industry and a Fledgling Institution, 1850-1862

Because student fees were modest, the drawing classes at the Mechanics' Institution in the late 1840s were dependent upon the voluntary donations of financial benefactors, and similar support was needed for the founding of a Government school of design in Stourbridge during 1851. Representatives of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district were involved to some extent in both endeavours, although it is difficult to assess the impact of their contributions. Records from the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution reveal that donations came from 'M. Grazebrook' [Michael Grazebrook, IV], whose family had been in glass manufacturing for more than a century, and from Francis Rufford, MP, and his grandson Francis T. Rufford, both of whom were involved with the Heath Glassworks near Stourbridge.¹⁰ Another glass manufacturing firm, that of William H., Benjamin and Johnathan Richardson at Wordsley (identified as 'Richardson, Messrs.'), pledged an annual subscription of one guinea. However, the total financial support from those in the glass industry came to just £9 1s, a small portion of the income totaling £68 that is listed in the 1851 *Annual Report* of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution.

Some additional evidence reveals the interest of the Richardson glass manufacturing enterprise for the drawing classes at the Mechanics' Institution and for the embryonic Stourbridge School. In its response to an enquiry from the 1849 Select Committee on the Schools of Design that sought information regarding Stourbridge as a potential site for a provincial school, the Richardson firm surely had the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution in mind when replying that 'we have a small school for general purposes ... which we encourage as much as we can.' This response from the Richardson firm also stated that 'a

¹⁰ Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution, *Annual Report for the Year ending 31st December, 1851* (Stourbridge: J. Heming, 1851), p. 10.

school of design should be established at Stourbridge on purpose to instruct the makers and cutters....'¹¹ In its final report, the 1849 Select Committee characterised Stourbridge as a 'seat of important decorative manufactures' and concluded that a school of design should be established there.¹² In late 1850, J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, reported that a Government grant of £100 was forthcoming for such an institution 'provided that suitable rooms are provided for the business of the proposed school.'¹³

The public meeting at Stourbridge on 3 February 1851 attracted a large gathering in the Corn Exchange to consider the establishment of a Government school. The subsequent printed report of that meeting lists the names of some 65 persons in attendance and records the proceedings, complete with various resolutions and accounts of the remarks of those who voiced support.¹⁴ Of the individuals listed, only two persons associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district can be identified, namely, glass engraver Thomas Wood and John Davis of the glass manufacturing firm Davis, Greathead and Green at Wordsley. A proposed resolution read, in part, 'That the manufacturers of this kingdom are bound by their own interests to promote the formation of Schools of Design....' John Davis seconded

¹¹ *Report from the Select Committee on the Schools of Design together with the proceedings of the committee, minutes of evidence, appendix, and index* (London: HMSO, 27 July 1849), p. 445 [hereafter cited as *Select Committee* (1849)].

¹² *Select Committee* (1849), p. xxviii.

¹³ *Worcester Herald*, 28 December 1850.

¹⁴ *Report of a Public Meeting held at the Corn Exchange, Stourbridge, on Monday, Feb. 3, 1851; the Right Honourable Lord Ward in the chair; to consider the best means of promoting a School of Design for Stourbridge and Kingswinford* (Worcester: Knight and Arrowsmith, 1851) [hereafter cited as *Report of a Public Meeting ... 1851*].

this resolution, saying that he had ‘seen the want of a School of Design for a long time, and seeing that it was now so influentially supported, it could not fail of success.’¹⁵

The records of financial benefactors during the first decade of the operation of the Stourbridge School are incomplete, but some donors associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district can be identified: Joseph Webb, William James Hodgetts, Benjamin Richardson, and Charles Webb, along with the firm of Davis, Greathead and Green (all 1852); and William James Hodgetts, Joseph Webb and Thomas Webb (all 1862).¹⁶ In 1862, Council president Lord Lyttelton, was moved to remark that ‘there are few Subscribers among the Manufacturers of the district, though the local manufactures are of a kind peculiarly to benefit by the neighbourhood of a good school of design....’

Some of the foremost supporters of efforts for drawing instruction within the Mechanics’ Institution were also involved with the Stourbridge School, especially during the first decade of its existence. Among them were the following gentlemen, all of whom served on the initial governing Council of the school: Lord Ward; Lord Lyttelton; Rev. William H. Lyttelton; banker John Amery; solicitor William Blow Collis; J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP; industrialist William Orme Foster; solicitor John Harward; tanner Joseph Pitman; and barrister Robert Scott. Formed in 1851-1852, the first Council of the Stourbridge School also included two glass manufacturers, Benjamin Richardson and Joseph Webb. Benjamin Richardson is listed as a financial benefactor in 1852. Joseph Webb appears in both the 1852 and the 1862 donor listings, so he and other members of the Webb family who were associated with the glass industry may have been frequent donors

¹⁵ *Report of a Public Meeting ... 1851*, p. 10.

¹⁶ The 1852 listing can be seen in Nigel Perry, *A History of Stourbridge* (West Sussex: Phillimore, 2001), p. 167; see also Stourbridge School of Art, ‘List of Subscribers, 1862’ and ‘Cash Account for the Year ending December 31, 1863’ (available in the Stourbridge Public Library, these documents also contain a brief letter signed by Lord Lyttelton).

to the Stourbridge School. Nonetheless, Lord Lyttelton's note that 'few Manufacturers' were among the subscribers in 1862 is an apt characterisation of the involvement of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district at that time regarding the Stourbridge School.

Those who served on the Council of the Stourbridge School typically occupied their positions for periods of many years spanning some decades, and their service was altogether voluntary, as no monetary compensation came from Council membership. Family members who were siblings (or subsequent generations) were often among the ranks of benefactors and supporters, and some were Council members as well. For example, solicitor John Harward was on the Council in the 1850s and 1860s, and his son, solicitor Gainsborough Harward, became a member in the 1870s and served for a number of years. Industrialist James Foster was a strong supporter until his death in 1853, and his nephew and heir William Orme Foster served on the Council for many years. Similarly, various members of the Collis family and the Foley family were active in support of the Stourbridge School over several decades. Glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams joined the Council of the Stourbridge School in the early 1880s, as did glass manufacturers Charles Webb and James Harry Walker. Joseph Silvers-Williams was an active member of the Council for more than three decades, attending meetings and often addressing the annual meeting or participating in the prize-giving, and he was also instrumental in efforts to bring art education to both Brierley Hill and Wordsley.

In short, the glass industry of the Stourbridge district afforded only limited support to the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution in the late 1840s and early 1850s or to the Stourbridge Government School of Art from 1852 to 1862. Token financial support came from enterprises in the local glass industry or from a few individuals associated with the

industry. Only a few persons associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district were involved in the governance or oversight of either of these educational efforts.

Support from the Glass Industry, 1863-1905

During this period of more than four decades, individuals associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district and business firms engaged in glass manufacturing or glass decorating had various avenues through which they could support the Stourbridge School and its mission: membership on the school Council; attendance at annual meetings; regular or occasional donations of money; encouragement for employees to attend the school; establishing prizes for students who were employed in the glass industry; or activity on behalf of a special project, such as an exhibition or the establishment of a museum.

Records of Council membership are incomplete, although newspaper accounts of attendance at annual meetings reveal many names of Council officers and other members. The first Council of the Stourbridge School in 1852 included glass manufacturers Joseph Webb and Benjamin Richardson, but, over the next five decades, the Council typically consisted of gentry, such as Lord Ward and Lord Lyttelton, along with several clergymen, whilst other members were associated with industries such as iron and leather or local business enterprises or came from the ranks of various professions, that is, bankers, solicitors, physicians, or surgeons. In 1882-1883, the Council consisted of 27 officers and members, including glass manufacturer Charles Webb, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams, and James Harry Walker, a young man whose father, Major Walker, had been associated with the Heath Glassworks near Stourbridge.¹⁷ Between 1883 and 1905, no other

¹⁷ In the 1881 PRO Census, Charles Webb, age 46, was listed as 'glass manufacturer employing 140 men 46 boys 10 women.' Joseph Silvers-Williams, age 32, was listed as 'glass manufacturer.' James Harry Walker, age 22, listed as 'artist designer in glass' and

persons associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district were members of the Council of the Stourbridge School.

In reporting the annual meetings of the Stourbridge School, the local newspapers frequently began their accounts with a listing of the names of various persons who were in attendance, and details of the resolutions passed typically included the names of those who made supporting remarks. An examination of the accounts of the Stourbridge School annual meetings in the *Worcester Herald*, *Birmingham Daily Post*, *Advertiser* and *County Express* newspapers between 1863 and 1905 indicates that local glass manufacturers and the proprietors of glass decorating enterprises were seldom in attendance. One finds the occasional mentions of someone representing the Richardson or Webb firms during the 1860s and 1870s, but the names mentioned most frequently in the 1880s and 1890s are those of Walker family members or that of glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams.

Although their attendance at meetings was infrequent, the glass manufacturers and the owners of glass decorating establishments made some modest monetary contributions to the Stourbridge School. As noted earlier, some glass manufacturers contributed to the Mechanics' Institution in the late 1840s or early 1850s, but only a few individuals (such as Benjamin Richardson and Joseph Webb) or firms (Davis, Greathead and Green) are listed in the records from 1852 and/or 1862. Several Stourbridge School students were employed as glass decorators at J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley, and this enterprise paid the fees for some of them during the 1864-1874 period recorded in the *Register of Students*. When the Council made a concerted effort to retire the mortgage debt of the Stourbridge School in

further identified as a 'lodger' residing with Alfred Lucas and family in Heath Road, Upper Swinford, was the son of retired glass manufacturer Major William Walker. In May 1882, James Harry Walker became a partner in the firm Mills, Walker & Co., which took over the glass manufacturing operation at the Heath; see Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley, 1612-2002*, pp. 444-450.

1881-1882, a few local glass industry firms (Thomas Webb and Sons; Boulton and Mills; Stevens & Williams; and Guest Brothers) and individuals associated with the glass industry (William Webb, Edward Webb, and Philip Pargeter) made monetary contributions.

When Sir Rupert Kettle spoke at the annual meeting and prize-giving of the Stourbridge School in January 1883, he suggested that special prizes should be established for students who created meritorious works related to glass design. In October 1884, the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, which had been formed in the late 1850s, promised to offer £10 annually as cash prizes for ‘pupils at the school from local glassworks.’¹⁸ Unfortunately, there is no information available to ascertain the criteria used by the Midland Association to allocate these cash prizes. In response to the announcement of funds from the Midland Association, Stourbridge School art master Edward J. Simms planned to offer classes at times (‘Saturday afternoons’ and ‘Monday afternoons’) convenient for glass makers as long as ‘some half-dozen pupils came forward.’¹⁹ The first prizes ‘to glassmakers’ and ‘to persons engaged in glassworks otherwise than glassmakers’ were determined sometime in 1885 and made public at the annual meeting and prize-giving of the Stourbridge School in January 1886. Subsequently, prizes were awarded annually for about fifteen years (see Appendix Four, ‘Awards to Stourbridge School Students 1852-1905’) until the Midland Association organisation was dissolved in 1902. The numbers of students recognised varied from year to year, with as many as eight students or as few as

¹⁸ *County Express*, 25 October 1884 (some other accounts list the amount as £5). For background on the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, see Matsumura, *The Labour Aristocracy Revisited: The Victorian Flint Glass Makers, 1850-80*, pp. 130-134.

¹⁹ *Advertiser*, 24 January 1885 and *Pottery Gazette*, February 1885. The Saturday class was probably for advanced students who wished to do ‘modelling,’ and it was soon discontinued; see *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886. There is no indication in any later reports regarding the Stourbridge School that the Monday afternoon class was actually begun.

three students designated as recipients of a monetary prize, but the promised total of £10 annually seems never to have been disbursed and relatively few students received awards. Several students (Francis R. Grice, Samuel C. Phipps, Frederick Noke, Ernest H. Windmill, James F. Moore and Charles W. Smith) were frequent prizewinners, with Francis R. Grice recognized on 14 occasions, Samuel C. Phipps on nine occasions, Frederick Noke on eight occasions, Ernest C. Windmill on seven occasions, and James F. Moore and Charles W. Smith on six occasions each. Almost all of the students from the Stourbridge School who received monetary prizes from the Midland Association were employed in the glass decorating industry, as the only exceptions were Frederick Scriven (son of glass maker John Scriven) and glass blower Joseph Flavell, both of whom were awarded prizes at the annual meeting in January 1886. When the awards to Scriven and Flavell were announced, a representative of the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers noted that ‘only two glassmakers competed.’²⁰

The most substantial glass manufacturers and glass decorating firms of the Stourbridge district sometimes loaned examples of their products to be displayed in the art exhibitions that often accompanied the annual public meetings of the Stourbridge School, but, as noted below, attempts in 1853 and again in 1885 to create an ongoing museum emphasizing glassware did not come to fruition. An exhibition in 1865 included glassware from the Heath Glassworks, the Webb firms, and Davis, Greathead and Green. Some of the items in the 1865 exhibition were ‘done by old students’ [probably Josiah Fairfax Muckley and/or John Northwood I, Joseph Northwood and Edwin Grice, who were associated with J. & J. Northwood]. Other items were loaned by local glass enterprises ‘to show the

²⁰ *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886. For similar circumstances, see *Advertiser*, 14 January 1888 and *Advertiser*, 12 January 1889.

proficiency that might be reached by the application of art to this elegant manufacture.’²¹ A year later, ‘richly cut glass ... lent for the occasion’ was displayed.²² The 1885 annual meeting featured a large exhibition of glassware produced by local manufacturers, including the cameo glass Portland Vase by John Northwood I and articles decorated by Josiah Fairfax Muckley.²³ Other newspaper accounts of Stourbridge School art exhibitions that featured local glassware were referenced in Chapter Five regarding the Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition in April-May 1905 that prefaced the opening of the Stourbridge School in the Free Library and Technical Institute.

When the Stourbridge School was in its infancy in 1853, the interest in establishing a museum was an expression of desire rather than a concerted effort. In April 1885, however, Council president George Perry and secretary A. W. Worthington carried forward the suggestion of Sir Philip Cunliffe Owen for a museum that was made at the January 1885 annual meeting. Council member Charles Evers-Swindell donated £50, and Perry and Worthington prepared a circular letter to publicise the effort. Their letter began with a cautious note, suggesting that a separate building and the appointment of a curator were not likely, although the Council was ready ‘to form the nucleus of an Art Museum in its present building.’²⁴ The Council stood against ‘a mere collection of Miscellaneous Curiosities’ but in favour of the acquisition of ‘such objects of artistic value as might especially tend to develope [sic] and promote the Local Art Manufactures’ along with ‘specimens to illustrate

²¹ *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865.

²² *Stourbridge Observer*, 22 December 1866.

²³ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 18 February 1885.

²⁴ Stourbridge School of Art, ‘Proposed Museum’ (circular letter dated April, 1885). This document is in the Stourbridge Public Library.

the history of the Glass Manufacture ... that would mark the progress and direct the taste of future workers.’ Lastly, the Council sought donations of suitable glass articles. However, little mention was made of this proposal for a museum during the latter 1880s, and, as noted in the previous chapter, the monies donated by Charles Evers-Swindell were ultimately used to fund an endowed scholarship beginning in 1891.

In summary, some individuals associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district and a few business firms engaged in glass manufacturing or glass decorating contributed funds to the Stourbridge School at various times. However, most financial support for the school came from local elites including gentry, businessmen, professionals and tradesmen where those in the glass industry were but a small minority. Likewise, membership on the school Council and attendance at meetings followed this same pattern. Whilst some glass manufacturers and glass decorating firms loaned glassware for various short-lived art exhibitions in conjunction with the annual public meetings, the prospects for a museum in Stourbridge did not generate any measure of response from the glass industry of the Stourbridge district.

Art Masters, Pupil Teachers and the Glass Industry

As noted in Chapters Four and Five of this thesis, none of the six gentlemen (Henry Alexander Bowler, Andrew MacCallum, George Paterson Yeats, William Plastons Bowen, Edward John Simms, and George Henry Cromack) who served as art master at Stourbridge during various years between 1851 and 1905 had any direct experience with glass manufacturing or glass decorating.²⁵ However, each of them conducted drawing lessons

²⁵ Whilst at the Worcester School of Art in 1855, William Bowen submitted a design for a vase to secure a travel stipend to the *Exposition Universelle*, but, given the proximity of the

and other art instruction with a number of boys and men who were employed in various areas of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district concurrent with their enrolment in the Stourbridge School.

Each art master was talented and skilled in specific areas of fine art such as sculpture or painting, but, regarding the teaching methods that might be employed, their instructional practices were constrained by the rigid twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum as well as the rules, regulations and policies of the Department of Science and Art, which mandated a strong emphasis upon elementary drawing and copying exercises as well as shading. Much of the time for instruction was devoted to drawing, although Yeats, Bowen, Simms and Cromack each developed and oversaw some specific areas of advanced work in fine art, such as painting from nature or drawing the human figure from life.

As noted elsewhere in this chapter, various members of the Council of the Stourbridge School sometimes expressed their concerns regarding the disappointing numbers of students from the local glass industry who were enrolled. Unfortunately, minutes of the private Council meetings have not survived, so any other discussions of this matter among Council members or with the art master are not extant. During the 1884 public meeting of the Stourbridge School, Council member A. W. Worthington requested art master Simms ‘to notice what kind of work was being done in the glassworks of this district and as far as possible to adapt the teaching of the school to the end which it was desirable to promote.’²⁶ Whether or not Worthington had design for glassmaking and/or

Worcester school to the local ceramic industry, his design was likely for such an item; see *Third Report of the Department of Science and Art* (London: HMSO, 1856), p. 216.

²⁶ *County Express*, 12 January 1884 and *Advertiser*, 12 January 1884.

glass decorating in mind cannot be ascertained, but his request reflects a desire to secure a close affinity of the instruction in the school with the needs of the local glass industry.

Nonetheless, each of the art masters (and/or the assistant art masters and the pupil teachers) would have instructed numerous students who were then employed in the local glass industry. As noted in the next section of this chapter, many of those students won local or Government (that is, national) prizes (see Appendix Four, 'Awards to Stourbridge School Students 1852-1905' in which the names of students known to be associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district are in bold type). Some of the most proficient students became pupil teachers, receiving a modest stipend and remission of fees. In the 1850s, students John Northwood I and Edwin Grice, both of whom were employed in glass decorating, won numerous awards.²⁷ John Northwood I was a pupil teacher at the Stourbridge School in 1861, about the time he and his brother Joseph Northwood began a glass decorating firm styled J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley, and Edwin Grice became a pupil teacher in 1863-1864 whilst he was employed as a glass etcher at J. & J. Northwood. Thomas A. Guest, then 22, was a pupil teacher in 1861 and was listed as a 'glass painter' in the 1861 PRO Census. In 1866, Thomas Woodall, age 17, was a pupil teacher whilst employed as a glass etcher at J. & J. Northwood. Others employed in glass decorating who were also assistant art masters or pupil teachers include Ludwig Kny in 1886 and, in 1891, Samuel C. Phipps and Francis R. Grice, the son of Edwin Grice.²⁸

²⁷ At age 14, John Northwood's occupation was listed as 'glass painter' in the 1851 PRO Census, and Edwin Grice was a glass etcher. Edwin Grice was later associated with the glass etching firm Grice Brothers; see Hajdamach, *British Glass 1800-1914*, p. 195.

²⁸ Two former Stourbridge School students, Elizabeth Richardson and Martha Richardson, became assistants to the art master at the Wordsley School of Art in the 1890s, and their tenure there continued into the first decade of the twentieth century. These women were daughters of glass manufacturer Henry Gething Richardson.

John Alexander Service was a pupil teacher at the Stourbridge School in the late 1860s or early 1870s whilst employed in glass decorating, and he was appointed assistant art master for the Stourbridge School class sessions in 1873-1874. Nearly a decade thereafter, in letters to the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction in 1883, Service described his duties and compensation in rather acerbic terms: '[I was] devoting three nights per week, 2 ½ hours each, to assistance at the school of art, besides giving instruction at three separate local schools in the daytime (necessitating my absence from my usual employ) for the handsome sum of 15/. per year.'²⁹ Service asserted that 'a goodly portion of the work of training the younger students devolves upon the assistant master,' and he stated further that former pupil teachers John Northwood I and Thomas Woodall, who were, in 1883, then 'at the very top of their profession ... cannot afford to give the time and attention required for the miserable salary attached to the post.' Elsewhere in his letters to the Royal Commission, Service suggested that 'the masters not having a practical knowledge of the trade, cannot impart it to the student.' The implications of Service's charges are clear enough, pointing to a disconnect between the mission of the Stourbridge School (that is, instruction in drawing and art to train designers for local industry) and the practice of the school (that is, instruction in drawing and other basic levels of the South Kensington curriculum, with very few students progressing to higher levels such as design).

Although many students who were employed in the glass decorating trade enrolled in the Stourbridge School, the art masters who met these students were neither willing nor able to adapt their teaching of drawing and other instruction in art to the decorative glass

²⁹ *Second Report of the Royal Commissioners on Technical Instruction*, vol. III (London: HMSO, 1884), pp. 657-658. According to the 1881 PRO Census, Service lived in Wollaston with his wife and daughter, and his occupation, at Thomas Webb and Sons, was given as 'designer in glass works.' Little else has come to light regarding Service's career in the glass industry; see Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002*, p. 450.

industry of the Stourbridge district and, thus, were unable to address the specific requirements of the decorative glass industry. Moreover, those students who had employment experience in the decorative glass industry as glass cutters, glass engravers or glass etchers and who persevered to become pupil teachers themselves were deterred from continuing in a teaching capacity at the Stourbridge School by the demands of their employment as well as the meagre financial compensation.

Stourbridge Students from the Glass Industry 1852-1905

During the period of more than five decades considered in this study, the Stourbridge School sought to enrol students who were employed in local industries, particularly iron and glass. The Stourbridge School offered an evening class on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays for males from 1851 until the mid-1880s and for both males and females from the mid-1880s onward. The structured programme of drawing and art instruction was the twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum, so students began with exercises in elementary drawing along with much copying of examples before they progressed to shading from flat or solid examples and to considerations of colour. Design was at stage 23, the apex of the curriculum.

Various sources are available to identify students at the Stourbridge School who were associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. Early reports from the Department of Practical Art and its successor, the Department of Science and Art, contain some statistical information regarding the occupations of students. The handwritten *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 is an especially rich resource, as the ages, names and occupations of many students and parents (that is, father) are recorded for the Male Evening Class from 1864 to 1874 (see Appendix Six, 'Stourbridge School *Register of Students*, 1864-1874'). For this study, newspaper accounts naming Stourbridge School

students who gained local or Government prizes or other recognition were scrutinised (see Appendix Four, 'Awards to Stourbridge School Students 1852-1905'), and available occupational information regarding those students and/or parents (that is, father) was sought using the decennial 1841 to 1911 PRO Census rolls.³⁰

Records regarding the evening class during 1852-1853 indicate that numerous students were employed in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. During 1852, the evening class of 59 students included 20 who were associated with the glass industry: nine glass engravers, seven glass painters, two glass manufacturers, and two glass blowers. Of the 57 evening class students described as 'artisans' in 1853, there were nine glass engravers, four glass manufacturers, and seven glass painters.³¹ The paucity of glass manufacturers and the absence of glass blowers in the 1853 class were due to the demands of the well-established glass manufacturing work schedule, which consisted of six hours work/six hours off commencing at 6 or 7 p. m. on Monday evening or Tuesday morning and ending Saturday at noon or one o'clock. The annual report of the Department of Practical Art reveals that the two glass manufacturers and the two glass blowers enrolled in the Stourbridge School during 1852 were 'prevented by their occupation from receiving more than two lessons per week,' and, because of this fact, they were 'admitted at half-fee.'³² The traditional glass manufacturing work schedule remained essentially unchanged throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, so this factor must be considered when evaluating the record of the Stourbridge School in enrolling students from

³⁰ The website ukcensusonline.com allows ready access to these PRO Census rolls.

³¹ *First Report of the Department of Practical Art* (London: HMSO, 1853), p. 130 and *First Report of the Department of Science and Art* (London: HMSO, 1854), pp. 129 and 152-153.

³² *First Report of the Department of Practical Art*, p. 138. For information on the working cycle, see Matsumura, *The Labour Aristocracy Revisited*, pp. 33-35.

the glass manufacturing industry within the Stourbridge district.

During 1852-1864, Stourbridge School students claimed a number of local and Government medals or similar awards. Glass engraver Josiah Fairfax Muckley (b. 1832) had four Government medals during 1852-1854, two of which were for designs, although no descriptions of them have come to light.³³ Brothers John Northwood I (b. 1836) and Joseph Northwood (b. 1840) had several medals between them from 1854 through 1861. At age 14, John Northwood's occupation was given as 'glass painter' in the 1851 PRO Census, and, whilst later in partnership with his brother Joseph at J. & J. Northwood, he went on to win great fame in the 1870s for his cameo glass Portland Vase and other works.³⁴ After John Northwood I left J. & J. Northwood in 1882 to become art director and works manager at Stevens & Williams, Joseph Northwood carried on the business.³⁵ Glass cutter William Adey (b. 1844), glass painter Thomas A. Guest (b. 1839) and glass etcher Edwin Grice (b. 1838), who was employed at J. & J. Northwood, won many local and Government awards between 1858 and 1864.³⁶ William Henry Stuart (b. 1850), the eldest son of glass

³³ By 1861, Muckley was a principal in his father's glass engraving business; see *Corporation General and Trades Directory of Birmingham* (Birmingham: William Cornish, 1861), pp. 800-801.

³⁴ See for example, *Art Journal*, 16 (1877), pp. 126-127.

³⁵ The firm's advertisement in the *Pottery Gazette*, January 1883, p. 70, described this enterprise as the 'oldest established house in the trade' for 'all kinds of etching and engraving on glass, earthenware, and china....'

³⁶ Beginning in the mid-1860s, Thomas Guest, Edward Guest and Richard Guest operated a glass etching firm styled Guest Brothers in Brettell Lane; the firm's advertisement in the *Pottery Gazette*, 1 January 1883, p. 32, described this enterprise as 'glass globe manufacturers, designers and decorators for cut, etched and engraved table glass, china, earthenware, &c., specialists in crests monograms, badges, &c. in every variety and style for the trade.' See also Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914*, p. 192 and Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002*, p. 334.

manufacturer Frederick Stuart, had a local medal in 1862.³⁷

The handwritten *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 contains class rosters listing students by name, and several of these rosters record ages and occupations. The 1864 Male Evening Class, enrolling 89 students, is a representative example. Occupations are listed for 55 of the students, with 26 identified as either 'glass cutter' or 'glass engraver' or 'glass etcher.' Many of these 26 students were ages 13-17, so they were likely apprentices and relatively new to the trade.³⁸ A few student occupations were listed simply as 'glass trade.' The class rosters for 1865 to 1874 are much the same (see Appendix Six, 'Stourbridge School *Register of Students*, 1864-1874'), as the occupations of glass cutter, glass engraver or glass etcher were recorded for numerous students.

Although the occupations of a parent (that is, father) are not always listed in the *Register of Students*, an examination of this area indicates that the young sons of several

³⁷ One of Frederick Stuart's daughters, Helen Stuart, won two Government prizes during 1885-1886. Ellen Davis (b. 1850), daughter of glass manufacturer John Davis, is listed in the *Register of Students* for 1864. Helen Webb, wife of glass manufacturer Walter Wilkes Webb, is listed in the *Register of Students* for 1867; their daughter, Edith Helen Webb (b. 1879) had local prizes in 1895-1896 and won a Government bronze medal in 1897 for a plant drawing in outline and another Government award in 1899 for a painting from still life. Edith Helen Webb's occupation is given as 'governess' in the 1901 PRO Census. Ida C. Mills (b. 1866), daughter of glass manufacturer George Mills, won a local prize in 1880. Three daughters of prominent flint glass manufacturer Henry Gething Richardson attended the Stourbridge School and were recognized with local or Government awards. May Richardson (b. 1862) won a local prize in 1881-1882, but no other information about her is available. Daughters Elizabeth Richardson (b. 1859 and first listed in the *Register of Students* during 1874) and Martha Richardson (b. 1860) won some local prizes in the late 1870s, and both of them are listed with the occupation 'artist' in the 1881 PRO Census. Elizabeth won three Government prizes in 1890 (for outline drawing from cast, shading from models and shading from cast), and both Elizabeth and Martha are listed with the same occupation, namely, 'artist in oil and watercolour painting,' in the 1891 PRO Census. Martha's occupation is given as 'artist painter' in the 1901 PRO Census. Florence Williams (b. 1878), daughter of Joseph Silvers-Williams, had local prizes in 1899 and 1900.

³⁸ The occupations of many students who attended the Stourbridge School in successive years are not always recorded, perhaps because they were well known to the art master.

men associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district were in the evening class at the Stourbridge School. Two sons of glass manufacturer Frederick Stuart, namely, Frederick Stuart, junior (b. 1851) and Arthur Stuart (b. 1853), were enrolled in the Stourbridge School c. 1864-1865, and an older son, William Stuart (b. 1850) had been at the school a few years earlier. Benjamin Levi and William Levi, sons of Benjamin C. Levi, the proprietor of a glass cutting firm, attended the Stourbridge School in 1864 whilst they were employed as glass cutters in their father's enterprise. Alfred Hingley, George Hingley and William Hingley, whose fathers were involved in the 'glass trade,' attended at various times between 1865 and 1874, and both William Hingley and Alfred Hingley claimed prizes during the 1870s and early 1880s.³⁹

Many of the students at the Stourbridge School were employed at the J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley, and some were also members of the Northwood family. Glass etcher James Benjamin Hill (b. 1850) was likely an apprentice at J. & J. Northwood when he first enrolled at the Stourbridge School on 9 May 1864, and an entry in the *Register of Students* indicates that Hill's student fees were 'paid for by Messers. Northwood.' James Hill had his first local prize in 1866, and, between 1867 and 1885, he won numerous local and Government awards, including several for glass design.⁴⁰ Edwin Grice (b. 1838) won several awards in the late 1850s before being employed as a glass etcher at J. & J. Northwood. Glass etcher Thomas Woodall (b. 1849) was awarded

³⁹ For glass decorating and related businesses associated with the Hingley families, see Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002*, pp. 451-452.

⁴⁰ Some of Hill's prize-winning drawings are in the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum). For illustrations, see Hajdamach, *British Glass 1800-1914*, pp. 179 and 190-191. James Hill was in charge of the acid etching operations at J. & J. Northwood, and he also did some work in cameo glass; see Hajdamach, *20th Century British Glass*, p. 73-74 and David Whitehouse, *English Cameo Glass in the Corning Museum of Glass* (Corning: Corning Museum of Glass, 1994), p. 29.

Government prizes in 1862, 1867, and 1879, and his brother George Woodall (b. 1850) had a Government prize in 1868.⁴¹ Other Stourbridge School students employed at J. & J. Northwood were machinist Daniel Beech (b. 1845), glass etcher Albert Gyngell (b. 1842), and glass engravers Benjamin Fenn (b. 1853),⁴² Francis Scheibner (b. 1853), Joshua Hodgetts (b. 1857), Joseph Hill (b. 1863) and Samuel C. Phipps (b. 1868).⁴³

Harry Northwood (b. 1860), the eldest son of former Stourbridge school student John Northwood I, enrolled briefly in the Stourbridge School at age nine before beginning again in 1872. He claimed a local book prize (Bulwer-Lytton's *Last of the Barons*) for glass decoration in 1878.⁴⁴ Harry Northwood was employed as a glass etcher at J. & J.

⁴¹ In 1862, Thomas Woodall and George Woodall were students at the Dudley School of Art. They received unspecified certificates at an annual meeting and prize-giving on 18 February 1862; see *Birmingham Daily Post*, 19 February 1862. In 1863, George Woodall was awarded a medal for his 'outline drawing of pilaster of the gates of the Madeline' and a prize for passing the second grade level examination in geometry; see *Birmingham Daily Post*, 19 October 1863 and 16 November 1863. For details on their lives and careers, see Christopher Woodall Perry, *The Cameo Glass of Thomas and George Woodall* (Somerset: Richard Dennis, 2000), Geoffrey W. Beard, 'George Woodall's Cameo Glass,' *Country Life*, 11 February 1954, p. 347; and H. Jack Haden, *Artists in Cameo Glass: Incorporating Thomas Woodall's Memoirs* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 1993).

⁴² For an illustration of an engraved vase attributed to Fenn, see G. Bernard Hughes, 'A Rainbow with a Sparkle: Stourbridge Glass,' *Country Life*, 3 December 1964, p. 1502. Benjamin Fenn's occupation is listed as 'glass engraver' in the 1881 PRO Census.

⁴³ John Northwood II, *John Northwood: His Contributions to the Stourbridge Flint Glass Industry 1850-1902* (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1958), p. 79. Joshua Hodgetts began work in the glass industry at age 8, and he attended the Stourbridge School beginning in 1874; when employed at J. & J. Northwood and later at Stevens & Williams, he designed cameo glass and intaglio engraving; see R. S. Williams-Thomas and Sam Thompson, '19th Century Cameo Glass,' *The Antiques Journal* (September 1979), pp. 30-32 and 49; Lt.-Col. R. S. Williams-Thomas, 'Six Generations Reflected in Glass,' *Glass* (February 1983), pp. 54, 56, and 58; Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914*, pp. 190, 217-218 and 440-441; Hajdamach, *20th Century British Glass*, pp. 24, 27-32 and 73-74; and Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002*, pp. 483 and 486.

⁴⁴ For 1878, book prizes for glass decoration also went to James Hill (Cassell's *Book of Birds*) and William Northwood (Geikie's *Life in the Woods*); see *County Express*, 11 January 1879.

Northwood until 1881, when he emigrated to the United States and began a lengthy and successful career as a glass decorator, glass designer and glass manufacturer.⁴⁵ Whilst at the Stourbridge School in the 1870s and early 1880s, Harry Northwood received art instruction from art master William P. Bowen, who was particularly interested in having his students study ‘flowers, fruit and plants from nature’ and once made the statement that ‘the study of flowers and foliage drawn from nature ... [is] the only true mode of arriving at facility for design.’⁴⁶ When Harry Northwood designed glassware for his Northwood Glass Co. in Martins Ferry, Ohio, USA, in the early 1890s, he created realistic patterns called Royal Oak and Royal Ivy that probably would have pleased art master Bowen.⁴⁷

Joseph Northwood’s son, Charles O. Northwood (b. 1865), was also a glass etcher at J. & J. Northwood, and he claimed prizes during the 1880s whilst at the Stourbridge School. John Northwood II (b. 1870), the son of John Northwood I (and Margaret Lawley, a J. & J. Northwood employee), also worked at J. & J. Northwood. In the 1880s and early 1890s whilst a student at the Stourbridge School, he had many awards, including several prizes for glass design from the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers.⁴⁸ Glass

⁴⁵ William Heacock, James Measell and Berry Wiggins, *Harry Northwood: The Early Years, 1881-1900* (Marietta: Antique Publication, 1990) and *Harry Northwood: The Wheeling Years, 1901-1925* (Marietta: Antique Publications, 1991).

⁴⁶ *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865; *Advertiser*, 21 December 1867 and *County Express*, 21 December 1867.

⁴⁷ Heacock, Measell and Wiggins, *Harry Northwood: The Early Years, 1881-1900*, pp. 35-37, 39, 41-43 and 47.

⁴⁸ For an illustration of a cameo vase attributed to John Northwood II, see G. Bernard Hughes, ‘A Rainbow with a Sparkle: Stourbridge Glass,’ *Country Life*, 3 December 1964, p. 1500. John Northwood II succeeded his father as art director at the Stevens & Williams firm in 1902, and he had a long career there. In March 1924, at a meeting of the Society of Glass Technology held in Stourbridge, he presented a paper describing his father’s ‘duplication’ of the Portland Vase; see *County Express*, 22 March 1924 and *Journal of the Society of Glass Technology*, 8 (June 1924), pp. 85-91. Some years thereafter, he authored a

etcher William Northwood, a cousin of John Northwood I and Joseph Northwood, worked at J. & J. Northwood whilst attending the Stourbridge School. He won several prizes whilst there, and, during his time at the art school in Wordsley in the late 1880s, he claimed a significant Government prize, as noted later in this chapter.

Glass etcher Joseph Locke (1847-1936) attended the Stourbridge school briefly in 1870-1871, whilst he was employed at Guest Brothers⁴⁹ as a ‘designer on glass,’ according to the 1871 PRO Census. After working for other glass decorating firms in the Stourbridge district, Locke emigrated to the United States in 1883, and he had a lengthy career in the American glass industry, acquiring patents for glass manufacture and for glass design.⁵⁰

Frederick Carder (b. 1863) entered the Stourbridge School sometime in the mid-1870s, whilst working as a labourer shoveling coal to fire kilns at Leys Pottery, which was owned by his grandfather.⁵¹ Carder was interested in art, and that led him to enrol in the Stourbridge School. In a brief autobiography written many years later, he recounted his experience regarding his travel and attendance in the evening classes:

As my leanings were toward artistic endeavor, I decided to go to the Stourbridge School of Art three nights a week [Monday, Wednesday and Friday]. After I had tea

general article on cameo glass with illustrations; see John Northwood, ‘Stourbridge Cameo Glass,’ *Journal of the Society of Glass Technology*, 33 (June 1949), pp. 106-113.

⁴⁹ Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914*, pp. 192-193 and 424 and Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002*, p. 334.

⁵⁰ Alexander Silverman, ‘Joseph Locke, Artist,’ *The Glass Industry*, 17 (August 1936), pp. 272-275; Joseph H. Locke and Jane T. Locke, *Locke Art Glass: A Guide for Collectors* (New York: Dover Publications, 1987); and H. Jack Haden, *Artists in Cameo Glass Incorporating Thomas Woodall’s Memoirs*, pp. 1-2.

⁵¹ These details of Frederick Carder’s life are from Thomas S. Buechner, *Frederick Carder: His Life and Work* (Corning: Corning Museum of Glass, 1952), Paul V. Gardner, *The Glass of Frederick Carder* (New York: Crown, 1971) and Thomas P. Dimitroff, ed., *Frederick Carder and Steuben Glass* (Atglen: Schiffer Publishing, 1998).

and washed up and changed my clothes, I walked the three miles, worked at the school and came back home usually about eleven p. m.⁵²

Frederick Carder's interest in clay prompted him to attend science classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays at the Mechanics' Institution in Dudley, necessitating 'another three miles walk there and back each night.' At Dudley, he studied chemistry, electricity and metallurgy.

Harry Northwood was a classmate in the Stourbridge School, and, through him about 1878, Frederick Carder met John Northwood I as Northwood was being celebrated for his cameo glass recreation of the Portland Vase and was engaged in other cameo glass projects.

Frederick Carder began to visit John Northwood's studio on Saturdays to observe and to receive comments on his own work. The J. & J. Northwood enterprise was often decorating glassware produced at the Stevens & Williams manufacturing firm, and, when John Northwood I learned about a position for a draughtsman at Stevens & Williams in 1880 or 1881, he encouraged Frederick Carder to put in his application, which was successful.

Frederick Carder had won local prizes at the Stourbridge School in 1879 and 1880, and, between 1881 and 1886, he claimed several local and Government awards, including prizes for glass designs. In April 1887, Frederick Carder and several other students left the Stourbridge School to attend art classes at Wordsley, as noted later in this chapter.

In the late 1870s and during the 1880s and 1890s, other Stourbridge School students who were associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district were recognized with local and Government prizes. Glass engraver Theodore Kny (b. 1858), who had a local book prize in 1877, was the son of glass engraver Ludwig Kny, who had emigrated from Bohemia to England. Glass engraver Frederick Englebert Kny, who also emigrated from

⁵² Frederick Carder, *The Autobiography of an Englishman in the United States of America* (typescript, c. 1957). This is in the Rakow Library at the Corning Museum of Glass in Corning, New York, USA (hereafter cited as Carder, *Autobiography*).

Bohemia in 1860 and was employed at Thomas Webb's Dennis Glassworks, had two sons, Ludwig Kny (b. 1868) and William Kny (b. 1870), and, during the 1880s and 1890s whilst at the Stourbridge School, brothers Ludwig Kny and William Kny claimed more than 20 prizes, including monetary awards established by the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers. Francis R. Grice (b. 1868) was a Stourbridge School student who had numerous prizes and was employed as a glass etcher. Glass engraver Ernest H. Windmill (b. 1870) gained many prizes in the 1880s and early 1890s.

Over the years, some Stourbridge School students created designs specifically intended for glass decoration, and their efforts were recognized with local or Government awards. James Hill, a glass etcher at the J. & J. Northwood firm in Wordsley and who first enrolled in the Stourbridge School in 1864, had a prize for an engraved glass vase in 1869. Over the next several years, Hill claimed several local and Government prizes for decorative glass designs, including a Government Queen's Prize in 1878. Other glass decorators employed at J. & J. Northwood—including Harry Northwood, William Northwood, Thomas Woodall, and Samuel C. Phipps—were recognized with local or Government prizes for glass design in the 1870s or 1880s. Also in the 1880s, Ernest H. Windmill and George J. Carder were frequent prizewinners, and, in the 1890s, Frederick Noke, an employee at Stevens & Williams in Brierley Hill, had several prizes. In 1900, Frederick Noke won a Government bronze medal for 'The Dancers,' a modelled design in wax for a cameo glass plaque.⁵³

Insofar as can be determined from available sources, most of the Stourbridge students who had prizes for glass design were employed as glass decorators, not in glass

⁵³ Frederick Noke's 'The Dancers' is on display at the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum); see Charles Hajdamach, 'The Discovery of Frederick Noke,' *Cameo*, 8 (Winter 1995-1996), p. 5.

manufacturing. James Hill was a longtime employee of J. & J. Northwood,⁵⁴ and Thomas Woodall also worked there as an apprentice. Woodall was later employed to work on cameo glass at the Thomas Webb firm, and George E. Round and William Hill were also part of a group of cameo glass artists there under Thomas Woodall's supervision during the 1880s.⁵⁵ Both James F. Moore and Frederick Noke were employees at Stevens & Williams during 1900-1901, and they were recognized with local medals for glass design at the annual meeting of the Stourbridge School in January 1901. Moore's work was a design for a cameo claret jug, and Noke's works included a design for a water set (jug and goblets) in rock crystal and a design for a claret jug in flint glass.⁵⁶

The glass design achievements of several former Stourbridge School students were on display and recognized as an important part of the 1884 International Health Exhibition in London.⁵⁷ Although this exhibition was devoted principally to areas that directly affected public health, the Department of Science and Art participated in this event to promote

⁵⁴ The Rakow Library at the Corning Museum of Glass in Corning, New York, USA, has a scrapbook containing detailed sketches for etched glass articles produced at J. & J. Northwood (http://exhibitdb.cmog.org/opacimages/PDFs/Books/Rakow_1000130297.pdf). This item came to the Rakow Library from a family member, and a note signed by Frederick Carder identifies the scrapbook as 'Sketches of etched glass J. J. Northwood about 1881-1884.' Some sketches are initialed 'FC,' so they were likely designed by Frederick Carder. Others are initialed 'SW,' perhaps indicating that these were etchings created especially for the Stevens & Williams firm. Some of these designs for etchings are likely the work of J. & J. Northwood employee James Hill.

⁵⁵ Perry, *The Cameo Glass of Thomas and George Woodall*, p. 23. For an illustration and description of Thomas Woodall's cameo plaque 'Venus and Cupids,' see *Art Journal*, 32 (December 1895), p. iii.

⁵⁶ *County Express*, 19 January 1901. In the summer of 1905, Moore and Noke were awarded Government bronze medals for glass designs. Moore's design was for a vase in crystal, and Noke's design was for table glass; see *County Express*, 5 August 1905.

⁵⁷ For background on this event, see Anthony David Edwards, *The Role of International Exhibitions in Britain, 1850-1910* (Amherst: Cambria Press, 2008), pp. 135-152.

technical education, and there was a sizeable display of glassware produced at factories in the Stourbridge district. The Stourbridge School could point with pride to the former students whose work in cameo glass (Joshua Hodgetts, Charles O. Northwood, John Northwood I, William Northwood, George Woodall and Thomas Woodall) or other decorated glass (William Adey, Frederick Carder, James Hill, Ludwig Kny, Theodore Kny, John Northwood I, Joseph Northwood, William Northwood and Francis Scheibner) dominated the two hundred glass articles displayed at the International Health Exhibition.⁵⁸ Thomas Webb and Co. was awarded a medal, and the firm's display of cameo glass at the International Health Exhibition was noted, albeit briefly, in local newspapers. In accounts of the Stourbridge School's Council meeting in October 1884, both the *Birmingham Daily Post* and the *County Express* reported only that numerous glass articles 'designed by past and present pupils' were displayed at the exhibition, and the *County Express* mentioned that the Webb firm had been awarded a medal for its cameo glass.⁵⁹

In terms of attracting students associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, the Stourbridge School certainly had some measure of success, although the students tended to come from the glass decorating area rather than from glass manufacturing. There were numerous students who held employment in glass decorating establishments, especially J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley, and, over the years, several students who were glass decorators had prize-winning projects in glass design. In an effort

⁵⁸ 'Glass—Cut, Engraved, Flashed, Pressed, &c.,' *The Health Exhibition Literature*, vol. XVII (London: Executive Council of the International Health Exhibition, 1884), pp. 222-225. Whilst about 175 articles are listed, fewer than 30 are credited to a specific designer, so it is likely that those named were responsible for some additional items and other former Stourbridge School students may have been responsible for other items.

⁵⁹ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 24 October 1884; *County Express*, 25 October 1884 and 15 November 1884; see also *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 25 October 1884.

to attract students from local industries to the Stourbridge School, art master Edward J. Simms initiated the 'Penny Class.' As the name implies, this class, which was first scheduled in September 1891, consisted of drawing instruction for a fee of 1d per lesson. Interested students could come to the class on any weekday evening, so it was possible for those working in glass manufacturing to join the class from time to time, depending upon their work schedules. Those students already enrolled in the Evening Class (meeting Monday, Wednesday and Friday with fees of 6s per quarter) could take additional instruction for 1d per lesson on Tuesday and/or Thursday. As one might expect, student numbers increased in the fall of 1891, but fluctuations in attendance from day to day probably presented a challenge to both the art master and the pupil teachers. Just a few months later in January 1892, Simms related that the Penny Classes were 'going on satisfactorily,' but that he 'would like to see students attend more regularly.'⁶⁰ In October 1892, the Stourbridge School Council reported attendance in the Penny Class averaged 81 per night during the 1891-1892 but fell to 50 per night during September-October 1892.⁶¹

The Penny Classes continued for several more years, but they did not attract students employed in glass manufacturing, so the next Stourbridge School art master, George Henry Cromack, decided to offer a special 'Morning Class' for males only beginning in the fall of 1894. This class met from 10 am to noon on Monday, the only weekday when most of the boys and men employed in glass manufacturing could be free from work until at least 6 or 7 pm. The fee for this class was 5s per quarter, and students who enrolled were permitted to attend any other evening classes for an additional 3s per

⁶⁰ *Advertiser*, 9 January 1892.

⁶¹ *County Express*, 29 October 1892.

quarter.⁶² Despite the low fee and the set day and time that would not conflict with glass manufacturing work schedules, Cromack's special Morning Class attracted very few students and was discontinued in the summer of 1897. A few years later, the *County Express* voiced its agreement with Council member Joseph Silvers-Williams who 'publicly lamented' that an exhibition of student works contained so few that were 'applicable to local industry.'⁶³ This remark was followed by an interesting revelation regarding the outcome of the special Morning Class for students who were employed in glass manufacturing: 'The headmaster [George Henry Cromack] informs us that he did arrange a class especially for working glassmakers ... and for twelve months he waited every Monday morning for the students—who came not!'

Beyond the Stourbridge district, others in the glass industry expressed concern regarding the lack of enrolment in Government schools by students who were employed in glass manufacturing. In 1897, glass designer Harry J. Powell, who was associated with the Whitefriars firm in London, sought to define the role of technical education regarding glassmaking, and, in so doing, he addressed the matter of glass workers enrolling in schools of art.⁶⁴ His remarks and other statements appearing in the *Journal of the Society of Arts* are applicable to the situation in the Stourbridge School. Whilst Powell acknowledged the potential worth of 'artistic training' for those employed in glass works, he noted that they must be 'conversant with the technique of glass making,' and he went on to argue that they

⁶² *County Express*, 25 August 1894. In 1866, the Council noted that glassmakers 'are not able to attend upon any other day than Monday' and urged that 'some special arrangement should be made to meet this circumstance' (see *Advertiser*, 22 December 1866).

⁶³ *County Express*, 19 January 1901.

⁶⁴ Harry J. Powell, 'Technical Education in Relation to Glass Manufacture,' *Journal of the Society of Arts*, 45 (July 23, 1897), pp. 849-851.

‘are able to learn more of glass design in the works than in a school.’ Regarding young glass blowers, Powell suggested that they ‘would derive benefit from drawing classes,’ but he observed that ‘unless these classes are provided in the works there is great difficulty in persuading them to attend’ due to the cyclical work schedule of the flint glass trade. Powell had no specific plan to overcome the ‘difficulty,’ so he called generally for ‘some adequate inducement ... to persuade boys to undergo the necessary training’ and, moreover, for the boys to ‘give up some part of their leisure time to drawing.’

Several glass manufacturers offered responses to the issues raised by Powell. Chance Brothers & Co. of Birmingham asserted that they had no evidence that technical education would benefit glassworkers, and they advocated ‘a revival of the old system of apprenticeship’ instead, suggesting that this avenue for educating glassworkers ‘would be of far greater value and importance.’⁶⁵ L. J. Murray, Honorary Secretary of the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, questioned whether an ‘attempt to form a class from youths employed in glass-houses’ would produce sufficient ‘practical good ... to result to the trade.’ Thomas Webb & Co. of Stourbridge expressed itself most strongly in rejecting schools of art in favour of day-to-day experience in the various areas of a glass factory that encompassed glass decorating as well as glass manufacturing: ‘There can be no better school for those who desire to enter the glass trade than the glass-house, cutting, engraving, and etching shops, and the various other departments in the manufactory itself.’

In response to these comments of glass manufacturers, Powell proposed that the various boards responsible for technical education at the county level in 1897 ‘should found scholarships for boys which should be dependent partly on regular work in factories and partly on attendance in classes.’ Such a scheme, Powell reasoned, ‘would encourage young

⁶⁵ Quoted in the *Journal of the Society of Arts* (July 23, 1897), p. 851.

lads to take up skilled trades and at the same time it would encourage them to be regular and attentive in their work.’ Several years thereafter, however, Powell was waiting for technical education to have a positive impact upon the glass manufacturing industry. Although crediting the typical English glass blower with dexterity (‘clever ... with his fingers’), Powell asserted that he ‘has no talent for design.’⁶⁶ The glass blower, Powell said, ‘is painfully realistic’ and ‘will fail to create anything combining originality with beauty of outline.’ On a pessimistic note, Powell observed that ‘what technical education will do for the English glass-blower in the distant future remains to be proved.’

Despite the inability of the Stourbridge School to attract students employed in glass manufacturing, the school enrolled many who were employed in glass decorating. Some of them cultivated a personal interest in fine art, and the instruction they received at the Stourbridge School surely added to their abilities and sometimes brought a measure of recognition.⁶⁷ In 1877, William Northwood, Francis Scheibner, and Theodore Kny had book prizes for drawing the human figure, and Alfred Hingley claimed a book prize for his oil painting of a plant from nature. In 1891, George J. Carder won a Government prize for ‘shading the figure from antique,’ and William Kny had Government prizes in 1891 and 1892 for ‘shading the head from life.’ In the summer of 1892, Francis R. Grice was awarded a ‘Vacation Scholarship’ for a course in drawing from life at South Kensington. In

⁶⁶ Harry Powell, ‘On Table Glass’ [paper first read on 28 April 1903], *Journal of the Society of Arts*, 51 (June 12, 1903), pp. 638-641.

⁶⁷ See Chapter Four for Edwin Grice and Albert Gynge, both of whom were employed at J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley. Grice’s interest in painting was an avocation, as he remained employed until retirement, but Gynge left the glass decorating industry in the early 1870s and had a successful career as a painter with a studio in Worcester.

1900, Ludwig Kny had Government book prizes for his clay model of a head from life and for a full length drawing of a nude figure.⁶⁸

Despite the student successes detailed thus far in this chapter, members of the Council of the Stourbridge School and some invited guest speakers at the annual public meeting and prize-giving frequently expressed their disappointment in the fact that more students associated with local industries, especially the segment of the local glass industry devoted to glass manufacturing, were not enrolled in the school and attending classes. Their remarks were directed toward the potential students and, to some extent, to the glass manufacturing enterprises of the Stourbridge district themselves.

In December 1862, about a decade after the Stourbridge School began operations, the institution reportedly enrolled 141 students, including 30 who were connected in some way with the glass industry of the district, a small increase over the 27 who attended during the previous year.⁶⁹ The Stourbridge School actually enrolled more students from the glass trades than other provincial schools, including those in areas such as Newcastle, but its Council still took special note of ‘the unpleasant duty of directing attention to the small number of students representing the glass trade.’

In 1865, Lord Lyttelton spoke in general terms of the young persons ‘engaged in the manufactures of the district ... [who] had not taken advantage of the school to the extent

⁶⁸ Ludwig Kny (1868-1937) had a lengthy career as a glass engraver and designer with the Webb Corbett firm and its successor, Stuart and Sons. In March 1924, he presented two lectures on various techniques of glass decorating to the Pottery and Glass Trades Benevolent Institution in London; for reports of these lectures, see *County Express*, 8 March and 12 April 1924. For brief references to his glass designs in the 1930s, see *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 82 (2 November 1934), p. 1257 and Christopher Hussey, ‘The Art Industry Exhibition: Some Preferences at Burlington House,’ *Country Life*, 19 January 1935, p. 78.

⁶⁹ *Advertiser*, 20 December 1862 and *Building News and Architectural Review*, 9 (19 December 1862), p. 481.

they might have done.’⁷⁰ Just a year later in 1866, the report of the Stourbridge School Council expressed its ‘regret that so few of the glassmakers are students.’⁷¹ This trend continued, and, in 1874, the Council addressed ‘employers of workmen’ directly, urging them ‘to induce those in their employ to take advantage of these schools and the numerous benefits offered by it.’⁷² Rev. William H. Lyttelton, in presiding over the annual meeting in 1874, quoted Henry Cole, the administrative head of the Department of Science and Art, who had said that ‘art was more promoted by the manufacturers of pottery than by the glass manufacturers.’⁷³ When the Council met in October 1878, its members were concerned that a current ‘commercial depression’ had had some impact upon enrolment at the Stourbridge School because the economic situation ‘restricted the ability of many to bear even the moderate expense of attending the classes at the school.’⁷⁴ In 1882, Council chairman J. B. Shepherd noted that student Frank Porter had developed original designs for carpet, and he suggested that Stourbridge students should be creating original designs for glass.⁷⁵

When Sir Rupert Kettle, judge of the County Court of Worcestershire, presided at the annual public meeting and prize-giving of the Stourbridge School on 8 January 1883, the question of support from local glass manufacturers was an important topic in his address and in the responses from members of the Stourbridge School Council. Sir Rupert,

⁷⁰ *Advertiser*, 9 December 1865.

⁷¹ *Advertiser*, 22 December 1866. In 1870, the Council felt that the school had rendered ‘good service’ to the local glass trade, but some of its members wished that ‘glass blowers will study art and so improve their profession’ (see *Advertiser*, 15 January 1870).

⁷² *Advertiser*, 24 January 1874.

⁷³ *County Express*, 31 January 1874 and *County Express*, 31 January 1874.

⁷⁴ *County Express*, 26 October 1878.

⁷⁵ *Advertiser*, 14 January 1882.

who was a descendent within a family of glassmakers, began by observing that the school ‘was not quite so well supported as it ought to be in that wealthy manufacturing district.’⁷⁶ After a lengthy discussion of exports and imports and remarks on changing fashions in taste, Sir Rupert mentioned the ‘very pure cut glass which was always the pride of the Stourbridge glassmaker’ and urged his audience to ‘support the School of Art for the purpose of training workmen to the attainment of the highest degree of known perfection in their manufactures.’ ‘Glass,’ he said, must be ‘made to suit the tastes of purchasers [and] they would have it, whatever the price might be.’ In considering training for those employed in glass decorating, Sir Rupert said that students ‘should stay in the school two years longer than they usually stayed ... to make them more useful workmen.’ In response to Sir Rupert’s address, Council chairman J. B. Shepherd remarked that it was desirable that ‘manufacturers of the district should be invited to give information as to what they required in the way of designs’ and that ‘pupils might be carried on in the light of such experience and observations as manufacturers felt disposed to give.’ Shepherd said that he ‘did not know whether anything had yet been done in this direction,’ but, if not, he ‘hoped something would be.’ Sir Rupert responded, suggesting that ‘one or two manufacturers should each give a £5 prize for the best original designs of some article in glass.’

The response by J. B. Shepherd and the remarks of Sir Rupert Kettle reveal aspects of the nature of the disconnect between the glass industry of the Stourbridge district and the Stourbridge School. Neither the art master nor the students (although some were employed in the glass industry) were fully cognizant of the specific needs of the industry in terms of designs, perhaps because of reluctance on the part of industry representatives to

⁷⁶ *Advertiser*, 13 January 1883; *County Express*, 13 January 1883; and *Pottery Gazette*, 1 February 1883, p. 143. Quotations in this paragraph are from the report in the *Advertiser*.

communicate with the school or because the school failed to reach out to those involved in the industry. Moreover, as Sir Rupert Kettle indicated, the brief time most students attended the school was insufficient to advance their abilities and become designers. Later in 1883, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams, who had become a member of the Council of the Stourbridge School about a year earlier, offered a resolution in support of ‘art education for the development of the manufactures of this neighbourhood’ and suggested that such instruction would help to address the pressures from foreign competition in the glass manufacturing industry.⁷⁷ At the outset of the annual meeting in January 1885, Council secretary A. W. Worthington announced that the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, in response to the suggestion made by Sir Rupert Kettle two years earlier, had pledged £10 for student prizes.⁷⁸ As noted elsewhere in this chapter, the first awards, determined later during 1885 and made public in early 1886, went to two ‘glassmakers’ and to eight young men who were ‘persons engaged in glassworks otherwise than glassmakers.’

Carpet manufacturer John Brinton of Kidderminster was the invited guest speaker at the January 1888 annual meeting, and he questioned the current status of the provincial schools of art: ‘Are our art schools, generally speaking, abreast of the wants of the day? Does our manufacturing population avail itself of the advantages conferred?’⁷⁹ Brinton said that there had been much progress since 1851 and that he was encouraged by current interest in technical education, but he lamented that there was ‘difficulty ... in ensuring constant and regular attendance of students in our artisan classes.’ In a statement

⁷⁷ *Advertiser*, 29 September 1883.

⁷⁸ *Advertiser*, 24 January 1885; this report mentions that ‘the conditions on which the prizes out of that fund would be given ... would be hung up in a day or two.’

⁷⁹ *Advertiser*, 14 January 1888.

reminiscent of remarks made decades earlier at the Stourbridge School by J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, John Brinton advocated that attendance in classes at the school of art should be ‘part of the conditions of employment,’ a position he sought to maintain in his carpet manufactory at Kidderminster.

Shortly after the January 1888 annual meeting, in an editorial supporting technical education, the *County Express* noted that no glassmakers had sought the cash prizes of the manufacturers association and stated its opinion that ‘our glass makers have a deep-rooted and widespread prejudice against art teaching’ and that any who dare attend the school are ‘made the object of much quizzing and bantering’ by their workmates.⁸⁰ Major Walker, who was then president of the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, had spoken after John Brinton’s address, and, whilst Major Walker took pleasure at the competition among Stourbridge School students who were employed in glass decoration, he was ‘grieved to say that there were no competitors for the prizes offered to glassmakers.’⁸¹ Furthermore, Major Walker stated, the entire glass trade ‘would derive far greater advantages by all those employed in the glasshouse coming to those schools for a short time to be taught elementary drawing.’

In early 1889, another editorial in the *County Express* took note of the continuing lack of glassmakers as competitors for prizes offered by the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, and the editorial went on to charge the glassmaker operatives with ‘art apathy’ and ‘prejudice’ in regards to technical education:

⁸⁰ *County Express*, 14 January 1888. A year later, the Council expressed ‘great regret’ and called the continued lack of interest on the part of those engaged in glass manufacturing ‘a matter of shame.’ See *County Express*, 12 January 1889.

⁸¹ *County Express*, 14 January 1888.

The teachers and preachers of Art among our flint glassmakers are like Wisdom, who uttered her voice in the streets, yet no man regarded. Year by year, the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers offers £5 in prizes to the local glass operatives for art work, but not a solitary competitor is found. The subject was referred to at the annual prize distribution to the students of the Stourbridge and Brierley Hill Schools of Art this week, regret being expressed at the lamentable art apathy displayed by our glassworkers. A thick crust of prejudice has to be penetrated. Our operatives are conservative in a bad sense. They are slow to recognise the practical benefits of technical training.⁸²

This editorial statement by the *County Express* identifies in precise terms the disconnect between the art education offered by Stourbridge School and the glass manufacturing interests of the Stourbridge district. Whilst the association of glass manufacturers was willing to donate funds for annual local prizes, the various glass manufacturing firms employed individuals who showed little interest in either the classes or the financial prizes. Moreover, the glass manufacturing firms were not disposed to encourage their employees to attend the school or to offer substantial financial support to the Stourbridge School.

As technical education became increasingly important in the 1890s, the Council tended to focus its attention on increasing the attendance in science classes.⁸³ However, concerns remained regarding the relationship of the art classes at the school with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. When classes began once more at the Stourbridge School in the fall of 1893, the *County Express* offered its assessment of the situation regarding art education in the district. In concluding that the classes ‘have not hitherto been appreciated by the young people for whom they are specially intended,’ the editorial statement took particular note of the local glass trade.⁸⁴ Although acknowledging that the Stourbridge School ‘has without doubt done important work,’ the editorial asserted that ‘it

⁸² *County Express*, 19 January 1889.

⁸³ *County Express*, 8 January and 10 September 1892.

⁸⁴ *County Express*, 16 September 1893.

has done a much smaller work than it ought to have done' and went on to say that 'every one who is engaged in it [the glass trade] would find it an advantage to go through a course of instruction in art.' Those engaged in glass decorating were characterised as needing art education 'to attain to any position in their craft,' and those employed in glass manufacturing were urged to abandon 'rule of thumb' and 'the old order of things' in favour of 'any agency that will help him forward.' This editorial suggested further that local glass industry employers and the trade unions alike ought to encourage technical education generally and went on to state the view that art education was most essential: 'In this neighbourhood the glass trade stands out prominently as an art industry and one in which consequently the study of art is really a matter of necessity.' Months later, another editorial in the *County Express* reiterated this stance, calling attention to 'the stagnation of local industries' and alleging that there was 'too much apathy both on the part of employers and employed in realising the importance of technical and art training.'⁸⁵

Glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams, a Council member since the early 1880s and a strong advocate for art education in Brierley Hill and Wordsley, often spoke about the mission of the Stourbridge School and the nature and status of its relations with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. In 1894, he expressed his hope that 'the rising generation would only turn up in the numbers they should and take the advantage offered them,' because, as he saw it, 'their very existence depended on giving proper attention to art and technical education.'⁸⁶ During the annual meeting of the Stourbridge School in January 1897, Silvers-Williams spoke on behalf of the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, saying that its members 'felt the greatest interest in the School of Art

⁸⁵ *County Express*, 13 January 1894.

⁸⁶ *County Express*, 13 January 1894.

because so much of their welfare depended upon the advance their younger hands made in drawing in outline and in the study of design.’⁸⁷ However, in contrast to this positive view of the glass manufacturers regarding art instruction, he continued, the workers themselves were apathetic: ‘Unfortunately, glassmakers did not take sufficient advantage of the opportunities that they had before them in these useful classes.’ Silvers-Williams felt that the workers ‘preferred ... football and other things to attending such schools’ and that ‘there were a few who came, but only a small number,’ although he ‘hoped the time would come when they would see the necessity of taking advantage of art education.’ Silvers-Williams noted the close affinity of the schools of art in the ‘potting towns’ such as Worcester, Stoke and Lambeth with local manufacturers in those respective areas, and he remarked that ‘great strides had been made through art education’ in those locations.

The contrasts drawn by glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams and others in these sorts of remarks are significant for this thesis: (1) whilst some local glass manufacturers supported the Stourbridge School in a general way and the flint glass manufacturers association offered prizes for students who were employed in the industry, few such students chose to attend the school; and (2) whilst both manufacturers and students in the pottery districts were reaping the economic and aesthetic benefits of art education, those in the Stourbridge district were not doing so to the same extent. To be sure, Silvers-Williams was not altogether pessimistic in 1897. He concluded by thanking the art master and by praising those few students ‘who had devoted so much time and shown so much ability in their work,’ and he looked forward to the time when Stourbridge

⁸⁷ *County Express*, 30 January 1897.

‘should have a better school for their art and technical classes,’⁸⁸ a reference to the prospects for the proposed Victoria Institute to house the Stourbridge School of Art.

The Glass Industry and the School of Art: Assessing Relationships

As indicated in the previous chapters of this thesis and documented further in the sections above, the Stourbridge School received only limited financial contributions and other support from the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, although the Stourbridge School enrolled numerous students who were associated with the glass decorating segment of that industry, including glass cutters, glass engravers and glass etchers. In considering the student enrolment over more than five decades, this central question regarding the relation of the school to the local glass industry emerges: why was the Stourbridge School generally successful in gaining students from glass decorating but not glass manufacturing during the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century?

At least part of the answer is rooted in the respective work schedules of glass decorating and glass manufacturing. In the 1850s and 1860s, those students employed in glass decorating (glass cutters, glass engravers and glass etchers) had a ten-hour workday commencing at 6 a. m.⁸⁹ Such a day might add up to 11 or 12 hours with time for travel or meals, but those in glass decorating who were sufficiently motivated to do so could attend evening classes that convened at 7 p. m. or shortly thereafter. In contrast, the traditional work schedule for those in glass manufacturing (six hours work/six hours off, commencing Monday evening or Tuesday morning and ending on Saturday) was likely a factor

⁸⁸ *County Express*, 30 January 1897.

⁸⁹ Matsumura, *Labour Aristocracy Revisited: The Victorian Flint Glass Makers, 1850-80*, p. 37. In 1872, the glass cutters in the Stourbridge area sought to set the hours of work from 6 a. m. to 5 p. m. Monday-Friday and 6 a. m. to 1 p. m. on Saturday.

preventing regular attendance, and the attempts by the Stourbridge School in the 1890s to offer its Penny Class on weekday evenings or a special Morning Class for males only on Monday mornings were not successful in attracting glassworkers to attend. Moreover, the nature of the work itself in the hot environment of a glass factory was physically taxing, especially for those who were unskilled labourers or apprentices.⁹⁰ Additionally, the skilled glassworkers (glass blowers, servitors and foot makers) held positions that were somewhat less arduous, and their wages (40-44s per week) were such that Matsumura and others have considered them to be a 'labour aristocracy.'⁹¹ The relatively high wages of skilled glassworkers might be a disincentive to seek education, and, conversely, it could be that the relatively low wages of glass cutters (about 24s per week, less for apprentices) could be an incentive to seek education, especially if one was employed by a glass decorating firm such as J. & J. Northwood, where art education was encouraged by paying fees for some employees and with a library of art books and some on-site art instruction.⁹²

Beyond these matters relating to conditions of hours of employment and wages in the segments of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, one must consider several nineteenth-century statements regarding the conduct of the Stourbridge School and the role of the Department of Science and Art. There is interesting evidence that was submitted to the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction and from a work published in conjunction with the International Health Exhibition as well as in editorial comments in local newspapers and published responses from correspondents.

⁹⁰ 'Weather and Workmen in the Glass Trade,' *Pottery Gazette*, September 1884, p. 1044.

⁹¹ Eric Hopkins, 'Small Town Aristocrats of Labour and Their Standard of Living, 1840-1914,' *Economic History Review*, New Series, 28 (May 1975), pp. 222-242.

⁹² John Northwood II, *John Northwood: His Contributions to the Stourbridge Flint Glass Industry 1850-1902*, pp. 59 and 62.

Letters written to the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction in February 1883 by former Stourbridge School student John A. Service offer insights regarding the practices of the Department of Science and Art and the operation of the Stourbridge School and its relationships with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district.⁹³ Service was employed as a glass engraver whilst a student at the Stourbridge School in the 1860s and early 1870s, and he also served as a pupil-teacher. In 1873-1874, he was assistant art master at the Stourbridge School. When writing in 1883, Service was a manager at Thomas Webb and Sons, Stourbridge Glass Works, Wordsley. Service's letters were written in reply to an enquiry to his employer from the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction. These two letters combine the experiences of former student, pupil-teacher, and assistant art master with years of employment and managerial experience in the glass industry. Thus, these letters reflect a unique perspective regarding the conduct of the Stourbridge School (see Appendix Eight, 'John A. Service's Letters to the Royal Commission').

Although John A. Service observed that the Stourbridge School 'had some little influence upon the trade of the district,' he felt that 'its influence upon the glass trade ... is very doubtful.' After asserting that the Stourbridge art masters lacked 'practical knowledge of the trade,' Service related that a student who was employed in the glass trade could learn only the 'rudiments of drawing' at the Stourbridge School, and 'there is no inducement held out to him to attend the school [and] there are no examples or models for him to copy which would be of use to him ... the school is then only a place of practice.' Regarding instruction in the Stourbridge School, Service said that 'the desire to produce pretty

⁹³ *Second Report of the Royal Commissioners on Technical Instruction*, vol. III (London: HMSO, 1884), pp. 657-658. Service's letters were not mentioned in the *Advertiser* or *County Express*, but both appeared in *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 14 February 1885, along with a letter praising the art school at Kidderminster for its impact upon carpet manufacturing.

landscapes or handsome portraits seems to be encouraged too much.’ As for drawing instruction to benefit those in the glass industry, Service advocated a ‘more vigorous and practical style of drawing which is so essentially necessary in the training of the artizan.’

Service also faulted the Department of Science and Art, indicating that examples of fine art supplied by the Department ‘have not been selected with a view to specially assist the worker upon glass.’ Moreover, Service charged, the current members of the Council of the Stourbridge School, save one [surely Joseph Silvers-Williams], were ‘totally ignorant of the requirements of the glass trade,’ and he suggested that the Council would be more effective if comprised of ‘a few members, directly connected with the glass trade ... who would take an interest in the concern and assist in guiding it into the proper practical channel.’ These failures of administration led to the following conclusion, as stated by Service: ‘there is very little hope of the school finding its way out of the Slough of Despond in which it has been floundering so long.’

In these two letters, John A. Service raised a number of issues, ranging from the lack of practical experience of the art masters and the paucity of examples available for study to matters of convenience such as the distance of the school from various glassworks, but the essence of his criticism is clear enough: although the Stourbridge School of Art imparted basic instruction in drawing, the school was not connected to the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, especially the area of glass decorating, in any sustained and meaningful ways, and the successes of those students who were employed as glass decorators should be attributed to their personal motivations and efforts rather than the drawing and art instruction they received. Service observed that the governing Council of the school, whilst composed of earnest gentleman, had only one member [Joseph Silvers-Williams] who was intimately involved in the glass trade and that art instruction by the art

masters in the Stourbridge School emphasised fine art skills for the creation of ‘pretty landscapes or handsome portraits’ rather than the essential principles and elements of design that were needed for industry.

Some of the issues raised by John Service are also to be found in an account of the progress of the schools of art that was prepared in 1884 by John Sparkes, former art master at Lambeth who was then principal of the National Art Training School (formerly Head School) at South Kensington.⁹⁴ Published in conjunction with the International Health Exhibition, Sparkes’s work contains a ten-page section entitled ‘Helps and Hindrances,’ and this section detailed a wide variety of both positive and negative features relating to the schools of art. Sparkes began by noting that the schools of art are free from ‘political differences,’ and he cited several examples of cities (Manchester, Falkirk, Warrington, Derby, etc.) where substantial sums of financial contributions from individual citizens benefitted the respective schools. Whilst hopeful for ‘a change in the attitude of manufacturers’ regarding support for these institutions, Sparkes noted that manufacturers are ‘often indifferent to art except as a saleable commodity’ and that ‘the feeling of many manufacturers towards art in relation to their productions is certainly very capable of elevation.’ In particular, Sparkes wrote of the failure of many local manufacturers to donate

⁹⁴ John C. L. Sparkes, ‘Schools of Art: Their Origin, History, Work, and Influence,’ *The Health Exhibition Literature*, vol. VII (London: Executive Council of the International Health Exhibition, 1884), pp. 721-880 (quotations are from the ‘Helps and Hindrances’ section of this source). Titled ‘Influences of English Schools of Art on Manufactures,’ excerpts from Sparkes’s entire work appeared in *Pottery Gazette*, February 1885, pp. 194-196. More than a quarter-century later, Walter Crane’s criticism of the Department of Science and Art reiterated some of the points made by Service and Sparkes, particularly regarding the instructional emphasis upon fine art rather than principles of design and, most importantly, the need for ‘special knowledge and specialized skill in design’ to meet ‘the ever shifting and changing demands of the modern manufacturer and the modern market.’ See W. Cr. [Walter Crane], ‘Art Teaching, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. II (New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica Co., 1910), pp. 703-705.

even modest sums ('not a single penny') to be used as local prizes for students, suggesting that such awards 'are greatly needed as an inducement to exertion' and 'keep alive the interest of students, especially the younger ones.' Regarding a positive direction, Sparkes related several instances of firms 'that insist on the attendance of their apprentices at the evening classes ... sometimes paying the school fees and contributing also to the local subscription in aid of its support.' In terms of difficulties faced by students, Sparkes mentioned that 'many have to walk long distances to and fro' and that attendance in an evening class must come 'at the end of a hard day's labour, when they are naturally inclined to devote their scanty leisure to recreation, rather than to study.'

Elsewhere in his report, Sparkes sought to document a trend on the part of manufacturers away from foreign designs to those produced domestically by citing examples from Sheffield, Nottingham, Macclesfield, Belfast, Birmingham, and others. His discussion of the institution at Stoke on Trent related that the school there 'has produced hosts of art-workmen,' and his description of the relationship between the Lambeth school and the Doulton art pottery manufactory served to epitomise 'the proper co-operation that ought to exist between Schools of Art and local manufacturers.' For a final example, Sparkes mentioned Stourbridge. Whilst first suggesting that the Stourbridge School 'has had much influence on the glass manufactures of the district,' Sparkes limited this statement sharply, saying that the school 'appears to have founded one important branch, etching on glass, which was started about twenty-five years ago'⁹⁵ Sparkes also mentioned the 'recently introduced' decorative technique of 'cameo glass cutting' and a general reference to 'other departments of the trade' without elaboration before concluding with a

⁹⁵ Sparkes, 'Schools of Art: Their Origin, History, Work, and Influence,' pp. 831-832. On the art education career of Sparkes, see Alex Werner, 'John Charles Lewis Sparkes 1833-1907,' *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society 1850 - the Present*, 13 (1989), pp. 9-18.

quotation from an address by Sir Rupert Kettle concerning the excellence of decorated glass ‘now being produced in my own neighbourhood.’ The reference to decorative etching on glass by Sparkes likely refers to the business success of former Stourbridge student John Northwood I, who had a brief partnership with Henry Gething Richardson and Thomas Guest for glass decorating in 1859-1860 before founding the J. & J. Northwood glass decorating enterprise with his brother Joseph Northwood soon thereafter.⁹⁶ From the perspective of this study, it is significant that Sparkes’s account of the influence of the Stourbridge School upon the glass industry of the Stourbridge district was focused narrowly upon the glass etching segment of the glass decorating industry, although the school had then been in existence for more than three decades and had had at least a few representatives from glass manufactories among its benefactors and Council members.

About a decade after John A. Service’s correspondence addressed to the Royal Commission and the publication of John Sparkes’s work, the Stourbridge School was the object of public criticism in a local newspaper. This episode began when the *County Express* offered an editorial comment regarding the Stourbridge School in which it concluded that the school ‘is not up to date.’⁹⁷ The editorial charged that the ‘annual prize giving ... comes round year after year without that advance being seen in the results of its work’ and stated further that such an advance ‘ought to be observable in a district where one of the staple industries rests on successful art decoration.’ The industry referenced was surely that of glass, and the editorial went on to urge ‘friends of the school to compare its work and results with those secured in the schools which are most alive and abreast of the

⁹⁶ Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley, 1612-2002*, p. 334.

⁹⁷ *County Express*, 7 January 1893.

times,' a statement that probably relates to the schools of art in the districts such as Stoke and Worcester where ceramic industries flourished.

A week later, in its report of the annual meeting of the Stourbridge School, the *County Express* printed a statement from the Council of the school in which the successful careers of former Stourbridge School students Frank Short (artist and engraver), Frank Porter (designer of carpet in Kidderminster), Ludwig Kny (glass decorator), and Frederick Carder (glass designer) were mentioned along with the surnames of Stourbridge School students (Grice, Phipps, Round, Windmill, etc.) who claimed many of the prizes financed by the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers. Although the Council's statement was intended to link art instruction at the Stourbridge School to the successes of these former students, it ended with this curious remark: 'No doubt the school might be made more useful to the neighbourhood, but, unless the class of students will attend who it will most benefit, little can be done in the way of progression.'⁹⁸

Although the dispute between the editor of the *County Express* and the Council was carried no further by either party, letters from other interested parties soon appeared in the 'Correspondence' section of the newspaper, and statements and opinions therein offer insights into local perceptions of the Stourbridge School. Over the signature 'An Observer,' a letter writer noted the 'list of students who have made positions for themselves' and the purported 'designers in glass' and went on to question whether their training in the Stourbridge School had, in fact, really 'assisted them in becoming designers in glass.'⁹⁹ This writer challenged the Council's statement that the school was responsible for their success, suggesting instead that, because these young men were employed 'at the leading

⁹⁸ *County Express*, 14 January 1893.

⁹⁹ *County Express*, 21 January 1893.

glass works in the neighbourhood, ... they acquire the knowledge of designing for glass, simply because they come into daily contact with competent designers and art workmen.’ An Observer asked if prizewinning designs were really ‘executed in the school under the direct supervision of the master,’ suggesting instead that they were created ‘by the students during their leisure hours at home without any assistance from the master whatsoever.’

A week later, a brief letter penned by ‘An Ex-Student’ sought to express the views of himself and others in stating that ‘some change must be made if the school is to occupy the position it was intended to fill in the town’ and urging that ‘a way out of the difficulty ought to be found by the management.’¹⁰⁰ In this same newspaper issue, letter writer ‘Another Observer’ stated that ‘criticism upon the Stourbridge School of Art has long been wanting’ before asserting that ‘the institution is one which exists or ought to exist for the benefit of the neighbourhood and to assist its industries.’¹⁰¹ Another Observer compared the local glass trade to the carpet industry at Kidderminster, concluding that ‘the glass industry at Stourbridge depends far more largely on art than the carpet trade at Kidderminster does.’ Another Observer ended this letter with ‘regret’ that the Stourbridge School was not ‘fulfilling its mission’ and urged the school Council to ‘visit the Potteries Schools and draw a conclusion.’ No further public statements from 1893 have come to light regarding this controversy, but it may be significant that the tenure of art master Edward J. Simms at the Stourbridge School came to an end just a few months thereafter in the spring of 1893 and that the subsequent hiring of the next Stourbridge art master, George Henry Cromack, was

¹⁰⁰ *County Express*, 28 January 1893.

¹⁰¹ *County Express*, 28 January 1893. A reference to Staffordshire by Another Observer probably hints at the developing art instruction in Wordsley that is considered in the next section of this chapter.

quickly accomplished and publicly announced in May 1893, although his official duties were not to begin until months later at the start of classes in late September.

From the standpoint of this study, the above episode from 1893, considered together with the letters of John A. Service and the work of John Sparkes, indicates that there was a continuing disconnect between the intended purpose of the Stourbridge School (that is, art instruction suited to the training of designers for local industry) and the dominant outcome of its classes (that is, mostly basic instruction in drawing with an emphasis upon fine art for the more advanced students). Despite more than four decades of existence, the Stourbridge School had enrolled very few students who came from glass manufacturing. Additionally, although numerous students were associated with glass decorating by cutting, engraving or etching, it is tenuous indeed to link improvements in their abilities solely to the drawing and art instruction they received at the Stourbridge School.

In the early twentieth century, critical comments of a different sort regarding the Stourbridge School were voiced in a letter to the *County Express*. The annual meeting and prize-giving at the Stourbridge School was held on Monday, 14 January 1901, and a full report of the meeting and an address by glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams was published in the *County Express* on the following Saturday.¹⁰² A week thereafter, a lengthy letter in favour of technical education appeared in the newspaper over the signature ‘En Avant’ [Fr. ‘forward’]. This writer first expressed concern regarding the ‘indifference of the manufacturers of the districts to the value of an institution on which to some extent the fortunes of the district depend.’¹⁰³ But for this indifference, the writer continued, ‘the art and science classes at Stourbridge, Lye and Wordsley would be crammed with students

¹⁰² *County Express*, 19 January 1901.

¹⁰³ *County Express*, 26 January 1901.

from their works.’ Additionally, whilst recognising the annual prizes from the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, En Avant urged the established manufacturers themselves ‘to encourage and stimulate training in art and science.’ The words of En Avant in 1901 are reminiscent of the statement made by J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, nearly four decades earlier in 1853, when he called for the ‘co-operation of all the manufacturers of this district’ and advocated that manufacturers should ‘consider the set of workmen employed by each of them as an adult School, to pay the School price for them, and to give them opportunities for instruction.’¹⁰⁴

At this point, an assessment of the relations of the Stourbridge School with the local glass industry must conclude that various factors inhibited both student enrolment and financial support from the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. Whilst many potential students would have had at least some distance to walk to the school, the daily work routine of young men employed in glass decorating was more amenable to attendance in an evening class than the longstanding cyclical work schedule in place at glass manufacturing plants. However, even when the Stourbridge School offered alternative class opportunities, those employed in glass manufacturing firms did not enrol, and several sources noted above cite the lack of encouragement from employers as an important consideration. Additionally, the wage structure of skilled glassworkers was likely a disincentive to pursue art education.

Comments made by former student John A. Service and Department of Science and Art administrator John Sparkes in 1883-1884 suggest that, like other provincial schools of art, the Stourbridge School provided ample and adequate instruction in basic drawing and some principles of fine art but was not able to create any specialised or focused instruction that would be useful to those employed in the glass industry. Moreover, neither the art

¹⁰⁴ *Berrow’s Worcester Journal*, 26 November 1853.

masters of the Stourbridge School nor the faculty of the Department of Science and Art were able to offer examples that would contribute to such specialised training.

Editorial comments about the Stourbridge School in local newspapers during the 1890s charged that the institution was not as helpful as it ought to be with regard to local industry. Responses to these editorials by letter writers confirmed the lack of influence of the school upon the local glass industry and, furthermore, sought to negate assertions linking instruction at the school to the career successes of some former students. As noted in the next section of this chapter, individuals and enterprises in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district became interested in efforts to further art education at Brierley Hill and Wordsley, and their responses in the 1890s and early twentieth century varied from the experiences of the Stourbridge School.

Competitive Classes at Brierley Hill and Wordsley

As noted in the previous chapter, the founding of art schools in nearby Brierley Hill and Wordsley during the 1880s had an impact upon student enrolments at the Stourbridge School. Brierley Hill and Wordsley were home to substantial enterprises in glass manufacturing and in glass decorating, and Stourbridge School students or prospective students who were employed in Brierley Hill or Wordsley might find it far more convenient after a day of work to attend an art school nearby rather than walk a few miles or journey by tram to Stourbridge for an evening class that met three times during the week.

Efforts began to establish art education at Brierley Hill in the late 1870s, but these did not come to fruition until the 1880s with the assistance of the Stourbridge School. Sessions in drawing and in science were held at the Moor Street School in 1877, and, by 1880, some 24 students were attending. In 1882, about 50 students, including two young men employed as glass cutters, were enrolled, and a prize-giving took place on 30

September.¹⁰⁵ In September 1883, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams, a member of the Stourbridge School Council, and John Northwood I, who attended the Stourbridge School in the 1850s and was employed as glass works manager and art director at Stevens & Williams, were present at a public meeting to announce that art classes would begin at Brierley Hill ‘in connection with the Stourbridge School of Art.’¹⁰⁶ Held in the Bent Street School at Brierley Hill, these classes were deemed ‘an experiment’ on the part of the Stourbridge School, and art master Edward Simms was responsible for the instruction. By October 1884, some 70 students were engaged in the Bent Street School, and the Stourbridge School received income from student fees along with Government grants based upon student success in examinations. In support of the classes, the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers, ‘with the view of encouraging work at the school which might more directly promote the excellence of the local glass manufacture,’ promised £10 annually for prizes to be awarded to pupils at Brierley Hill.¹⁰⁷ At this same time, art classes were being conducted in Wordsley under the auspices of the Department of Science and Art, whilst the City and Guilds of London Institute oversaw some science classes.¹⁰⁸

The Stourbridge and Brierley Hill schools held several joint annual public meetings and prize-givings in the mid- and late 1880s, but, in October 1887, there were ‘competing art classes’ in Brierley Hill that diminished attendance in the classes at the Bent Street

¹⁰⁵ *County Express*, 7 October 1882.

¹⁰⁶ ‘Formation of Art Classes,’ *Advertiser*, 29 September 1883; see also ‘A School of Art for Brierley Hill,’ *County Express*, 29 September 1883.

¹⁰⁷ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 24 October 1884.

¹⁰⁸ *County Express*, 24 October 1891.

School under Stourbridge art master Simms.¹⁰⁹ Public Notices in the *County Express* contain evidence of this competition and its resolution. In August 1888, a Public Notice for the Stourbridge School of Art announced that art classes in the ‘branch school at Bent Street, Brierley Hill’ would convene on Tuesday 4 September.¹¹⁰ In late September 1888, a Public Notice for the ‘Brierley Hill Science and Art School’ announced that its art classes in the Brockmoor Board School would convene on Tuesday 2 October.¹¹¹ In the early fall of 1889, a Public Notice regarding the start of classes for the Stourbridge School made no mention of the branch at Brierley Hill, and, in early 1890, the *County Express* reported that ‘the branch school at Brierley Hill is now closed, as other classes have been established, which provide the town with instruction in science and art.’¹¹² The art and science classes in Brookmoor Board School continued. Subsequently, citizens at Brierley Hill, led by *Advertiser* publisher John Addison, who had served on the Council of the Stourbridge School in the early 1880s, petitioned the Brierley Hill Local Board for funds and proceeded to offer both art instruction and technical education classes in the Albion House School. By the fall of 1893, the school at Brierley Hill offered art classes, including modelling, taught by art master Francis Gibbons as well as classes in French, physiography, machine

¹⁰⁹ *County Express*, 8 October 1887.

¹¹⁰ *County Express*, 25 August 1888.

¹¹¹ *County Express*, 29 September 1888. The teachers were ‘Mr. A. [Arthur] Gibbons, Certificated Science and Art Teacher’ and ‘Mr. F. [Francis] Gibbons, Gold Medallist, Science and Art Department.’ Francis Gibbons’s first gold medal was awarded in 1880, when he was at the school of art in Cirencester, Gloucestershire, and he won a gold medal in 1883 when at the school of art in Coalbrookdale, Shropshire. His occupation was listed as ‘art tile manufacturer’ in the 1891 PRO Census, and he was associated with Gibbons, Hinton and Co. at Buckpool.

¹¹² *County Express*, 31 August 1889 and 4 January 1890.

construction and drawing. A decade later, a new building, the Technical Institute and Public Library, was erected at Brierley Hill in Moor Street.¹¹³

Interest in technical education was also manifest in Wordsley during the 1880s, and the instruction offered was proved to be much stronger competition for students than were the classes at Brierley Hill. As a member of the Council of the Stourbridge School, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams had been instrumental in establishing the ‘branch school’ at Brierley Hill, and, as enthusiasm for technical education grew, he and other glass manufacturers and proprietors of glass decorating firms in Wordsley became determined to advance art and science instruction by founding a school at Wordsley.

Under the headline ‘Local Science and Art Classes,’ an article in the *County Express* reported the results of the Government examinations of April-May 1889 for the Stourbridge School as well as the institutions at Brierley Hill and Wordsley. This article reveals that several students who had previously attended the Stourbridge School were now enrolled in art classes at the Wordsley Board School and that two of them achieved high honours in the national competitions of the Department of Science and Art: ‘Frederick Carder ... has gained one out of the eight gold medals of the year for a modelled design in wax on a glass vase, and William Northwood ... has a bronze medal for a similar design.’¹¹⁴ The article mentioned that Frederick Carder and William Northwood ‘were for many years well-known students at the Stourbridge School of Art.’ In its editorial column ‘The Looker-

¹¹³ *County Express*, 6 February 1892 and 23 September 1893.

¹¹⁴ *County Express*, 24 August 1889. Frederick Carder’s Government gold medal (eight awarded) was for ‘The Muses,’ a design in wax for a cameo glass vase and William Northwood’s bronze medal (109 awarded) for a design in wax for a cameo glass plaque. Frederick Carder and William Northwood were awarded ‘Vacation Scholarships’ for fourteen days of study at South Kensington. Frederick Carder’s ‘The Muses’ is now in the Corning Museum of Glass, and William Northwood’s plaque is at the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum).

On,' the *County Express* reflected upon the achievements of Carder and Northwood, and underscored the relationship between art education and local manufacturing interests:

The local art record ... is eminently satisfactory. The students have done well—some of them brilliantly. The conspicuous successes of Carder and Northwood confer lustre on Wordsley and Stourbridge which many a larger place might envy.... These awards ... are particularly gratifying because they show that no ordinary success is attending the class's aim in encouraging design suitable for the special manufacture of this district. An art training has thus a practical, as well as an aesthetic, value. It ministers to the graces of life, but it has also a commercial importance....¹¹⁵

About ten months earlier, the Council of the Stourbridge School had taken notice of achievements in 1888 by former students Frederick Carder (a Government silver medal) and Thomas A. Guest, noting that 'the Wordsley school especially continues to attract pupils who used to attend formerly at [Stourbridge] ... and who owe at least some of their success to instruction received from your master [Edward J. Simms].'¹¹⁶ Frederick Carder, William Northwood and other former Stourbridge school students, including brothers Thomas A. Guest and Albert A. Guest, may have found the school at Wordsley more convenient to attend in terms of distance from a workplace or home, but the key factor for their change in the choice of art school to attend was surely the nature of the curriculum at Wordsley. The Public Notice of the Wordsley Board School for classes commencing in October 1889 described the second and third grade art curriculum with the terms 'design' and 'modelling,' and the account of the science curriculum included a specific reference to 'glass manufacture.'¹¹⁷ The art master was Owen Gibbons, a gold medal winner in the

¹¹⁵ *County Express*, 24 August 1889.

¹¹⁶ *County Express*, 20 October 1888. Frederick Carder's silver medal was for 'Cupid and Psyche,' a vase with wax modelling to create the effect of cameo glass.

¹¹⁷ *County Express*, 5 October 1889.

national competitions in 1872 and 1873.¹¹⁸ He was the brother of Francis Gibbons and Arthur Gibbons, who were associated with the school at Brierley Hill. The science master at Wordsley was Benjamin F. Mason, who taught woodwork and construction as well as a science class that included metallurgy, a subject vital to the chemistry of glassmaking.

When the Wordsley Board School became unavailable for classes, Owen Gibbons and Benjamin F. Mason moved their art and science instruction to a building that was originally constructed as a Congregational Chapel and had later housed, in turn, the Wordsley Mechanics' Institution, the Conservative Club, and a day school.¹¹⁹ This relocation allowed the classes to continue with little interruption, and, in April 1890, a special art exhibition that included glassware of local manufacture and decoration generated much public enthusiasm and extensive coverage in a local newspaper.¹²⁰

In 1891, the Staffordshire County Council granted £150 toward a new building for the Wordsley school, provided that local monetary donations would meet the amount needed for construction, and an illustration of a proposed building estimated to cost £1460 appeared in the *County Express* some months later.¹²¹ Both glass manufacturers and glass decorators responded quickly with substantial financial support for this project. The initial fundraising included pledges of £110 from glass manufacturers Stuart and Sons and £105 from William Haden Richardson, who was a partner in the glassmaking firm styled Henry

¹¹⁸ H. Jack Haden, *Artists in Cameo Glass: Incorporating Thomas Woodall's Memoirs* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 1993), p. 25.

¹¹⁹ See *Advertiser*, 14 September 1907, for a lengthy account of the history of the Wordsley school. For a photo of the former Congregational Chapel, see Stan Hill, *Wordsley Past and Present* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2005), p. 87.

¹²⁰ *County Express*, 19 April 1890.

¹²¹ *County Express*, 9 April 1892.

G. Richardson and Sons. Records from the subsequent fundraising that culminated in 1899 and secured the building for Wordsley reveal the names of local glass industry firms (Boulton and Mills; L. Guest and Sons; L. & S. Hingley & Sons; and Guest Brothers) along with individuals who were associated with glass manufacturing and/or glass decorating: William George Webb; Edward Webb; Frederick Stuart; Henry Gething Richardson; John Northwood I; Joseph Silvers-Williams; Frederick Carder; William Henry Stuart; Thomas Woodall; William Haden Arthur Richardson; William Northwood; and James Hill.¹²²

Whilst the fundraising took place during the 1890s, the teaching staff at the Wordsley school changed and the curriculum evolved, with glass emerging as a prominent subject. In 1893, art master Owen Gibbons left the school, and, after assistant art master Frederick Carder took his place, a Public Notice describing the art classes mentioned that ‘Particular attention [is] paid to Design as applied to the Local Industries,’ an indication that glass was to be emphasised in the curriculum.¹²³ Former Stourbridge School student Frederick Carder, who had been employed since the early 1880s at the Stevens & Williams glass manufacturing firm where he was responsible for glass design and conducted experiments in the chemistry of glass colours, sought to use his knowledge and experience

¹²² *Proposed New Art School, Wordsley, Subscription List* (dated 30 September 1897); a subsequent printed listing, *New Art School, Wordsley* (dated 20 June 1899), shows further contributions from many members of the Richardson family; both of these documents are in the collection of the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum).

¹²³ *County Express*, 16 September 1893. Frederick Carder was awarded his full Art Masters Certificate with ‘exceptional qualifications’ from the Department of Science and Art in 1894; see *County Express*, 17 February 1894.

regarding glass decorating and glass manufacturing to enhance and enlarge the art and science curriculum at the Wordsley School of Art.¹²⁴

In 1900, after the Wordsley School settled into its new building, a Public Notice described the curriculum as one ‘to give sound Instruction in Arts and Science as important branches of a general education to train Designers, Modellers, Painters, Artizans, and other Art Workers’ and indicated that ‘there are Special Classes for the study of Decorative Design as applied to manufacturers; and in Glass Manufacture in the principles underlying this industry.’¹²⁵ Two years later, the emphasis upon artistic and scientific training relating to glass manufacturing and decorating was extended, as evidenced in the prospectus for the 1902-1903 classes at the Wordsley School of Art that is quoted below:

Glass Manufacture

A Special Class in this subject is held on Mondays. The Course includes Composition of Glass generally – Modes of Manufacture – Special properties of Glass – Construction of Furnaces, &c.— Chemical Changes during Manufacture – Composition of Materials used, including colours — Moulds and Tools – Various Methods of Decoration, &c.¹²⁶

This course was the responsibility of Frederick Carder, who was then serving as both art master and instructor in glass manufacture in addition to his employment at Stevens & Williams. The class sessions met on Monday evenings from 7:30 to 9:30 to consider subject matters deemed ‘Preliminary’ and ‘Ordinary,’ and those students interested in the advanced instruction termed ‘Honours’ stayed on until 10 p. m. In

¹²⁴ Many years later, Frederick Carder would credit Thomas Turner, Director of Technical Instruction for the County of Stafford (and later Professor of Metallurgy at the University of Birmingham) for suggesting ‘the idea for a class in glassmaking, teaching the chemical and manufacturing sides of the industry.’ See Frederick Carder, *Autobiography*, p. 12.

¹²⁵ *County Express*, 15 September 1900. Former Stourbridge School student Thomas Woodall was treasurer of the Wordsley School of Art, and William Northwood was honorary secretary.

¹²⁶ This prospectus is illustrated in Hill, *Wordsley Past and Present*, p. 92.

conjunction with his employment at Stevens & Williams and funded by the South Staffordshire County Council, Frederick Carder had made a journey during 1902 to Austria and Germany for the purpose of observing glass manufacturing there, and the Wordsley prospectus for 1902-1903 noted that 'Special attention will be given to Continental methods of work, as studied by the Instructor during the past vacation in Germany and Austria.'¹²⁷

The 1902-1903 classes were to be Frederick Carder's final sessions as instructor at the Wordsley School of Art, for, after a visit to various glass factories in the United States during March 1903, he decided to leave his employment at Stevens & Williams for a position at the newly founded Steuben Glass Works in Corning, New York, USA.¹²⁸

Frederick Carder's brother, George J. Carder, a former student of the Stourbridge School, took over at the Wordsley School of Art and continued the curriculum that focused on glass manufacturing and decorating. Whilst attending the Stourbridge School (and the 'branch' at Brierley Hill) between 1885 and 1891, George J. Carder won a number of prizes, including monetary awards from the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers (see Appendix Four, 'Awards to Stourbridge School Students, 1852-1905').

¹²⁷ Frederick Carder presented two lectures devoted to his observations regarding glass manufacturing in Austria and Germany at the Wordsley School of Art; for lengthy reports of these lectures, see *County Express*, 29 November 1902 and 6 December 1902.

¹²⁸ For Frederick Carder's life and career at Steuben, see Paul V. Gardner, *The Glass of Frederick Carder* (New York: Crown, 1971) and Thomas P. Dimitroff, ed., *Frederick Carder and Steuben Glass* (Atglen: Schiffer Publishing, 1998). Frederick Carder's decision to leave his employment at Stevens & Williams and his post at the Wordsley School of Art was due in large measure to the fact that John Northwood II succeeded John Northwood I as art director at Stevens & Williams, although Frederick Carder had worked closely with John Northwood I for about two decades, creating more than 23,000 glass designs; see Charles R. Hajdamach, *20th Century British Glass* (Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club), p. 25. Frederick Carder's relationship with John Northwood I found expression in a glass vase with an art nouveau floral decoration in silver overlay and the following inscription on a silver cartouche: 'To my dear friend John Northwood 1st as a token of appreciation and esteem from Frederick C. Carder.' See <http://jamesdjulia.com/item/lot-1546-important-frederick-carder-presentation-vase-66805/>

The early efforts for art education at Brierley Hill and Wordsley in the 1880s had some impact upon both student enrolment levels and the financial wellbeing of the Stourbridge School. The classes at Brierley Hill were initially a ‘branch’ of the Stourbridge School, and there was some cooperation with the local interests at Wordsley. However, the subsequent development of independent institutions at both Brierley Hill and Wordsley attracted students who might otherwise have attended the Stourbridge School. The fundraising campaign for the erection of a building at Wordsley was strongly supported by both firms and individuals associated with the glass industry there, and the innovative curriculum, with its emphasis upon glass design and glass manufacture, during the 1890s and early twentieth century was another significant development.

Conclusions

This chapter provides both details and analysis regarding the relationships between the Stourbridge School of Art and the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. In short, the school had some longstanding connexions with the glass decorating segment of the local glass industry, but little connexion with glass manufacturing, although one prominent glass manufacturing executive was a member of the governing Council of the Stourbridge School for more than three decades.

In the late 1840s, a few representatives of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district were modest financial supporters of the drawing classes at the Stourbridge Mechanics’ Institution, but there is no evidence that the glass industry of the Stourbridge district had a significant role in the founding and first decade of operation of the Stourbridge Government School of Art, although many of the gentry, clergy, industrialists, business owners, professionals, and tradesmen who were supporters of the institution

expressed confidence that it would be of some general benefit to local industries, including glass. The first governing Council of the Stourbridge School included two glass manufacturers, but most of the Council officers and members over the subsequent five decades came from the ranks of local gentry, clergy, industrialists, business owners, professionals and tradesmen. The key financial benefactors of the Stourbridge School were from the same social strata, although some enterprises or individuals associated with the glass industry made monetary donations to the school during 1852-1862. When the Stourbridge School sought to retire its mortgage debt in the early 1880s, a few firms in the glass industry made contributions, as did several individuals who were associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district.

Based upon the newspaper accounts of annual meetings and prize-givings as well as other records, this thesis concludes that the most active members of the Council of the Stourbridge School during the first three decades of its existence were not associated with the local glass industry. However, in the early 1880s, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams became a member of the Council of the Stourbridge School, and he attended most annual meetings between 1882 and 1905 and assumed an active role in seeking to advance the institution. As did other members of the Council of the Stourbridge School, Silvers-Williams sometimes spoke with a sense of frustration regarding the fact that greater numbers of students did not come from the local glass industry. Silvers-Williams was instrumental in efforts to bring art instruction to Brierley Hill and Wordsley, and his activities with the Wordsley School were important to the success of that endeavour.

None of the six Stourbridge art masters had experience with either glass manufacturing or glass decorating, although many of their students were employed as glass cutters, glass engravers, or glass etchers. The focus of instruction in the school, as

mandated by the Department of Science and Art, was the twenty-three-stage South Kensington curriculum that placed a strong emphasis upon basic drawing and copying exercises, so only those students who attended for lengthy periods were likely to attempt works in the area of design, the apex of the curriculum.

In keeping with the mission of all of the provincial schools, the Stourbridge School of Art scheduled an evening class that was intended to enrol students employed in local industries so that those students could partake of art instruction to further their personal circumstances as employees in that industry and, if they became competent designers, to be of economic benefit to their employers. Those potential students who were employed in glass manufacturing were greatly constrained by a cyclical work schedule (six hours work/six hours off, Monday or Tuesday through Saturday) that made regular attendance in evening classes quite difficult. Although the Stourbridge School offered some alternative classes for art instruction, such as the Penny Class on weekday evenings and a special Morning Class on Mondays, neither class attracted students who were employed in glass manufacturing. Skilled glassworkers who earned relatively high wages had little incentive to seek education, and labourers and apprentices were constrained by the cyclical work schedule and the physically demanding nature of their employment. Some of the sons of glass manufacturers attended the Stourbridge School briefly, and many of the daughters were pupils for numbers of years in succession.

Those young men employed in glass decorating had a 10-12 hour workday, so evening class attendance was possible. However, because the majority of glass manufacturing plants and glass decorating enterprises were located in Brierley Hill or Wordsley, students employed there had to make their way to the Stourbridge School on foot or, when available later in the nineteenth century, by tram.

Student records are limited, but the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and local newspaper listings of award winners indicate that numerous students who were employed in the local glass decorating industry attended the Stourbridge School. Many of them won local or Government awards, and some of them became pupil teachers for short periods. At least one employer, glass decorators J. & J. Northwood at Wordsley, encouraged its employees to attend, and several of them claimed lofty local or Government awards, including prizes for glass design, over long stretches of years. Whether or not the award-winning designs of students were actually used by their respective employers is problematic at best, but the work of students James Hill and William Northwood probably brought some positive results to their employer.

Some criticism of the efficacy and utility of instruction at the Stourbridge School for the glass industry emerged in the 1880s and was also voiced by others in the 1890s. Letters written to a Royal Commission by former student John A. Service in 1883 and letters written to the editor of the *County Express* newspaper a decade later suggest that the Stourbridge School fell short of its intent to train designers for the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, especially glass manufacturing, although there was some measure of success in terms of the glass decorating segment of the industry.

The development of art instruction at Brierley Hill and Wordsley during the 1880s began with the cooperation of the Stourbridge School. Some Stourbridge School students, notably Frederick Carder but also others, chose to take instruction at Wordsley, and, as public enthusiasm favouring technical education gained momentum in the early 1890s, both the Brierley Hill and the Wordsley institutions secured funding from the County Council of Staffordshire. Local glass manufacturing and glass decorating interests supported the Wordsley school with substantial financial contributions. Former Stourbridge school

student Frederick Carder became art master at Wordsley, and, in the early years of the twentieth century, he established courses devoted to glass design and glass manufacturing within the curriculum of the school.

Between 1851 and 1905, the Stourbridge School, like other provincial schools during the last half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, sought to establish a relationship with local industries. Although quite a few students employed in the glass decorating segment of the industry attended the school and some achieved local and Government awards for their work, very few students of the Stourbridge School were employed in glass manufacturing, a circumstance that was often noted by members of the Council at annual meetings.

Voluntary financial support for the Stourbridge School came from various sources, but contributions from gentry, clergy, industrialists, business owners, professionals, and tradesmen greatly outpaced donations from enterprises or individuals associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. Likewise, almost all of the officers and members of the Council of the Stourbridge School came from the ranks of gentry, clergy, industrialists, business owners, professionals and tradesmen. In contrast, there was substantial support from glass manufacturers for the founding of art schools in Brierley Hill and Wordsley, and, in the late 1890s and the early twentieth century, the institution in Wordsley developed a curriculum of instruction that was especially focused on glass.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This thesis detailed, documented and analysed the historical development of an educational institution, namely the Stourbridge Government School of Art, within the context of political, economic, social and cultural forces that were present in Britain during the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century. The primary purposes of this thesis were to identify and to analyse the connexions and relationships of this educational institution with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district from 1850 to 1905. The methodology used to assess the historical development and the impact of the institution upon the glass industry of the Stourbridge district was that of social history, broadly defined, combining narrative and analytical modes.¹

Chapter One offered a review of scholarly literature regarding the Government schools of art, including various provincial schools similar to the Stourbridge School, along with general studies of the history of art instruction and technical education as well as published accounts of various aspects of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. In addition, numerous primary sources were identified and described, ranging from Government reports and documents, county directories, and local newspapers to fugitive documents pertaining to the Stourbridge Government School of Art, such as the printed report of a public meeting held in Stourbridge on 3 February 1851 and the handwritten Stourbridge Government School of Art *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874.

Following the review of literature in Chapter One, these six research questions were set forth. Firstly, to what extent did the national and local political, economic, social and cultural forces that brought the Stourbridge School into existence continue to impact its

¹ John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, fifth ed. (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2010), p. 157.

development and influence its supporters during the last half of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century? Second, who were the benefactors of the Stourbridge School and what was the nature and extent of their influence upon the school during the period from 1850 to 1905? Third, what were the approaches to art and design education of the various Stourbridge art masters during the period from 1850 to 1905? Fourth, in terms of socio-economic background and/or occupations, what were the characteristics of the students at the Stourbridge School during the period from 1850 to 1905? Fifth, how did the structure and content of the curriculum at the Stourbridge School contribute to art and design education during the period from 1850 to 1905? Sixth, what was the nature and character of the connexions and relationships of the Stourbridge School with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district during 1850-1905, especially regarding the accomplishments of its students?

Chapter Two and Chapter Three of this thesis provided the background and the context through which to gain an understanding of the historical development of the Stourbridge School. Chapter Two detailed the growth and evolution of Stourbridge from a market town in north Worcestershire to its mid-nineteenth-century attainment of status as the centre of an industrial area in which iron and glassware were important manufactured products. Trends in population, occupations and transportation were identified, and changes in the structure of municipal government and the growth of the built environment were noted. The impacts of the economic, political, and socio-cultural aspects of nineteenth-century Stourbridge were considered insofar as they affected industrialisation, urbanisation and civic culture. Most importantly in Chapter Two, the national political, economic, social and cultural forces that brought the Stourbridge School into existence and continued to impact its development and influence its supporters during the nineteenth century were

isolated and discussed. Chapter Three continued the explication of background and context of nineteenth-century Britain, focusing upon the growth of educational opportunities and the expanding role of Government regarding education at various levels. The advent of the Government schools of art was traced, ranging from the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures of 1835-1836 to Parliamentary committees in the 1840s that were charged to investigate the status of the schools of art and to review the policies, rules and regulations of the Head School and its administration. This chapter also offered details regarding the art classes begun in the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution in the late 1840s and described and analysed the public meeting of 3 February 1851 that resulted in the founding of a Government school of design at Stourbridge.

Chapter Four and Chapter Five of this thesis contained both historical details and analysis regarding management issues and the ongoing operations of the Stourbridge School spanning five and one-half decades. The matters considered ranged from mortgage debt, building renovations, and relations with the Government Department of Science and Art or political bodies to the nature and structure of the curriculum, the teaching methods of art masters, and the socio-economic characteristics of students as well as the various benefactors who supported the Stourbridge School. The importance of annual meetings and art exhibitions was discussed in terms of maintaining public support for the institution, and the advent of technical education and the relocation of the Stourbridge School to a new building in 1905 were considered in regard to their impact upon the institution and upon the civic culture of the Stourbridge district.

Chapter Six described and analysed the character and impact of the connexions and relationships of the Stourbridge School and the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, which consisted of glass manufacturing establishments and glass decorating firms. The

respective roles of the glass manufacturers and the proprietors of glass decorating establishments were noted in terms of their support for the Stourbridge School as evidenced in financial contributions, membership on the school Council, or other forms of participation in the operations and conduct of the school. The achievements of Stourbridge School students who were employed in the glass industry of the Stourbridge district were documented. Additionally, the effect on student enrolment in the Stourbridge School due to the founding of nearby schools of art in Brierley Hill and Wordsley was assessed, and the nature and extent of support by glass manufacturing establishments and glass decorating firms for the schools in Brierley Hill and Wordsley was contrasted with the support that had been afforded to the Stourbridge School by these same organisations.

With the foregoing overview of these chapters in mind, one can now turn to a consideration of the specific research questions that were the focal points of this thesis. Although these questions were set forth separately, there are areas of overlap among them, since the political, economic, social and cultural forces that influenced both Government and individuals (benefactors, art masters, and students) who were associated with the Stourbridge School of Art were common to all of them.

Research Questions: Restatements and Resolutions

To what extent did the national and local political, economic, social and cultural forces that brought the Stourbridge School into existence continue to impact its development and influence its supporters during the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century? The foremost national political and economic forces were twofold: first, concern for the aesthetics of British manufactured goods in the face of foreign competition; and, second, legislative and public favour for increased Government

involvement in education generally and, specifically, for instruction in art and science through evening classes intended for artisans who were employed in manufacturing industries of all kinds. Both of these national trends were clearly evident within the various remarks and the formal resolutions passed at the local public meeting in Stourbridge on 3 February 1851, and these same views were echoed from time to time in the annual meetings of the Stourbridge School by members of the school Council or by other benefactors and supporters during the five and one-half decades encompassed by this study. In terms of social and cultural forces during this period, there was popular interest in libraries, museums, and instruction in art, science and technical subjects that led to greater acceptance of Government involvement in these areas, and, one could argue, to a public expectation that Government intervention through legislation was necessary to bring about the desired changes and improvements. Motivated in part by the concept of 'self-help,' many individuals from the labouring classes sought education at Mechanics' Institutions in the 1840s and, later, at Government schools of art, whilst the philanthropic endeavours of gentry, industrialists, business owners, professionals and tradesmen were important factors in both the establishment and the ongoing operations of such educational institutions. Government support in the form of grants for provincial schools of art and science was predicated upon the prospects for financial contributions from local donors, but the major Government interest in the provincial schools was based upon the proposition that the provincial schools would be of particular benefit to manufacturing industries in their respective districts. In the Stourbridge district, a group of local benefactors led by gentry convened a public meeting to create enthusiasm and financial support for the Stourbridge School. The initial monetary contributions came from gentry, industrialists, business owners, professionals and tradesmen, but financial support from those involved in the glass

industry of the Stourbridge district was negligible, although two prominent glass manufacturers were members of the first Council of the Stourbridge School.

Beginning in the mid-1850s and continuing for some three and one-half decades, the provincial schools were charged to be 'self-supporting' by the Department of Science and Art, but, in the late 1880s, national legislation regarding governance and funding for technical education enabled some county political bodies to erect purpose built structures for the establishment of technical schools. Such enthusiasm was relatively late in coming to Stourbridge because of other civic projects and some conflicts, but a group of interested businessmen and other benefactors in the Stourbridge district worked closely with the Worcestershire County Council to bring about the new Free Library and Technical Institute building that was erected in Stourbridge in 1905. The opening of that facility, accompanied by the Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition, was a noteworthy occasion in the history of civic culture in the Stourbridge district.

In the initial chapter of this thesis, differing viewpoints regarding the rationale for support of the provincial schools by local benefactors were noted in the review of literature. Macdonald and others argued that economic considerations expressed by supporters were most important, whilst Cunningham identified 'cultural elite' groups of benefactors who imparted vigour to the schools he studied, concluding that 'the true motivation for the schools was as much the encouragement of fine art as of manufactures.'² This study of the Stourbridge School suggests that a univocal explanation for the rationale of the motivations of benefactors is probably not tenable. Some involved with the founding and development of the Stourbridge School voiced economic concerns, especially at the outset of the local

² Peter James Cunningham, 'The Formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 1979), p. 79.

school's operations. Other benefactors spoke of a need to refine public taste and for the cultivation of interest in fine art. Moreover, some of the most ardent and longstanding benefactors, such as Lord Ward and Lord Lyttelton, expressed themselves on both the potential economic benefits of the school to local industry and their hope that the school would serve to elevate public taste.

Who were the benefactors of the Stourbridge School and what was the nature and extent of their influence upon the school during the period from 1850 to 1905? The benefactors of the Stourbridge School of Art came from various social strata: gentry, clergy, industrialists, business owners, professionals and tradesmen. Those who held positions as president or vice-president of the school Council and presided at the annual public meetings and prize-givings were typically gentry or clergymen. J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, and barrister Robert Scott, who were prime movers and officers of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institute in the 1830s-1840s, were instrumental in securing a Government grant to found the Stourbridge School and were among the first financial donors. Between 1851 and 1905, the Council of the Stourbridge School always included numerous clergymen representing various churches, and there were usually Council members from the medical professions. Council membership almost always included solicitors, such as William Blow Collis, John Harward or Gainsborough Harward.

Lord Ward (Earl of Dudley), who served as president of the Council for more than three decades, was a major financial benefactor, contributing £25 or more annually, and Lord Lyttelton was a vice-president for about 25 years and presided or spoke at many of the annual public meetings. Industrialists William Orme Foster and Charles Evers-Swindell were substantial benefactors over several decades, although the school had little, if any, direct benefit to their respective manufacturing interests in iron. Beginning in the early

1880s, glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams joined the Council and was active in the affairs of the Stourbridge School for more than three decades. However, Joseph Silvers-Williams's leadership in the encouragement of art education in the Brierley Hill and Wordsley areas of the Stourbridge district is probably of greater significance than are his connexions with the Stourbridge School.

Alfred W. Worthington was Honourary Secretary of the Stourbridge School during the 1882-1905 period, and he was active in political circles in Worcestershire as well as in many benevolent or charitable organisations in Stourbridge. Former student H. Watson Smith, a community leader for the promotion of fine art and music in Stourbridge for more than four decades, was a longtime member of the school Council from the 1880s onward, and he was the key advocate for the appointment of George Henry Cromack as art master of the Stourbridge School in 1893. Smith and Cromack became close friends, and they were responsible for the art exhibits within the comprehensive Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition held at the opening of the Free Library and Technical Institute in 1905.

What were the approaches to art and design education of the various Stourbridge art masters during the period from 1850 to 1905? The first two art masters, Henry Alexander Bowler (September 1851-July 1852) and Andrew MacCallum (September 1852-July 1854), were at the Stourbridge School only briefly, and both gentlemen went on to lengthy and noteworthy careers in fine art as painters. Art masters George Paterson Yeats (September 1854-September 1863), William Plastons Bowen (October 1863-December 1881), Edward John Simms (January 1882-June 1893), and George Henry Cromack (October 1893-April 1924) served for substantial periods of time, respectively. All of the art masters had been educated at the Head School in London and were certificated in one or more areas of fine art proficiency, and each was familiar with the twenty-three-stage South

Kensington curriculum and its emphasis upon drawing and copying along with other areas of instruction in various aspects of fine art. This rigid curriculum was in place throughout all of the provincial schools under the administrative control of the Department of Science and Art. The art masters were assisted by pupil teachers, and instruction by the art masters and the pupil teachers consisted primarily of lessons in basic drawing and exercises in copying, the latter often receiving such considerable emphasis that it led to adverse criticism. Art masters were responsible for the intermediate and advanced areas of art instruction, and individual art masters tended to emphasise their favourite areas, such as painting from nature or drawing and painting from life. Evidence regarding the teaching methods of the several Stourbridge art masters is scant, but William Bowen was interested in nature (flowers and foliage) for points of emphasis in teaching about colour and painting. Competitions based upon timed studies began in the 1890s, and art master Cromack's approaches to fine art included sketching outdoors and other innovative activities.

Based upon the available evidence, none of the art masters had any background or direct experience in the area of design for industrial applications such as glass. More importantly, there is no evidence that any of the art masters sought to interact with local industries in the Stourbridge district to determine their needs in the area of design; in fact, art master Simms, was urged to be in contact with the glass manufacturers and glass decorators by Alfred W. Worthington, one of several Council members who expressed concern regarding the benefits of the school to the local glass industry from time to time.

In terms of socio-economic background and/or occupations, what were the characteristics of the students at the Stourbridge School during the period from 1850 to 1905? Based upon the variety of documents at hand (class rosters from 1864-1874 in the handwritten *Register of Students*, Government reports, newspaper listings of award-

winning students, and the decennial PRO Census), the boys and men in the evening class were typically employed. The great majority were ages 13-17, although a very few were as young as 9 or 10 and a small number were age 20 or a few years older. These students and their parents (that is, father) were engaged in a wide variety of occupations that can be characterised generally as 'labour,' and it is significant for this study that those students and/or parents (that is, father) who were associated with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district were typically employed in glass decorating establishments (cutting, engraving, or etching) rather than in glass manufacturing. The glass decorating firm of J. & J. Northwood, owned and operated in Wordsley by former Stourbridge School students John Northwood and Joseph Northwood, employed a number of young men who attended the Stourbridge School, and several of them, such as Edwin Grice and James Hill, were award-winning students over periods of years. The local and national awards secured by these students were linked to various stages in the twenty-three-stage curriculum. Some students had awards for designs related to glass decorating, including cameo glass, but most of the awards were for drawing, painting, and other aspects of traditional fine art. From the early 1850s until 1894, the Stourbridge School also served a number of students who were boys, ages 10-13, and who were enrolled at the Old Swinford Hospital School.

Based upon the available evidence (class rosters from 1864-1874 in the handwritten *Register of Students*, Government reports, newspaper listings of award-winning students, and the decennial PRO Census), the students who attended the Ladies Morning Class were not employed, and the great majority of them were members of families headed by a parent (that is, father) who was from the ranks of gentry, clergy, industrialists, professionals, or business owners. Ages of these students were seldom entered in the handwritten *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874, but evidence from the PRO Census rolls suggests that the

ages of the girl students were generally similar to that of the boys, that is, 13-17 for the majority of them. In keeping with the policies of the Department of Science and Art, the students in the Ladies Morning Classes throughout Britain paid higher fees than the students in the Male Evening Classes, and these higher fees generated income that was especially important to the financial wellbeing of the provincial institutions similar to the Stourbridge School. Although girls and women could attend the lower cost evening class at the Stourbridge School beginning in the mid-1880s, there is no evidence to suggest that they, either employed or not employed, did so to any extent. The female students from the Stourbridge School were recognised with numerous local and national awards, typically in drawing, painting and other aspects of traditional fine art.

How did the structure and content of the curriculum at the Stourbridge School contribute to art and design education during the period from 1850 to 1905? Without doubt, many young men and women received art instruction through the Stourbridge School of Art during the latter half of the nineteenth century and the first few years of the twentieth century. Based upon the class rosters in the handwritten *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and the comprehensive listings of award-winning students in local newspapers 1852 to 1905, it can be demonstrated that quite a few students remained in the school for periods of at least several years in succession and that many of them were recognised with local or national awards for various stages of the South Kensington curriculum. Several Stourbridge School students—including Frederick Carder, James Hill, Frederick Noke, John Northwood II, William Northwood, and Thomas Woodall—who were employed in the glass decorating industry won awards for various types of glass design. A few former students, such as Albert Gyngell, Harriet Skidmore and Frank Short, had substantial careers in fine art for a number of years. However, it is problematic to link

the relatively fundamental art education received by these students with their subsequent successes in fine art or in the glass industry that demanded mastery of concepts and specialised techniques that were not part of the South Kensington curriculum.

What was the nature and character of the connexions and relationships of the Stourbridge School with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district during 1850-1905, especially regarding the accomplishments of its students? From the time of its founding and inception in the early 1850s until its metamorphosis as a technical school in the 1890s and subsequent relocation to a purpose-built structure in 1905, the Stourbridge School, as expressed in numerous remarks by its benefactors and Council members, sought to establish and maintain relations with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. However, as the previous chapters have indicated, only a few individuals who were involved in glass manufacturing were financial benefactors or Council members of the Stourbridge School. Participation in the affairs of the Stourbridge School by representatives of the glass industry of the Stourbridge district was not particularly noteworthy, although several former students (Frederick Carder, John Northwood I, Thomas Woodall and George Woodall) rose to prominence in the area of glass decorating.

Several glass manufacturers were members of the school Council for brief periods in the 1850s and again in the 1880s, but only glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams maintained a longstanding presence on the Council, as his membership began in the early 1880s and spanned several decades, during which time he attended most of the annual meetings and was a frequent speaker. Joseph Silvers-Williams was also active in promoting art education in both Brierley Hill and Wordsley, and it must be emphasised once more that these institutions came to compete for students with the Stourbridge School and that the

innovative curriculum in glass manufacture and glass design in 1901-1903 at Wordsley was quite different from the art education offered at Stourbridge.

The annual monetary prizes for student work that were offered by the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers were rarely claimed by students employed in glass manufacturing, as all but two of the awards between 1886 and 1902 went to Stourbridge School students who were employed in glass decorating establishments. A number of former students, including James Hill and Edwin Grice, found long term employment in the decorative glass industry, and John Northwood II was works manager at Stevens & Williams for many years beginning in 1902. Former student Harry Northwood, who attended the Stourbridge School during 1874-1881, had a lengthy career in glass manufacturing after he left England for the United States, as did Joseph Locke. Frederick Carder was employed as a designer by Stevens & Williams for about two decades before leaving England to become head of the Steuben Glass Works in Corning, New York, USA.

These six research questions and their respective resolutions as detailed in the various chapters of this thesis and summarised above comprise a reasonably comprehensive explanation of the historical development of the Stourbridge School of Art from its founding in 1851 to its relocation in 1905. In addition to an explication of the political, economic, social and cultural forces that were at work during this period, this thesis offers insights regarding those persons who were benefactors of the Stourbridge School and those persons who were students at the school, including many who were associated with the glass decorating area of local industry in the Stourbridge district. Most importantly, this thesis reveals and explicates the nature of the relationships between the Stourbridge School and the glass industry of the Stourbridge district.

Implications for Future Research

This study of the Stourbridge School of Art and its relationships with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district is more than a ‘micro history’ of a period, namely, 1850-1905, in the history and development of a provincial Government school of science and art within an industrial centre that had evolved from a market town. Based upon the available evidence from Government reports, local newspapers and a variety of other primary sources, this thesis reveals much about the operations of a nineteenth-century Government school of art, and, as such, offers avenues for historical research of a local nature as well as broader considerations of historiography.

Among the most obvious possibilities for further research is an opportunity to add to this study with an exploration of the history and development of the Stourbridge School beyond 1905. The new Free Library and Technical Institute that opened in April 1905 became an integral part of civic culture in Stourbridge for many years to come, and the school created and maintained a curriculum in glass design and glassmaking for several decades beginning in the 1930s.³ This curriculum at the Stourbridge School of Arts and

³ For further information about the curriculum for glass design and glassmaking, see *County Express*, 4 November 1936; James H. Hogan, ‘The Development in the Design of English Glassware during the last Hundred Years,’ *Journal of the Society of Glass Technology*, 20 (December 1936), p. 740; J. C. Vidgen-Jenks, ‘Stourbridge Glass,’ *Pottery Gazette and Glass Trade Review*, 1 April 1938, p. 567; J. C. Vidgen-Jenks, ‘Co-Operation between Art Schools and Glass Manufacturers,’ *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 86 (29 April 1938), pp. 590-606; ‘Art Schools and Glass Manufacture: What is being done at Stourbridge,’ *Pottery Gazette and Glass Trade Review*, 1 June 1938, pp. 814-815; *County Express*, 7 October 1939; *County Express*, 21 December 1940; *County Express*, 19 April 1941; ‘Design in Glass: Products of the Stourbridge School of Arts and Crafts,’ *Pottery Gazette and Glass Trade Review*, March 1944, pp. 142-143; *Birmingham Post and Mail*, 4 January 1952; and H. J. Haden, ‘Artist-Craftsmen of Stourbridge School of Art Glass Department,’ *The Glass Cone* (Summer 1988), pp. 3-6. Cyril Harper, who attended the Stourbridge School in 1935-1937, recorded his memories of the curriculum and his subsequent career in glass manufacturing; see C. W. Harper, ‘Making Glass,’ in *Black Country Folk at Work*, ed. by Ned Williams (Wolverhampton: Uralia Press, 1989), p. 43.

Crafts was developed under the leadership of principal J. C. Vidgen-Jenks about 1934 and continued by his successor, principal Ernest M. Dinkel, who served from 1940-1948, and by J. C. Downing, who became principal in 1948. Charles D. Stanier was the instructor for glass design and glassmaking for many years, and William G. Webb was responsible for instruction in glass engraving. In July 1949, the Stourbridge School of Arts and Crafts suffered serious damage from a fire that destroyed the entire contents of the 'exhibition room' and affected other areas of the building.⁴ The Free Library continued at the site until the mid-1980s, when the new Stourbridge Public Library facility was opened in the Crown Centre near the Stourbridge Town Hall. In 1989, the University of Wolverhampton absorbed the various classes that were devoted to glass.⁵

Additionally for local interest, the history and development of the Government schools of art in Brierley Hill and Wordsley are worthy of study, particularly in view of the strong support they received from their respective local glass manufacturing and glass decorating enterprises in the 1890s. Newspaper accounts of the development of these schools are available in the *Advertiser* and the *County Express*, and there are documents in the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum) that were recovered from a time capsule at the Wordsley school after its demolition in 2000.⁶

In its broadest sense, this study offers an opportunity to expand the current scholarly understanding of the general history of the Government schools of art in Britain and of the

⁴ *Birmingham Post and Mail*, 26 July 1949 and *Express and Star*, 26 July 1949.

⁵ Keith Cummings, 'Born of Industry: The First 150 Years of Glass Education in Stourbridge, England,' *Glass* (Spring 2005), pp. 40-45.

⁶ *Proposed New Art School, Wordsley, Subscription List* (dated 30 September 1897); a subsequent printed listing, *New Art School, Wordsley* (dated 20 June 1899), shows further contributions from many members of the Richardson family; these and other similar documents are in the collection of the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum).

relationship of a particular provincial school with an important segment of one or more local industries. The general history of the Government schools of art in Britain may be profitably extended by integrating the scholarly studies of individual schools that have been completed within the past few decades, especially when some of these studies have revealed information regarding the backgrounds and motivations of financial benefactors and other supporters. Such an integration would involve comparisons and contrasts, but the resulting conclusions could shed further light on the present viewpoints of historians regarding the impacts of the political, economic, social and cultural forces that influenced those who supported the provincial schools during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

This study particularly invites scholarly enquiries into several provincial schools that sought relationships with local industries in their respective districts: Coventry (ribbons); Kidderminster (carpet); Newcastle (ceramics and glass); Sheffield (silverware); The Potteries, Burslem and Stoke-on-Trent (ceramic manufacture and decorating); and Worcester (porcelain manufacture and decorating). Studies of these schools could yield insights into the teaching methods of the respective art masters and the occupations of students, and most importantly, the interactions of manufacturing industries with those art masters and students, as well as the roles played by manufacturing interests as benefactors and supporters of the schools. In short, there remains considerable work to be undertaken in order to ascertain the full significance of the provincial schools of art during the nineteenth-century in Great Britain.

APPENDIX ONE

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTH KENSINGTON CURRICULUM

The curriculum that was in place in 1852 was the culmination of developments that began nearly a decade earlier. This appendix summarizes the key plateaus of that development.

This seven-stage curriculum was in place during 1843-1844:

- VII. Outline drawing of ornament, in pencil
- VI. Shading and use of chalks
- V. Modeling from casts and from nature
- IV. Drawing from casts of ornament with chalk
- III. Elementary colouring, copy from coloured drawings and colouring from nature
- II. Elementary drawing of human figure with chalk, from prints and from casts of statues
- I. Instruction in the history, principles and practices of ornamental design¹

This twelve-stage curriculum was in place in 1846:

- 12. Elementary drawing (in outline, with pencil)
- 11. Shading from the flat (from engraved examples, with chalk)
- 10. Shading from casts (with chalk)
- 9. Chiaroscuro painting (grisaille)
- 8. Coloring
- 7. Figure drawing from the flat (from engraved examples)
- 6. Figure drawing from the round (from casts)
- 5. Painting the figure from the round (from casts and drapery)
- 4. Geometrical drawing (applied to ornament)
- 3. Perspective
- 2. Modelling (from engraved examples, from casts, and from nature)
- 1. Design (various applications of art to ornamental productions and decoration)²

¹ *Third Report of the Council of the School of Design for the Year 1843-4* (London: HMSO, 1844), pp. 29 and 51.

² *Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the Year 1845-46* (London: HMSO, 1846), p. 3.

This twenty-three-stage curriculum, later known as the ‘South Kensington Curriculum,’³ was developed by Richard Redgrave and was in place at the provincial schools in 1852:

Stage 1. Linear drawing by aid of instruments.

- a. Linear geometry.
- b. Mechanical and machine drawing, and details of architecture from copies.
- c. Linear Perspective.

Stage 2. Freehand outline drawing of rigid forms from examples or copies.

- a. Objects.
- b. Ornament.

Stage 3. Freehand drawing from the “round.”

- a. Models and objects.
- b. Ornament.

Stage 4. Shading from flat examples or copies.

- a. Models and objects.
- b. Ornament.

Stage 5. Shading from the round or solid forms.

- a. Models and objects.
- b. Ornament.
- c. Time sketching and shading from memory.

Stage 6. Drawing the human figure and animal forms from copies.

- a. In outline.
- b. Shaded.

Stage 7. Drawing flowers, foliage and natural history, from flat examples or copies.

- a. In outline.
- b. Shaded.

Stage 8. Drawing the human figure or animal forms from the “round” or nature.

- a. In outline from casts.
- b1. Shaded (details).
- b2. Shaded (whole figures).
- c. Studies of the human figure from nude model.
- d. Studies of the human figure, draped.
- e. Time sketching and sketching from memory.

³ For information regarding examples furnished by the Department of Science and Art that were to be used by students at various stages, see Stuart Macdonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London: University of London Press, 1970), pp. 388-391.

Stage 9. Anatomical studies.

- a. Of the human figure.
- b. Of animal forms.
- c. Of either, modeled.

Stage 10. Drawing flowers, foliage, landscapes, and objects from natural history from nature.

- a. In outline.
- b. Shaded.

Stage 11. Painting ornament from the flat or copies.

- a. In oil.
- b. In colours.

Stage 12. Painting ornament from the cast, &c.

- a. In monochrome, either in water-colour, oil, or tempera.

Stage 13. Painting (general) from flat examples or copies, flowers, still-life, &c.

- a. Flowers or natural objects, in water-colour, in oil, or in tempera.
- b. Landscapes.

Stage 14 Painting (general) direct from nature.

- a. Flowers, or still-life, in water-colour, oil, or tempera without backgrounds.
- b. Landscapes.

Stage 15. Painting groups as compositions of colour.

- a. In water-colour, oil, or tempera.

Stage 16. Painting the human figure or animals in monochrome from casts.

- a. In oil, water-colour, or tempera.

Stage 17. Painting the human figure or animals in colour.

- a. From the flat or copies.
- b. From nature, nude or draped.
- c. Time sketches and compositions.

Stage 18. Modelling ornament.

- a. Elementary, from casts.
- b. Advanced, from casts.
- c. From drawings.
- d. Time sketches from examples and from memory.

Stage 19. Modelling the human figure or animals.

- a. Elementary, from casts of hands, feet, masks, &c.
- b. Advanced, from casts or solid examples.
- c. From drawings.
- d. From nature, nude or draped.

Stage 20. Modelling fruits, flowers, foliage, and objects of natural history from nature.

Stage 21. Time sketches in clay of the human figure or animals, from nature.

Stage 22. Elementary design.

- a. Studies treating natural objects ornamentally.
- b. Ornamental arrangements to fill given spaces in monochrome.
- c. Ornamental arrangements to fill given spaces in colour.
- d. Studies of historic styles of ornament drawn or modelled.

Stage 23. Applied designs, technical or miscellaneous studies.

- a. Machine and mechanical drawing, plan drawing, mapping, surveys from measurement.
- b. Architectural design.
- c. Surface design.
- d. Plastic design.

APPENDIX TWO

BENEFACTORS AND SUPPORTERS, 1851-1855

The persons listed below attended the public meeting in the Stourbridge Corn Exchange on 3 February 1851.¹ Those designated with an asterisk (*) were financial benefactors as noted in one or more of the sources consulted.²

Name	Occupation
Akroyd, William*	currier, bailiff County Court
Allsop, James	painter/glazier/decorator
Aston, John	New Inn (Beauty Bank)
Bancks, Dr. Thomas*	<i>gentry</i> , surgeon
Barney, Richard	rope manufacturer
Bennitt, Capt. Joseph*	<i>gentry</i> , coalmaster (Dudley)
Betts, Dr. Henry A.*	surgeon, Betts & Giles
Blurton, Edward	watch and clockmaker
Brooks, Benjamin	Talbot Hotel
Brooks, Samuel	<i>gentry</i>
Clark, Thomas	head master, Birmingham school of design
Collis, Charles	solicitor/insurance agent
Collis, George	wine and spirit merchant
Collis, William Blow*	<i>gentry</i> , solicitor/clerk
Cooper, Josiah	linen and woolen draper
Cox, Rev. J. S.	<i>gentry</i> , clergyman, Christ Church (Quarry Bank)
Crudgington, Thomas	Turf Tavern Hotel
Davis, John	glass manufacturer
Davis, Solomon	currier/leather dealer
Dudley, Dr. Charles	<i>gentry</i> , physician
Dykes, John	hat maker
Edwards, William	Falcon Inn, auctioneer/appraiser
Foley, J. H. Hodgetts*	<i>gentry</i> , Member of Parliament
Foster, Percival	<i>gentry</i> , ironmaster
Foster, William Orme*	<i>gentry</i> , ironmaster
Gibson, Charles W.	insurance agent
Giles, Dr. Henry A.	<i>gentry</i> , surgeon, Betts and Giles

¹ The PRO 1851 Census was helpful in determining occupations and *gentry* designations as were these directories: *Post Office Directory of Birmingham with Staffordshire and Worcestershire* (London: W. Kelly and Co., 1850); *Slater's Classified Directory of the Extensive and Important Manufacturing District 15 Miles Round Birmingham* (Manchester: Isaac Slater, 1851); and *M. Billing's Directory and Gazetteer of the Country of Worcester* (Birmingham: M. Billing, 1855).

² Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution, *Annual Report for the Year Ending 31st December 1851* (Stourbridge: J. Heming, 1852); *Worcester Herald*, 22 February 1851; *Trustee's Remarks on the Report of the Stourbridge School of Design for the Year 1855* (Stourbridge: Thomas Mellard, n. d.).

Name	Occupation
Girdlestone, Rev. J.	<i>gentry</i> , clergyman, Holy Trinity (Wordsley)
Grainger	(Wolverhampton)
Green, Abraham	painter/plumber/glazier
Grier, Rev. John W.	<i>gentry</i> , clergyman
Griffiths, William	accountant/insurance agent
Harper, George	linen and woolen draper
Harris, Rev. (Brierley Hill)	<i>gentry</i> , clergyman
Harward, John*	<i>gentry</i> , solicitor
Hopkins, John	<i>gentry</i> , clothier
Hossack, Rev. J.	<i>gentry</i> , clergyman
Jobson, Robert	ironfounder
Kempton, P. T.	
Lord Lyttelton*	<i>gentry</i>
Lord Ward*	<i>gentry</i>
Lyttelton, Rev. W. H.*	<i>gentry</i> , clergyman, St. John the Baptist's (Hagley)
Manley, Thomas	bank manager
Mellard, Thomas	printer/bookseller
Morris, Henry	iron merchant
Norris, Dr. William	physician
Pargeter, Thomas*	<i>gentry</i> , nail factory & maltster
Perrins, Charles	auctioneer
Perry, William	<i>gentry</i>
Reynolds, Joshua	clock/watchmaker
Richards, Benjamin	victualler, Vine Commercial Hotel
Rogers, Edward	<i>gentry</i>
Roper, B.	
Scott, Robert*	<i>gentry</i> , barrister and magistrate
Shutt (Sr.), Walter	land agent/surveyor
Shutt (Jr.), Walter	insurance agent
Smith, Edward	architect/builder
Smith, F. Smallman	architect
Turner, Rev. R. P.	<i>gentry</i> , clergyman
Wells, Rev. Giffard	<i>gentry</i> , clergyman, St. Thomas's (Stourbridge)
Williams, B.	beer retailer (Kidderminster)
Wood, G.	manufacturer, chains and iron goods
Wood, Thomas	glass engraver
Woodward, Benjamin H.	carpet manufacturer (Kidderminster)
Wooldridge, Benjamin	auctioneer/appraiser
Yardley, Thomas	farmer

APPENDIX THREE

STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL CLASS SCHEDULES AND FEES, 1852-1905

1852-1862¹

Evening male class, 7-9 p.m., Monday, Wednesday, Friday (2s per month)
Afternoon male private class, 3-5 p.m., one day per week (21s per quarter)
Afternoon female private class, 3-5 p.m., one day per week (21s per quarter)
Afternoon female public class, 3-5 p.m., one day per week (2s per month)
Oldswinford Hospital boys class, 6:30-8:30 p.m., Tuesday and Thursday (£25 per year)²
Modelling class (clay), began c. August 1856

Note: six weeks vacation in mid-summer and two weeks at Christmas.³

1863-1869

Evening male 'artisan' class, 6:45-9:30 p.m., Monday, Wednesday, Friday (2s per month)
Female private class, 10 a.m.-12 p.m., Tuesday and Thursday (10s 6d per quarter)⁴
Afternoon male private class, 3-5 p.m., one day per week (21s per quarter), 1864-1865 only

Note: one week vacation at Easter, six weeks in mid-summer and two weeks at Christmas.⁵

1870-1884

Ladies Morning Class, 10 a.m.-12, Tuesday and Thursday (10s 6d per quarter)
General Evening Class 7-9:30 p.m. Monday, Wednesday, Friday (2s per month).⁶

¹ *First Report of the Department of Practical Art* (London: HMSO, 1853), p. 120 [hereafter cited as *First Report DPA*]. The evening male classes at the Birmingham and Worcester schools met five evenings per week, Monday through Friday; see *First Report DPA*, pp. 117 and 120. Boys from the Oldswinford Hospital School attended classes taught through the Stourbridge School of Art until mid-1894; see *County Express*, 26 January 1895.

² *First Report DPA*, p. 120. In September 1853, J. H. Hodgetts Foley, MP, indicated that the school would have 100 boys enrol in the Stourbridge School; see *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 26 September 1853.

³ *First Report DPA*, p. 116.

⁴ 'Young gentlemen under 16' were also permitted to enrol in this class; see *Report from the Select Committee on Schools of Art* (London: HMSO, 8 July 1864), p. 441 [hereafter cited as *Select Committee 1864*].

⁵ *Select Committee 1864*, p. 441.

⁶ *Advertiser*, 15 October 1870 and 15 August 1874.

1885-1893

Evening class (males & females) 7-9 p.m. Monday, Wednesday, Friday (2s per month)

Ladies morning class 10 a.m.-12 Tuesday and Thursday (15s per quarter)

Afternoon class 3:15-5:15 p.m. Wednesday (fee 7s 6d per quarter).⁷

Modelling class 3-5 p.m. Saturday (2s 6d per quarter)⁸

Note: c. 1884-1885 class Saturday and Monday afternoons for glassmakers (fee unknown)⁹

Note: September 1891, 'Penny Class' Tuesday and Thursday evenings (1d per lesson)

1894-1905

Evening class (males & females) 7-9 p.m. Monday, Wednesday, Friday (2s per month)

Morning class 10 a.m.-12 Tuesday and Thursday (15s per quarter)

Penny Class for drawing 7-9 p.m. Tuesday and Thursday (1d per lesson)

Note: class for glassmakers (males) 10 a.m. to 12 Monday began in 1894 (5s per quarter)¹⁰

Note: 'Life Class' 7-9 p.m. Monday, Wednesday and Friday began in 1895¹¹

⁷ This class for 'young Ladies and Gentlemen, attending Private Schools' began in the fall of 1885; see *County Express*, 22 August 1885. Citing lack of attendance, the Stourbridge School Council discontinued this class in 1887; see *County Express*, 8 October 1887.

⁸ *County Express*, 28 August 1886.

⁹ *Advertiser*, 24 January 1885 and *Pottery Gazette*, February 1885. The Saturday class was probably for advanced students who wished to do 'modelling,' and it was soon discontinued; see *Advertiser*, 16 January 1886. There is no indication in any later reports regarding the Stourbridge School that the Monday afternoon class was actually begun.

¹⁰ This class was intended for those engaged in glass manufacturing. Students could also attend any evening classes for an additional 3s per quarter; see *County Express*, 25 August 1894 (this class was discontinued in 1897, and there is no evidence that it actually functioned).

¹¹ *County Express*, 7 September 1895. For class schedules (1896-1901), see *County Express*, 29 August 1896, 28 August 1897, 27 August 1898, 1 September 1900, and 24 August 1901.

APPENDIX FOUR

AWARDS TO STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL STUDENTS, 1852-1905

This chronological listing of awards to Stourbridge School students was compiled from accounts of the annual public meetings and prize-givings as reported in the *Worcester Herald*, *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, *Advertiser*, *County Express* or *Stourbridge Observer* newspapers along with annual reports of the Department of Practical Art and its successor, the Department of Science and Art, and the handwritten *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874. Some newspaper accounts are quite exhaustive, listing by name the male and female students who received specific awards. Other newspaper reports are incomplete or do not differentiate clearly between Government (that is, national) and local awards. A few newspaper accounts provide the titles of books given as prizes. The Stourbridge School's annual meeting and prize-giving typically took place in December or January, and both national and local awards were made at that time. This listing includes Government awards as well as the highest local awards.

Because this study is concerned with the relationship of the Stourbridge school to the glass industry of the Stourbridge district, efforts were made to identify individual students who were employed in the glass industry or whose parents (that is, father) were employed in the glass industry.¹ Using the surnames and forenames of Stourbridge School students, the decennial PRO Census records from 1841 through 1911 were accessed, and searches yielded information about the individual students as well as their parents and siblings.² The names of Stourbridge School students who were associated with the glass industry are in **bold type** in this appendix. Information documenting the connexion of a student with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district is provided on the first occasion of that student's name in the list of awards.

Medals and other prizes awarded by the Department of Science and Art were typically termed 'Government prizes' in newspaper listings, and local prizes were sometimes termed 'committee prizes' because they were determined by the Stourbridge art master and a group of persons drawn from the Stourbridge School Council.³ Local book prizes were instituted in the late 1850s at the suggestion of Lord Ward, who served as president of the Stourbridge school Council for more than three decades.⁴ The total volume of awards grew steadily over the latter half of the nineteenth century and was greatly expanded in the 1880s and again in the 1890s with the advent of technical education. Descriptions of various medals awarded between 1852 and 1905 can be found on the last few pages of this appendix.

¹ Two sources with extensive indices were particularly useful: Charles R. Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914* (Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 1991) and Jason Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002* (Harrowgate: by author, 2002).

² <http://www.ukcensusonline.com/search/index.php>

³ See, for example, *Advertiser*, 14 January 1882; *Advertiser*, 24 January 1885; and *County Express*, 11 January 1890.

⁴ *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 17 December 1859.

1852

Government medals, male students: R. Wilson (outline drawing of ornament), James Allsop (outline drawing of ornament).

1853, May

Government medals, male students: Thomas Adams (stage 22) and **Josiah Fairfax Muckley** (stage 23). Note: Adams's drawing, a design for carpet, was purchased by the Department of Science and Art after being exhibited at Gore House; see *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 25 June 1853. **Josiah Fairfax Muckley** (b. 1832) was employed as a 'glass engraver' at the firm in Wordsley operated by his father, Jabez Muckley, so his project at stage 23 may have been a design for engraved glass.

1853, December

Government medals, male students: Thomas Adams (stages 1, 3, 5, 11), Charles Pardoe (stage 4), **Josiah Fairfax Muckley** (stage 10).

Government medal, female student: Mary Aldam (stage 5).

1854, Spring

Government medal, male student: **Josiah Fairfax Muckley** (stage 22d). Note: Muckley's work was selected for inclusion in the Department of Science and Art traveling exhibition that visited other provincial schools.

1854, Autumn

Government medals, male students: John Cartwright (stages 2b, 5b), Charles Evers (stage 4b), **Josiah Fairfax Muckley** (stage 6a), **John Northwood** (stage 4b), Fredrick Row (stage 10a). Note: **John Northwood** (b. 1837) was listed as a 'glass painter' in the 1851 PRO Census.

1855, Spring

Government medal, male student: James Allsop (stage 22d). Note: Allsop's work was selected for inclusion in the Department of Science and Art traveling exhibition at other provincial schools.

1855, Autumn

Government medals, male students: James Allsop (stage 3b), John Cartwright (stage 4b), **John Northwood** (stage 6a).

1856

Government medals, male students: Frederick Row (stage 4b), **John Northwood** (stage 11b), Thomas Charles Smyth (stage 8a).

1857

Government medal, male student: Thomas C. Smyth (stage 8a, frieze). Note: Smyth's work was noted in the *Daily News*, 12 October 1857 and *Morning Chronicle*, 13 October 1857.

1858

Government prize students, male: Henry Newnam, **John Northwood**, William Lewis, **Thomas Guest**. Note: Henry Newnam is listed as a 'schoolmaster' at the National School in Wordsley in the 1861 PRO Census, and he was later involved in art education efforts at Wordsley. **Thomas Guest** is listed as a 'glass painter' in the 1861 PRO Census.

Government certificates, male students: Henry Newnam, **John Northwood**, William Lewis, **Thomas Guest**.

local medals, male students: Henry Newnam, John Lewis, sen., John Lewis, jun., **William Adey**, James Sproat, **Thomas Guest**, Walter Hicks, **Edwin Grice** (three). Note: **William Adey** (b. 1844) is listed as a 'glass cutter' in the 1861 PRO Census. **Edwin Grice** (b. 1839) is listed as 'scholar' in the 1861 PRO Census; he was employed as a glass etcher at J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley soon thereafter and is listed as 'etcher in glass factory' in the 1871 PRO Census.

1859

Government medals, male students: **William Adey**, **William Southall**, **Edwin Grice** (two), **Thomas Guest**, **Joseph Northwood**, Henry Orford, William Lewis, George Wheelright. Note: **William Southall** (b. 1835) was listed as a 'glass blower' in the 1861 PRO Census. **Joseph Northwood** (b. 1840) was the brother of John Northwood, and these two men started the J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley about 1860.

local book prizes, male students: **William Adey**, James King, Edward Bates, John Lewis, William Lewis, George Wheelwright, **Edwin Grice**, **Thomas Guest**.

1860

local medals, male students: **William Adey**, William Lewis, **Joseph Northwood**, John Lewis, **William Southall**, James King (two).

1861

local medals, male students: John Bateman, **William Adey**, William Taylor, **Joseph Northwood**, James King, **Edwin Grice**, Henry Sutton, Walter Hicks. Note: Works by **Joseph Northwood** and Walter Hicks were sent to the national competition.

local medal, female student: Annie Green.

local book prizes, male students: James King, Nathaniel Lloyd, **Alfred James Nash**, James Perry. Note: **Alfred James Nash** (b. 1844) was listed as a 'glass engraver' in the 1861 PRO Census.

local book prize, female student: Fanny Green.

1862

Government prizes, male students: **Edward Breese**, Thomas Clarke, John Hall, John Matthews, Samuel Moore, **Alfred James Nash**, **Herbert H. Parker**, G. W. Richards, W. P. Taylor, **Thomas Woodall**, **Alfred Lucas**, George Payne, James Lees. Note: **Edward Breese** (b. 1846) was listed as a 'glass cutter' in the 1861 PRO Census. **Herbert H. Parker** was listed as a 'glass etcher' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and in the 1871 PRO Census. **Thomas Woodall** is listed as a 'glass etcher' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and as 'glass ornamentor' in the 1871 PRO Census. **Alfred Lucas** (b. 1850) was listed as 'clerk in glass works' in the 1861 PRO Census, and the occupation 'glass trade' was listed for him in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874.

Government prizes, female student: Georgina Blakeway

local medals, male students: Edward Taylor, **William Stuart**, James Perry, Samuel B. Moody (two), George Keen, James King, **William Adey**, Walter Hicks. Note: **William Stuart** (b. 1850) was the son of glass manufacturer Frederick Stuart.

local medal, female student: Georgina Blakeway.

local prize scholarships, male students: W. Taylor, Samuel B. Moody, James King, **William Adey**.

local prize scholarship, female student: Georgina Blakeway.

1863

Government medals/books, male students: James King, **William Adey**, John Matthews, Samuel B. Moody, Charles Vaughan, George Keen, Henry Millward (two), Samuel Davies.

Government medals/books, female students: Georgina Blakeway, Annie Green.

local prizes, male students: James King, **William Adey**, Samuel B. Moody, William Taylor, **Edward Breese**, **Alfred James Nash**, **Charles Breese**, **Alfred Lucas**, Benjamin Pearson. Note: According to the 1861 PRO Census, **Charles Breese** (b. 1841) was a student at Old Swinford Hospital School, and he was apprenticed as a 'glass cutter' to Cooksey Price in 1862.

1864

Government medals/books, male students: James King, George Keen, Charles Vaughan, **Alfred James Nash**.

local prizes, male students: **William Adey**, George Keen, Charles Vaughan, Thomas Hipwood, **Herbert H. Parker**, **Edward Breese**, **Alfred Lucas**, William Rankeilor.

local prizes, female students: Georgina Blakeway, Fanny Green.

1865

Government medals, male students: George Keen, **Herbert H. Parker**.

Government medals, female students: Georgina Blakeway, Fanny Green.

local prizes, male students: George Keen (outline of human figure from cast), George Bowdler (mechanical drawing), **Alfred Lucas** (shading in chalk), William Rankeillor (mechanical drawing), John Keen (freehand outline), **John Chaloner** (freehand outline), Thomas Heathcock (freehand outline), James Carpenter (freehand outline), George Hickman (freehand outline), Thomas Hipwood (freehand outline from cast), **Henry Frederick Chance** (freehand outline). Note: **John Chaloner** was listed as a 'glass engraver' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and in the 1871 PRO Census. According to the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874, **Henry Frederick Chance's** occupation was given as 'glass trade,' and he was listed as 'traveller glass trade' in the 1871 PRO Census.

local prizes, female students: Mrs. Ackroyd (landscape painting in oil), Miss E. Stewart (landscape painting in watercolours), Georgina Blakeway (fruit painting in oil), Miss A. T. Adams (flowers shaded from flat examples).

1866

Government prizes (in lieu of medals), male students: **John Chaloner**, T. Heathcock, Thomas Hipwood, **Herbert H. Parker**.

local book prizes, male students: George Keen (figure and ornament), George Hickman (shading in chalk), **Alfred Lucas** (shading in chalk), J. B. Herbert (original composition), J. Carpenter (outline from casts), **James Hill** (outline from copies), **Edward Cave** (outline from copies), **Josiah Perry** (outline from copies), **Thomas Woodall** (Charles Dickens' *The Old Curiosity Shop* for outline from copies), J. F. Hannah (flowers shaded), **John Chaloner** (outline from casts), William Fiddian (outline from casts). Note: In the 1871 PRO Census, **James Hill**, son of glass cutter Thomas Hill (deceased) was listed as 'glass cutter,' as is brother William Hill. **Edward Cave** is listed as 'glass cutter' in both the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and the 1871 PRO Census. **Josiah Perry** is listed as 'glass cutter' in the 1861 PRO Census.

local book prizes, female students: Miss J. Gibson (flower painting), Miss E. Price (flower painting), Miss Swindell (figure painting).

1867 [first year for three levels of national medals: gold, silver and bronze]

Government book prizes in lieu of medals, male students: **Thomas Woodall**, Wm. Fiddian, J. D. Hannah.

local prizes, male students: J. B. Herbert (painting in oil), **John Alexander Service** (outline of ornament), **Edward Cave** (outline of ornament), R. Vaughan (outline of ornament), **Thomas Woodall** (outline from nature), James M. Gething (outline of Trajan Scroll), W. Bevan (shading in colour), C. D. Ballanger (shading in colour). Note: **John Alexander Service** (b. 1850) is listed as a 'glass engraver' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and as a 'designer in glass works' in the 1881 PRO Census.

1867

local prizes, female students: Miss Gibson (painting flowers in watercolours), Miss Price (painting fruit in watercolours), Miss F. Greene (landscape in oil), Miss A. Blakeway (shading ornaments).

1868 [no local annual meeting and prize-giving held in this year]

Government prizes, male students: **Horace Bourne** (model drawing), James Carpenter (perspective drawing), Richard Chaloner (freehand, geometrical drawing and model drawing), **James Hill** (geometrical drawing), **John A. Service** (geometrical and model drawing), **George Woodall** (freehand drawing), James M. Gething (perspective drawing), Joseph B. Green (perspective drawing), **Joseph H. Pilsbury** (freehand drawing). Note: **Horace Bourne** (b. 1854) is listed as a 'glass cutter' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and in the 1871 PRO Census. **George Woodall** is listed as a 'glass engraver' in the 1871 PRO Census. **Joseph H. Pilsbury** is listed as a 'glass etcher' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874.

Government prize, female student: Harriet Skidmore (freehand and model drawing).

1869-1870

Government Queen's Prize, male student: **James Hill** (design for an engraved glass vase).

Government prizes, male students: **James Hill**, **John Alexander Service**, James M. Gething, Edward Vaughan, James B. Green, Richard Chaloner, **Thomas Woodall**.

Government prizes, female students: Harriet Skidmore, Miss Frances R. Binns.

local prizes, male students: J. R. Herbert (oil painting of game), **James Hill** (outlines drawn from nature), **John Alexander Service** (outlines drawn from nature), James M. Gething (ornament painted in monochrome), Joseph B. Green (outline of ornament from copies), **John Chaloner** (outline drawing from copies), Richard Chaloner (outline drawing from copies), Thomas Hipwood (ornament shaded in chalk), Arthur Mence (elementary drawing), Edwin Walters (elementary drawing).

local prizes, female students: Harriet Skidmore (fruit and flower painting in water colours and painting from nature), Miss Frances R. Binns (outline drawing from casts), Miss Ada Blakeway (outline of ornament from copies), Miss Rosa Price (landscape painting), Miss Josephine Gibson (watercolor painting of a lapwing).

1871

Government prizes, male students: **Albert Gyngell** (book prize and national bronze medal, stage 23c, design for a fan painted on silk), **James Hill** (book prize, design for etched glass). Note: **Albert Gyngell** is listed as a 'glass etcher' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874 and as 'etcher in glass' in the 1871 PRO Census.

Government prizes, female student: Harriet Skidmore (painting flowers in water colours)

local prizes [not available]

1872-1873

Government book prizes, male students:

James Hill (design for glass decoration) Westmacott's *Handbook of Sculpture*

Daniel Beech (outline ornament) Westmacott's *Handbook of Sculpture*

William J. Thomas (shaded ornament) Timb's *Anecdote Lives of Painters*

Alfred Hennessy (outline ornament) Scott's *Half-Hour Lectures on Art*

Edward Smith (ornamental drawing from cast) Westmacott's *Handbook of Sculpture*

Note: **Alfred Hennessy** is listed as a 'glass cutter' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874.

local book prizes, female students:

Agnes Sprout (flower painting watercolours) *Scott's Poetical Works*

Amy Jones (painting in monochrome) *Celebrated Female Sovereigns*

Ada Blakeway (outline of ornament from cast) *Moore's Poems*

local book prizes, male students:

Alexander Dalrymple (shading ornament) *Swiss Family Robinson*

William Henry Walters (shading ornament) *Enterprise beyond the Seas*

William Joseph Thomas (painting in oil) *Great African Travellers*

William Gething (drawing from cast) *Venice Past and Present*

James Hill (design for glass) *Giant Cities of Bashan*

Thomas Campbell Bennett (drawing from nature) *Buried Cities of Campania*

Ralph Bowen (drawing and painting the figure) *Barnard's Drawing from Nature*

William Hingley (shading ornament) *About Indians*

James D. Marshall (outline of ornament) *Youthful Diligence and Future Greatness*

Charles Clarkson (shading ornament from cast) *Triumphs of Steam*

George Hipwood (shading human figure in chalk) *1001 Gems of Prose*

Frank Allsop (architectural drawing) *Temples of Ancient Greece and Rome*

Herbert Turner (outline of ornament from cast) *Youthful Diligence and Future Greatness*.

Note: **William Hingley's** father's occupation is listed as 'glass trade' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874. **Herbert Turner's** father's occupation is listed as 'glass maker' in the *Register of Students* covering 1864-1874.

1874

Government prizes, male students: William Gething, John Collins, **James Hill** (designs for glass decoration)

Government prizes, female students: Agnes Sproat, Charlotte Scott

1875

Government prizes, male students: **James Hill**, William J. Thomas, **Alfred Hingley**, William Gething. Note: As reported in the *Advertiser*, 15 January 1876, **James Hill's** award was for 'original design in glass decoration.' **Alfred Hingley** is listed as 'glass engraver' in the 1881 PRO Census; his father, George Hingley, is listed as 'commercial traveller, glass trade,' and his brother Thomas is listed as 'glass engraver.'

Government prizes, female students: Agnes Sproat, Charlotte Scott

1876

Government prizes, male students: Frank Allsop (drawing ornament from cast and painting ornament), Ralph Bowen (painting animal from life), William Gething (outline of foliage from nature), **James Hill** (designs for glass decoration), **William Northwood** (shading ornament in chalk), **Joseph P. Reading** (outline of ornament from cast), **Alfred Hingley** (ornament shaded from cast), **Francis Schriebner** (outline ornament from copies), Thomas Sidaway (outline ornament from copies). Note: **Joseph P. Reading** (b. 1856) is listed as ‘glass engraver’ in the 1871 PRO Census. **William Northwood** is listed as a ‘glass etcher’ in the *Register of Students* covering 1874-1874 and as a ‘glass ornamentor’ in the 1881 PRO Census. **Francis Scheibner** is listed as a ‘glass engraver’ in the *Register of Students* covering 1874-1874.

Government prize, female student: Susan Taylor (shading ornament in chalk)

local prizes, male students: **James Hill** (designs for glass decoration), William Gething (ornament painted in sepia), Frank Allsop (studies of ornament painted in tempera), **William Northwood** (ornament shaded in chalk), **Joseph P. Reading** (outline of ornament from casts), **Alfred Hingley** (ornament shaded from cast), **Francis Scheibner** (figure shaded from the flat), James D. Marshall (ornament in chalk from copies), Cornelius Green (ornament in chalk from copies), Alfred Moore (foliage shaded from copies).

local prizes, female students: Annie H. Watson (painting fruit from nature), Julia C. Watson (ornament shaded in chalk), Agnes Sproat (painting still life from nature), **Elizabeth Richardson** (ornament shaded in chalk), Miss A. Hammond (painting flowers from nature), Amy Jones (painting figures and animals from copies), **Martha A. Richardson** (outlines of ornament). Note: **Elizabeth Richardson** (b. 1859) is the daughter of Henry Gething Richardson, flint glass manufacturer, and she is listed as ‘artist’ in the 1881 PRO Census and as ‘artist in oil and watercolour painting’ in the 1891 PRO Census. **Martha A. Richardson** (b. 1860), also a daughter of Henry Gething Richardson, is listed as ‘artist’ in the 1881 PRO Census, as ‘artist in oil and watercolour painting’ in the 1891 PRO Census and as ‘artist painter’ in the 1901 PRO Census.

1877

Government book prizes, male students:

Wm. J. Thomas (drawing human figure in chalk from copies) *Bell on Expression*

James Hill (designs for glass decorations) Flaxman’s *Anatomy*

Frank Allsop (outlines of plants from nature) *History of Painters of All Schools*

Benjamin Talbot (outline of ornament from copies) *Moody’s Lectures*

Philip Allsop (outline of ornament from copies) *Bell on Expression*

John Collins (ornament shaded in chalk from copies) *Anecdote Lives*

Charles J. Hodgkinson (outline of ornament from copies) *Anecdote Lives*

local book prizes, male students:

James Hill (designs for glass etching) *Animal Life throughout the Globe*

William Gething (monochrome from cast) *Selections from Writings of Lord Macaulay*

William Northwood (human figure in chalk from copies) *On the Banks of the Amazon*

Frank Allsop (studies of plants from nature) *The Lansdown Poets—Coleridge*

1877

local book prizes, male students:

Francis Scheibner (human figure in chalk from copies) *1001 Gems of Poetry*

Joseph P. Reading (ornament shaded from copies) *The Lansdown Poets—Shakespeare*

Alfred Hingley (painting a plant from nature in oil) *Half Hours Underground*

Charles E. Attenborough (designs in monochrome) *Lives of Labour*

Theodore Kny (human figure outline from copies) *Wonders and Beauty of Creation*

Philip Allsop (shading ornament in chalk from copies) *Half Hours in Woods and Wild*

Cornelius Green (shading ornament in chalk from copies) *Half Hours in Air and Sky*

John Nock (shading in ornament from copies) *Half Hours in the Deep*

Francis Smith (outline of ornament from copies) *Half Hours in the Far East*

Charles Pardoe (outline of ornament from copies) *Half Hours in the Far South*

Louis Muckley (shading the human figure in chalk from copies) *Marvels of Architecture*

William Hemming (shading ornament in chalk from copies) *Holiday Album for Boys*

William Griffiths (shading flowers in chalk, copies) *Pictures and Stories of Natural History*

Note: **Theodore Kny** is listed as ‘glass engraver’ in the 1881 PRO Census, and he is a ‘boarder’ in the home of ‘glass cutter’ Joseph Bishop (glass engraver Joseph Fritsche is another boarder in the same home). **Louis Muckley** is listed as the son of Joseph Muckley, ‘importer of glass,’ in the 1881 PRO Census.

local book prizes, female students:

Ada Blakeway (painting flowers in oil) *Memoirs of Celebrated Women*

Agnes Sproat (painting fruit from nature in oil) *Sketches of Natural History*

Charlotte Scott (painting fruit from nature in oil) *Longfellow’s Poetical Works*

Elizabeth Richardson (shading in chalk from copies) *The Lansdown Poets—Wordsworth*

1878

Government prizes, male students: **James Hill** (Queen’s Prize for original designs for glass decoration), William Gething (original design for iron gates).

local book prizes for glass decoration, male students:

James Hill, Cassell’s *Book of Birds*, **Harry Northwood**, Bulwer-Lytton’s *Last of the Barons*, **William Northwood**, Geikie’s *Life in the Woods*.

1879

Government prizes, male students: **Thomas Woodall** (Queen’s Prize, stage 23c, design for glass engraving), William Gething (Queen’s Prize, stage 23c, design for iron gates),

William Hingley, **Harry Billingham**. Note: **William Hingley** (b. 1865) is listed as ‘warehouse clerk glass trade’ in the 1881 PRO Census. **Harry Billingham** (b. 1863) is listed as ‘glass manufacturer’s clerk’ in the 1881 PRO Census.

local prizes, male students: Joseph F. Bloomer (outline of ornament from flat and outlines from cast), Charles F. Moody (outline of ornament from flat), Richard Thomas Cook (shading ornament and figure from flat), **Frederick Carder** (shading ornament and figure from flat), **William Hingley** (shading ornament and figure from flat), Frank Porter (shading ornament and figure from flat), Frank Bottomley (outlines from cast), **Harry Billingham** (shading ornament from cast), Philip James Allsop (outlines from nature), [continued]

1879

local prizes, male students: **Alfred Hingley** (figure shaded from cast), **Louis F. Muckley** (figure shades from cast, anatomical studies and painting fruit and flowers), **James H. Walker** (anatomical studies), **James Hill** (original designs for glass), Frank Porter (original design for carpet), William Gething (original design for iron), Samuel Dalton (outline from flat), George Henry Steadman (shading from flat), John Elliot (shading from flat). **Note:** **Frederick Carder** (b. 1864) is listed as 'earthenware potter' in the 1881 PRO Census, and he was employed as draughtsman/designer at the Stevens & Williams glass manufacturing firm in Brierley Hill later in 1881. **James H. Walker** (b. 1859) is listed as 'artist designer in glass' in the 1881 PRO Census, and he is a lodger in Upper Swinford near the Heath Glassworks.

local prizes, female students: Annie Short (shading ornament from cast), Ettie Penn (painting figures and animals from flat), Josephine Bowen (painting fruit and flowers from nature), **Elizabeth Richardson** (painting figures and animals from flat), Miss Green (painting figures and animals from flat).

1880

Government book prizes, male students:

John James Homer (model), Dennis's *Third Grade Perspective*

Harry Billingham (shading from cast) Penley's *Sketching from Nature*

Philip J. Allsop (elementary design) twelve photographs of Italian renaissance ornament

William Gething (design for painted panel) Penley's *Sketching from Nature*

local book prizes, male students:

Joseph Meredith (outlines from flat) *The Woodlands Natural History Rambles*

Joseph Wellings (outlines from flat) Baller's *Scientific Class Book*

Charles O. Northwood (shading ornament in chalk from flat) *Half Hours at Sea*

Francis R. Grice (shading ornament in chalk from flat) *The Sea Shore*

Charles Allen (shading ornament in chalk from flat) Baller's *Scientific Class Book*

David T. Plant (shading ornament in chalk from flat) Baller's *Scientific Class Book*

Samuel Williams (shading ornament in chalk from flat) *History of England*

Frank Bottomley (outlines from cast) Dickens's *Dombey and Son*

Charles F. Moody (outlines from cast) *Half Hours in the Tiny World*

Alfred Hingley (shading figures from flat) *Common Objects of the Sea Shore*

Frank J. Porter (original design) *Half Hours under Ground*

William Northwood (original design) *Half Hours in the Far South*

Philip James Allsop (elementary design) *Byron's Poetical Works*

Harry Billingham (shading ornament from cast) *Half Hours in the Deep*

William Hingley (shading ornament, cast) *Mountain and Moor Natural History Rambles*

Louis F. Muckley (shading ornament, cast, figures shaded from cast/anatomical studies)

Half Hours in Many Lands, The Treasury of Natural History and Gosse's *The Ocean*

Frederick Carder (shading figures from flat and modelling from cast) Wood's *Animal Traits and Characteristics* and *Sea Birds*

[continued]

1880

Note: **Charles O. Northwood** (b. 1865) is listed as 'glass etcher' in the 1881 PRO Census, and he is the son of 'glass ornamentor' Joseph Northwood. **Francis R. Grice** (b. 1868) is the son of **Edwin Grice**, a former Stourbridge school student who was employed at the J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm for many years; listed as a 'scholar' in the 1881 PRO Census, **Francis R. Grice** is listed as a 'glass etcher' in the 1891 PRO Census.

local book prizes, female students:

Ida Mills (shading figures from flat) *Country Walks of a Naturalist*

Mary Kate Mills (shading figures from flat) *Country Walks of a Naturalist*

Mary Watts (coloured landscape) *Ponds and Ditches Natural History Rambles*

Note: **Ida Mills** is the daughter of glass manufacturer George Mills, and **Mary Kate Mills** is his wife.

1881-1882

Government prizes, male students: **Frederick Carder**, **Louis Muckley**, Frank Porter.

local prizes, male students: Frank Porter, **Frederick Carder**, A. E. Millward, L. Harriman, J. F. Bloomer, **William Hingley**, Joseph Meredith, David Plant, W. S. Potter, Joseph Workman.

local prizes, female students: Mabel Harrison, Lizzie Cartwright, **May Richardson**

Note: **May Richardson** is the daughter of flint glass manufacturer Henry Gething Richardson.

1883

Government prizes, male students: Frank Porter (treating natural objects ornamentally, design for carpets and designs to fill spaces with colour)

Government prizes, female students: Mary Kidson (outline drawing from flat)

local prizes, male students: William Platt (outline drawing from flat), William Pardoe (outline drawing from cast, figure shading from cast and painting flowers from flat),

Thomas Alfred Guest (outline drawing from cast), Frank Porter (outline drawing from nature), **Charles O. Northwood** (outline drawing from nature and original design for iron gates), Frederick Guest (outline drawing of the figure from flat), **Ludwig Kny** (figure shading from cast), John W. Sanders (shading ornaments from cast), **Alfred Nash** (shading ornaments from cast). Note: **Thomas Alfred Guest** (b. 1864) is listed as 'glass engraver' in the 1881 PRO Census, and he is the son of glass engraver Thomas Guest. In the 1881 PRO Census, **Ludwig Kny** (b. 1869) is the son of 'glass engraver' Frederick E. Kny. **Alfred Nash** (b. 1866) is listed as 'apprentice glass flower depart' in the 1881 PRO Census, and his father, Charles Nash, is listed as 'glass cutters foreman.'

local prizes, female students: Mary Kidson (outline drawing from flat and outline drawing of the figure from flat), Eliza Gething (painting flowers from flat).

1884

Government prizes, male students: **Charles O. Northwood** (modeling ornament from cast), **Thomas Brunton** (outline drawing from flat), **Thomas Alfred Guest** (shading ornament from cast), Frank Porter (four designs treating natural objects ornamentally, historic styles of ornament, and designs for wall paper, wall decoration and Brussels carpet). Note: By 1885-1886, **Thomas Brunton** (b. 1869) was employed in some capacity in the glass industry and was, therefore, eligible for the prizes from the Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers.

local prizes, male students: **Thomas Brunton** (outline drawing from flat), **Francis R. Grice** (outline drawing from cast), **John Baker** (outline drawing of the figure from flat), **Benjamin Rider** (outline drawing of the figure from flat), William Guest (shading ornament from flat), **Thomas Alfred Guest** (shading ornament from cast), Joseph A. Meredith (shading animals from cast), Frank Porter (designs treating natural objects ornamentally, historic styles of ornament, designs for Brussels carpet and design for iron gates), **Frederick Carder** (design for wall decoration and design in plaster for panels), **Charles O. Northwood** (modeling ornament from cast and design for wall decoration). Note: **John Baker** is listed as 'glass warehouse apprentice' in the 1881 PRO Census. **Benjamin Rider** (b. 1869) may have been employed later in the glass industry, as the 1881 PRO Census lists his father Edward Rider as 'labourer at glassworks' and his brother Alfred Rider as a 'flint glass cutter.'

local prizes, female students: Kate Penley (outline drawing from flat), Mary Kidson (outline drawing from cast), Eliza Gething (painting flowers from flat).

1885

Government prizes, male students: **Frederick Carder** (design, stage 22d), **Ludwig Kny** (shading from the cast; outline from cast), **William Hingley** (outline from cast), Frank Porter (shading models from the round; shading from cast).

Government prizes, female students: Kate Penley (outline drawing from flat), **Helen M. Stuart** (outline drawing from flat). Note: **Helen M. Stuart** is the daughter of flint glass manufacturer Frederick Stuart.

local prizes, male students: **Thomas Brunton** (outline drawing of the figure), **Thomas Alfred Guest** (outline from flat; outline drawing from nature), **James Hill** (original designs for glass), **Ludwig Kny** (shading models from round; designs for glass), William Pardoe (outline from flat; outline drawing from nature), Richard Tyrer (painting ornament from flat), **Samuel C. Phipps** (designs for glass), **Ernest H. Windmill** (designs for glass). **Frederick Carder** (design for panel in plaster). Note: **Samuel C. Phipps** (b. 1868) is listed as 'glass etcher & designer' in the 1891 PRO Census; according to the 1881 PRO Census, **Samuel C. Phipps** then resided next door to 'glass designer' Arthur B. Mullett, who is listed as 'manager of glass works' in the 1891 PRO Census. **Ernest H. Windmill** (b. 1870) is listed as a 'scholar' and his brother William Windmill is listed as a 'bottle blower' in the 1881 PRO Census; **Ernest H. Windmill** is listed as 'glass engraver' in the 1901 PRO Census and in the 1911 PRO Census.

1885

local prizes, female students: Kate Penley (outline drawing from flat), **Helen M. Stuart** (outline drawing from flat), Ada Cartwright (outline drawing from flat), Mary Kidson (outline from flat; outline drawing from nature), Miss M. A. Barker (painting flowers from nature).

1885 (prizes awarded in January 1886)

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes (to 'persons engaged in glassworks otherwise than glassmakers'): **Ludwig Kny** £1; **Thomas Brunton** 17s 6d; **Ernest H. Windmill** 15s; **Samuel C. Phipps** 13s; **William J. Service** 12s; **William Guest** 10s; **Richard H. Thompson** 7s 6d; **George J. Carder** 5s. Note: **William J. Service** (b. 1866) is listed as a 'glass cutter' in the 1881 PRO Census, and his father, James Service, is a 'glass engraver.' In the 1881 PRO Census, **Richard H. Thompson** (b. 1868) is the son of George Thompson, who is listed as 'warehouseman glass works.' In the 1891 PRO Census, **Richard H. Thompson** is listed as 'clerk at glass works,' and his father as 'glass works manager.' Listed as 'scholar' in the 1881 PRO Census, **George J. Carder** (b. 1869), brother of **Frederick Carder**, is listed as a 'draughtsman' in the 1891 PRO Census and as 'designer (glass trade)' in the 1901 PRO Census.

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes ('to glassmakers'): **Frederick Scriven** 7s 6d; **Joseph Flavell** 5s. Note: **Frederick Scriven** (b. 1858) was employed in the glass industry after 1881; he was 'shingler, iron works' in the 1881 PRO Census, whilst his father John Scriven and his brothers Lawrence Scriven and Edgar Scriven are listed as 'glass maker.' **Joseph Flavell** (b. 1869) is listed as 'glass blower' in the 1881 PRO census.

1886

Government prizes, male students: **Frederick Carder** (modelling figure from cast), **Thomas Brunton** (modelling ornament from cast), **Thomas Alfred Guest** (modelling ornament from cast), William Pardoe (modelling ornament from cast), Frank Porter (painting flowers from nature; outline drawing from cast), **Ernest H. Windmill** (design for glass lamp), **Joseph Fletcher** (outline drawing from flat), **Francis R. Grice** (shading from cast). Note: **Joseph Fletcher** (b. 1865) is 'glasshouse pot maker' in the 1881 PRO Census.

Government prizes, female students: Kate Penley (outline drawing from cast)

local prizes, male students: **Joseph Fletcher** (outline drawing from flat), Joseph Scott (outline drawing from flat), **Ludwig Kny** (outline of ornament from cast; shading figure from cast; designs for glass), **Francis R. Grice** (outline of ornament from cast), **Frederick Carder** (designs for glass and terra cotta; design for panel in plaster; modelling figure from casts), **John Northwood II** (designs for glass), **Ernest H. Windmill** (designs for glass), William Pardoe (modelling ornament from cast; shading figure from cast), **Thomas Brunton** (modelling ornament from cast), **Thomas Alfred Guest** (modelling ornament from cast). Note: **John Northwood II** (b. 1870) is the son of John Northwood I, a former Stourbridge School student who, with his brother Joseph Northwood, operated the J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm. In 1881, **John Northwood II** was living with his mother Margaret Lawley, an employee at J. & J. Northwood; he is not listed in the 1891 PRO Census, but he is listed as 'foreman in glass works' in the 1901 PRO Census.

1886

local prizes, female students: Kate Penley (outline of ornament from cast), **Helen M. Stuart** (outline of ornament from cast).

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes (* designates students from Brierley Hill School): **John Northwood II** £1; **Ernest H. Windmill** 17s 6d; **Ludwig Kny** 15s; **George J. Carder*** 13s; **George E. Round** 12s; **Frank [Francis R.] Grice** 10s; **Samuel C. Phipps** 7s 6d; **Walter J. Grahame*** 5s. Note: Listed as a 'iron merchant's clerk' in the 1891 PRO Census, **George E. Round** (b. 1869) is listed as 'clerk glass works' in the 1901 PRO Census. **Walter J. Grahame** (b. 1868) is listed as 'scholar' in the 1881 PRO Census.

1887

Government prizes, male students: **Ludwig Kny** (design for glass vase; shading figure from the antique), **John Northwood II** (modelling ornament from drawing), Frank Porter (Queen's Prize, design for Brussels carpet; modelling still life from nature).

Government free studentships: Frank Porter, **Ludwig Kny**, **John Northwood II**

Government Full Art Class Teacher's Certificate: Frank Porter

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **John Northwood II** £1; **Ludwig Kny** 16s 3d; **George J. Carder** 16s 3d; **Samuel C. Phipps** 13s; **Joseph S. Reynolds** 12s; **William Kny** 10s; **Francis R. Grice** 7s 6d; **Ernest H. Windmill** 5s. Note: In the 1891 PRO Census, **William Kny** (b. 1870), the son of glass decorator Englebert Kny, is also listed as a 'glass decorator.'

1888

Government prizes, male students: **Samuel C. Phipps** (national book prize, design for cameo glass vase), **William Kny** (shading ornament from cast), Frank Porter (designs for Brussels carpets), **George E. Round** (design for glass cameo vase; design for glass cameo plaque), **Ernest H. Windmill** (design for glass cameo vase).

Government Free studentships: Frank Porter, **William Kny**, **Samuel C. Phipps**, **George E. Round**, **Ernest H. Windmill**

local prizes, male students: Walter Guest (time drawing freehand), Alexander Fiddian (time drawing model), **Samuel C. Phipps** (outline from cast), **William Kny** (outline from cast), **George J. Carder** (shading from cast, time design for glass), Frank Porter (shading head from life), **Ernest H. Windmill** (time design for glass).

local prizes, female students: Kate Simms (time drawing geometry), Gertrude E. Scott (time drawing geometry; time drawing model), Margaret Birt (time drawing freehand), **Elizabeth Richardson** (shading head from life).

1888

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Samuel C. Phipps** 18s 9d; **George E. Round** 18s 9d; **William Kny** 15s; **John Northwood II** 13s; **Frank [Francis R.] Grice** 12s; **Ludwig Kny** 10s; **George J. Carder** 7s 6d; **Ernest H. Windmill** 5s.

Note: In 1888, former Stourbridge School student **Frederick Carder**, who was then attending art classes at Wordsley, won a national silver medal for his ‘Cupid and Psyche,’ a design in wax for a cameo glass vase.

1889

Government prizes, male students: **Samuel C. Phipps** (2 designs for cameo glass vases; shading from model), Frank Porter (design for a Brussels carpet), **George E. Round** (2 designs for cameo glass vases), **George J. Carder** (modelling head from antique; outline drawing from cast; shading from model), Samuel Johnson (shading ornament from cast), **John Northwood II** (outline drawing from cast), **William Kny** (shading from model), **Ernest H. Windmill** (shading from model), **Thomas Brunton** (shading from cast).

Government Free studentships: **George J. Carder, Samuel C. Phipps**

Government prizes, female students: Kate Simms (outline drawing from cast), Hannah L. Mackridge (shading from model), Katherine M. Penley (shading from model; shading from cast), Florence Yeomans (shading from cast).

local prizes, male students: Donald Chesterman (freehand drawing), **Paul Taillandier** (model drawing), William T. G. Taylor (freehand drawing), Charles M. Attwood (model drawing), Charles Chambers (outline from cast), **Samuel C. Phipps** (plant drawing in outline; time drawing for engraved glass water jug), **Ernest H. Windmill** (time drawing for engraved glass water jug). Note: **Paul Taillandier** is listed as ‘glass & china decorator apprentice’ in the 1891 PRO Census, and his father, Paul Taillandier, is listed as ‘glass & china decorator.’

local prizes, female students: Florence Yeomans (shading from models), Lizzie Holland (shading from cast), Gertrude E. Scott (shading from cast), **Elizabeth Richardson** (drawing head from life).

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Samuel C. Phipps** 18s 9d; **George E. Round** 18s 9d; **Ernest H. Windmill** 15s; **John Northwood II** 12s 6d; **William Kny** 12s 6d; **Francis R. Grice** 10s; **George J. Carder** 7s 6d; **Samuel Johnson** 5s. Note: **Samuel Johnson** is listed as a ‘glass designer’ in the 1901 PRO Census.

Note: In 1889, former Stourbridge School student **Frederick Carder** won a national gold medal (eight awarded in the UK) for ‘The Muses,’ a design in wax for a cameo glass vase, and former Stourbridge School student **William Northwood** won a national bronze medal (109 awarded in the UK) for a design in wax for a cameo glass plaque. Both Carder and Northwood were attending the Wordsley School of Art, and they were also awarded Government ‘Vacation Scholarships’ to support fourteen days of study at South Kensington (see *County Express*, 24 August 1889). **Frederick Carder’s** ‘The Muses’ is now in the Corning Museum of Glass, and **William Northwood’s** plaque is at the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum).

1890

Government prizes, male students: **George J. Carder** (modeling head from antique; design for cameo glass vase; shading from cast), Marian Cochrane (painting ornament from cast in monochrome), Frank Porter (two designs for Brussels carpets), **Joseph S. Reynolds** (outline of ornament from cast; shading from cast), **George E. Round** (design for tiles; shading from cast), William Lavender (outline drawing from cast), Joseph S. Penn (outline drawing from cast), Louie Hyrons (shading from models), **John Northwood II** (shading from models), **Paul Taillandier** (shading from models; shading from cast).

Government prizes, female students: **Gertrude Grice** (shading ornament from cast; outline drawing from cast; shading from cast), Hannah L. Mackridge (shading ornament from cast; outline drawing from cast), Kate Simms (outline drawing of ornament; shading from models; shading from cast), **Elizabeth Richardson** (outline drawing from cast; shading from models; shading from cast), Gertrude E. Scott (outline drawing from cast), Florence Yeomans (outline drawing from cast; shading from models), Lizzie Holland (shading from cast). Note: **Gertrude Grice**, listed as a 'draughtswoman' employed in the glass industry in the 1891 PRO Census, is the sister of **Francis R. Grice** and the daughter of **Edwin Grice**, a former Stourbridge school student who was employed at the J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm for many years.

local prizes, male students: Claude Newnam (time drawing freehand), Albert E. Sharp (time drawing freehand), Joseph Hill (model drawing), Joseph Penn (shading from models; shading from cast), Frederick Hingley (shading from cast), **George J. Carder** (drawing the head from life; designs for glass), **Ernest H. Windmill** (designs for glass), **William Kny** (plant drawing), **Samuel C. Phipps** (plant drawing).

local prizes, female students: Alice Wedge (model drawing; outline from cast), Lizzie Holland (shading from models).

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Samuel C. Phipps** £1; **George E. Round** 17s 6d; **Ernest H. Windmill** 15s; **George J. Carder** 13s; **Francis R. Grice** 12s; **William Kny** 10s; **Joseph S. Reynolds** 7s 6d; **John Northwood II** 5s.

1891

Government prizes, male students: **George J. Carder** (shading the figure from antique), **William Kny** (shading the head from life; shading a group of models), **Ernest H. Windmill** (shading a group of models).

Government prizes, female students: **Gertrude Grice** (outline of ornament from cast), Kate Simms (outline of ornament from cast).

Government Free Studentship: **George J. Carder**

Samuel C. Phipps and **George E. Round** awarded Vacation Scholarships to attend a course of study and lectures in design at South Kensington (see *County Express*, 5 September 1891).

1891

local prizes, male students: Ernest H. Douglas, **Samuel C. Phipps**, **William Kny**, Joseph S. Penn, **Francis R. Grice**, **George J. Carder**, Albert S. Sharp. Charles Newman, William Lavender, Harold Pearce, **Ernest H. Windmill**, Thomas Newnam, George Green, Richard Mann

local prizes, female students: Kate Simms, Gertrude Scott, Florence Yeomans, **Gertrude Grice**, Kate Penley, Ida Green

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes:

Samuel C. Phipps £1; **Ernest H. Windmill** 15s; **George J. Carder** 15s; **William Kny** 15s; **Francis R. Grice** 12s; **Gertrude Grice** 10s; **Samuel Johnson** 7s 6d; **Jules Barbe** 5s. Note: **Jules Barbe** (b. 1877) is listed as a 'glass decorator' in the 1901 PRO Census; his father, also named Jules Barbe (b. 1847), was also a glass decorator.

1892

Government prizes, male students: Howard W. Pearce (outline drawing from cast; shading from models; shading from cast), **Jules Barbe** (outline drawing from cast; shading from cast), Albert E. Sharp (shading from models), William M. Lavender (shading from models), **James A. Cadman** (shading from cast), **Ernest H. Windmill** (design ornament; plant drawing in outline), **Samuel C. Phipps** (plant drawing in outline).

Government prizes, female students: Lizzie Holland (outline drawing from cast)

Francis R. Grice was awarded a 'Vacation Scholarship' for a special course in drawing from life at the South Kensington Museum.

local prizes, male students: Thomas Box (geometrical studies), Sidney Simms (outline drawing from flat), Howard W. Pearce (shading head from antique), **William Kny** (shading head from life), **Ernest Windmill** (shading head from life), **Francis R. Grice** (design of ornament in outline), William M. Lavender (shading from the cast), Harry Brearley (freehand time drawing), **James A. Cadman** (time shading models), **Frederick Noke** (freehand time drawing; model time drawing), Albert E. Sharp (outline time drawing from cast). Note: **Frederick Noke** (b. 1880) is listed as a 'glass designer' in the 1901 PRO Census, and he was employed at the Stevens & Williams glass manufacturing plant in Brierley Hill at that time.

local prizes, female students: Lizzie Holland (shading from models; shading from cast; shading head from antique; time study in modeling), **Gertrude Grice** (shading from models; shading head from antique; time study in modelling), Kate Parker (shading from cast), Kate Penley (shading head from life), Florence Clulow (painting ornament in monochrome; painting head from antique), Nellie Cookson (painting group in oil), Lizzie Walker (model time drawing).

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: (the report of the annual meeting in the *County Express* for 14 January 1893 makes no mention of these prizes).

1893

Government prizes, male students: Albert E. Sharp (outline drawing from cast; modelling in clay), **James A. Cadman** (shading from cast; modelling in clay), **Samuel C. Phipps** (principles of ornament), **Jules Barbe** (modelling in clay), Trevor Bird (modelling in clay), Thomas Davenport (modelling in clay), Joseph Humpherson (modelling in clay), Arthur Jennings (modelling in clay), **Frederick Noke** (modelling in clay), **Frank Osborne** (modelling in clay), **William H. Richards** (modelling in clay), Thomas Greenfield (perspective). Note: **Frank Osborne** is listed as 'carter in glass works' in the 1891 PRO Census, and his father, James Osborne, is a 'flint glass maker.' **William H. Richards** (b. 1872) is listed as a 'glass cutter' in the 1891 PRO 1891 Census.

Government prizes, female students: Alice W. Wedge (outline drawing from cast), **Gertrude Grice** (modelling in clay), Katherine M. Penley (perspective).

Ernest H. Windmill was awarded a 'Vacation Scholarship' to study at South Kensington.

local book prizes, male students:

Sidney Simms (outline from flat), Meyer's *Handbook of Ornament*
Sidney Simms (outline from cast), *Handbook of Majolica*
Howard W. Pearce (shading from antique), Penley's *Sketching from Nature*
Howard W. Pearce (shading from cast), *Artistic Anatomy*
James A. Cadman (chalk drawing), *Anatomy of Pattern*
James A. Cadman (drawing head from antique), *Planning of Ornament*
Francis R. Grice (original design), Day's *Some Principles of Everyday Art*
William Kny (time study), *Application of Ornament*
William King (drawing from life), *Planning of Ornament*
William King (time study) *Application of Ornament*
Samuel C. Phipps (outline design), *Application of Ornament*
Adam Haden (shading from cast time study), *Milton's Poetical Works*
Frederick Hinitt (models in outline time study), *Modern Painters and Their Works*
William M. Lavender (head from antique in chalk), *Book of the Poets*
Albert E. Sharp (shading from cast), *Anecdotes of Animal Life*

local prize, male student: **Frederick Noke** (shading and outline from cast), instruments

local book prizes, female students:

Florence Yeomans (drawing the head from life), Penley's *Sketching from Nature*
Florence Yeomans (design coloured; outline), Day's *Some Principles of Everyday Art*
Kate Simms (antique in outline), Day's *Nature in Ornament*
Kate Simms (antique time study; drawing head from life), *Persian Art*
Effie E. Penley (outline from cast), *Worthies of the World*
Elsie Boden (shading models time study), *Treasury of Modern Biography*
Florence R. Cartwright (freehand time study), *Treasury of English Literature*
Lizzie Holland (antique in outline), *Anatomy of Pattern*
Mabel Mountford (shading from cast), *Longfellow*.

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Francis R. Grice** £1; **Samuel C. Phipps** £1; **James Cadman** 10s.

1894

Government prizes, male students: **William Kny** (3 prizes), **Frederick Noke** (3 prizes), George H. Brearley (2 prizes), **Francis R. Grice** (1 prize), **William Northwood** (1 prize), Albert E. Sharp (1 prize), Howard W. Pearce (2 prizes), **Samuel C. Phipps** (2 prizes), G. H. Adams (2 prizes), Frederick Hinitt (1 prize), Thomas Davenport (1 prize), Hugh W. Goodhead (1 prize), **James A. Cadman** (1 prize), S. Robinson (1 prize).

Government prizes, female students: Kate Simms (3 prizes), **Gertrude Grice** (2 prizes), Teresa M. James (2 prizes), Elsie Boden (1 prize), Florence Yeomans (1 prize), Edith Boden (1 prize), Lizzie Holland (1 prize), Isabella Harrison (1 prize).

local prizes (first prizes only), male students: Howard W. Pearce, **Frederick Noke**, **James Cadman**, William King, **Samuel C. Phipps**

local prizes (first prizes only), female students: Florence Yeomans, Kate Simms, Effie Penley

Midland Flint Glass Manufacturers' Association prizes: **William Kny; Francis R. Grice; Samuel C. Phipps; Frederick Noke; James Cadman.** Note: In early 1894, other 'prizes awarded by the Glassmasters' amounting to £2 12s went to six students at the Wordsley School of Art: former Stourbridge School student George J. Carder 15s, Frederick Shuker 11s, George Parker 9s, Thomas Davies 7s, John Edward Wyres 5s, John C. Woodall 5s.

1895

Government art examinations (first prizes, advanced stage only), male students: R. Beasley (drawing in light and shade), J. Foxhall (drawing in light and shade), G. H. Brearley (drawing in light and shade), H. W. Richards (drawing in light and shade; freehand drawing), Adam Haden (freehand drawing; model drawing), J. J. Homer (model drawing), H. M. Shiner (model drawing).

Government art examinations (first prizes, advanced stage only), female students: Elsie M. Boden (drawing in light and shade; model drawing), Teresa M. James (drawing in light and shade; freehand drawing), Effie C. Penley (freehand drawing), Kate Simms (perspective).

local prizes (first prizes only), male students: **Francis R. Grice** (chalk study of head from life), **William Northwood** (time study full length life), **Frederick Noke** (outline from cast), David B. H. Wood (freehand drawing). Note: honorary award to **William Kny** for chalk study of head from life.

local prizes (first prizes only), female students: **Edith Helen Webb** (time study shading from models), Edith Boden (pencil sketches of heads from life; painting from cast in sepia), Elsie Boden (group of shaded models; advanced shading from cast; painting from cast in sepia), Florence Yeomans (principles of ornament), Tessie M. Roberts (time study water colour from still life; painting from cast in sepia), Isabella Harrison (painting from still life water colour), Hilda Webb (painting from cast in sepia), Florence Cartwright (shading from cast), Kathleen N. Boden (freehand drawing). Note: **Edith Helen Webb** (b. 1879), listed as a 'governess' in the 1901 PRO Census, is the daughter of retired flint glass manufacturer Walter Wilkes Webb.

1895

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **William Kny** 17s 6d; **William Northwood** 13s 6d; **Francis R. Grice** 13s 6d; **Frederick Noke** 5s 6d.

1896

Government prizes, male students: **Ludwig Kny** 10s (drawings) Note: **Ludwig Kny** was awarded a national scholarship (eight awarded) to South Kensington, 25s per week.

Government book prize, female student: Edith Boden (pen and ink drawing from nature).

local prizes (first prizes only), male students: **William Northwood** (time study, living model), Samuel Chesney (shading from models), Hugh B. Newland (chalk drawing of head from life; painting in sepia from cast), **Ludwig Kny** (time study, living model; charcoal of head, living model; drapery on living model), **Frederick Noke** (design for cut/engraved claret jug).

local prizes (first prizes only), female students: Annie Clements (freehand drawing), Hilda Webb (painting still life in water colour), Winifred Hand (shading from cast), **Helen Webb** (advanced shading from cast), **Gertrude Grice** (outline from antique figure; designs in colour). Note: **Helen Webb** is the wife of glass manufacturer Thomas Wilkes Webb.

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Ludwig Kny** £1 15s; **William Northwood** £1 15s; **Francis R. Grice** 15s; **Walter Booth** 13s; **Frederick Noke** 12s.

1897

Government prizes, male students: Hugh B. Newland (time study, nude figure), **William Northwood** (time study, nude figure), **Ludwig Kny** (drapery studies)

Government prizes, female students: **Edith Helen Webb**, bronze medal (plant drawing in outline), Kate Simms, book prize (chalk study of drapery on antique figure). Florence Yeomans, book prize (studies of flowers for design).

Government Free Studentships: Florence Yeomans and **Gertrude Grice**.

local prizes (advanced stage, first prizes only), male students: A. M. Barlow (drawing in light and shade), J. J. Homer (freehand drawing of ornament), Harry G. Mills (drawing in light and shade; shading), Albert E. Sharp (freehand drawing of ornament), E. Walker (freehand drawing of ornament), **William Northwood** (time study from life), Samuel Chesney (applied design), Ernest Hill (shading).

local prizes, (advanced stage, first prizes only) female students: Winifred M. Hand (drawing in light and shade), Florence Yeomans (drawing from antique; decorative flower studies), Elsie M. Boden (painting still life), Edith M. Boden (pen and ink foliage from nature), Jessie Roberts (painting still life), **Gertrude Grice** (applied design), **Edith Helen Webb** (outline from foliage), Kate Simms (painting still life), **Alice M. Webb** (sketching from nature). Note: As recorded in the 1901 PRO Census, **Alice M. Webb** (b. 1883) is the daughter of William Webb, 'glass house labourer,' and sister to Harry Webb and William J. Webb, both glass cutters.

1897

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **William Northwood, Frederick Noke, Francis R. Grice, James Moore, Charles W. Smith, George Pope.** *Note:* **James Moore** is listed as 'glass maker' in the 1901 PRO Census, and his father, James Moore, is a 'glass maker.' **George Pope** (b. 1883) is listed as 'glass engraver' in the 1901 PRO Census.

1898

Government medal [bronze], male student: Hugh B. Newland (drawing drapery, antique).

Government book prize, female student: Florence Yeomans (drawing drapery, antique)

local prizes (first prize only), male students: **Charles W. Smith** (light and shade), William Jones (modelling from cast), Frederick Marson (modelling from cast), John J. Homer (advanced freehand), Hugh B. Newland (time study from life).

local prizes (first prize only), female students: Violet Wall (advanced light and shade), Louise Perry (advanced design in colour), Agnes Barlow (advanced model), Grace Cutting (outline foliage from nature), Mabel Harrison (time studies from life), **Gertrude Grice** (modelled design), **Edith Helen Webb** (time drawing from antique), Jessie Roberts (advanced still life painting; advanced monochrome), Florence Yeomans (outline drawing from antique).

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Frederick Noke, James Moore, Charles W. Smith, George Pope, Arthur Dudley, Frederick J. Sutton.** *Note:* **Arthur Dudley** (b. 1882) is listed as 'glass engraver intaglio' in the 1901 PRO Census, and he was employed at the Stevens & Williams glass manufacturing plant in Brierley Hill. **Frederick J. Sutton** (b. 1883) is listed as a 'glass etcher' in the 1901 PRO Census, and his father, James W. Sutton is identified as a 'glass engraver.' **Frederick Noke's** work was 'a design for a flint white celery glass, richly ornamented,' as mentioned in the *County Express*, 11 February 1899.

1899

Government prizes, male students: **Frederick Noke** (advanced design), Hugh B. Newland (drawing antique from memory), Samuel Chesney (historic ornament). *Note:* **Frederick Noke's** design was a glass bowl with plated mounts; see *County Express*, 20 January 1900.

Government prizes, female students: **Edith Helen Webb** (painting from still life).

local prizes, male students: Walter Granger (freehand drawing), Frederick Marson (modelled design; modelled foliage), **James Moore** (outline of foliage from nature), **Frederick Noke** (design), **Francis R. Grice** (drawing from life; studies from life; study from life, full length).

local prizes, female students: Mildred Jones (painting in sepia), Dorothy Lambert (shading from cast), Connie Hickin (painting from still life), **Florence M. Williams** (painting in sepia), Grace Cutting (design in outline), Isabella Harrison (sketching from nature), **Edith Helen Webb** (design in colours), Jessie Roberts (painting from still life), [continued]

1899

local prizes, female students: Edith Boden (shading from cast), Florence Yeomans (head from life; drapery on human figure). **Note:** **Florence M. Williams** (b. 1878) is the daughter of glass manufacturer Joseph Silvers-Williams.

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Francis R. Grice** 13s 6d; **Frederick Noke** 11s; **James F. Moore** 11s; **Charles W. Smith** 7s 6d; **George Pope** 4s; **Frederick J. Sutton** 3s.

1900

Government prizes, male students: **Frederick Noke**, Government bronze medal (design for cameo plaque), **Ludwig Kny**, book prize (clay model of head from life; full length drawing of nude figure). **Note:** **Frederick Noke's** work, 'The Dancers,' is at the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum).

local prizes (first prizes only), male students: Charles F. Tooby (freehand drawing; time study models), Frederick Marson (modelling), Francis Lane (advanced shading), **Frederick Noke** (advanced design; applied design), **James F. Moore** (design; design time study; modelled design time study), **Francis R. Grice** (time study head from life; figure from life; shaded figure from life), Hugh B. Newland (time study drapery; figure from life).

local prizes (first prizes), female students: Emelie Colomb (painting still life), Ella F. Palme (painting in sepia), Grace Purkis (advanced shading), **Florence M. Williams** (advanced sepia from cast), Alice C. Hickin (foliage in pen and ink), Jessie M. Roberts (painting still life).

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Francis R. Grice; James F. Moore; Charles W. Smith; Frederick J. Sutton; George Pope.**

1901

Government prizes, male students: Edward R. Gammon, King's Prize (advanced design), Samuel Chesney, two book prizes (measured drawings), Joseph Broomfield (advanced freehand), Albert H. Brunton (advanced shading), Frederick J. Robinson (architectural drawing), **Frederick Noke** (advanced design).

Government prizes, female students: Winifred Wooldridge (freehand drawing; time study advanced models), Edith Palme (painting still life), Isabella Harrison (advanced monochrome), Jessie M. Roberts (advanced still life), Edith M. Boden (life studies; drapery studies; head life; draped antique), Florence Yeomans (design; life studies; head life in oil; applied design; modelled design).

local prizes, male students: Joseph Broomfield (freehand drawing of ornament; drawing light and shade), **Francis R. Grice** (drawing antique from memory), Edward R. Gammon (design), Arthur W. Lambert (freehand drawing of ornament), Frank A. Rollason (freehand drawing of ornament), Frederick J. Robinson (freehand drawing of ornament).

1901

local prizes, female students: Alice Birt (freehand drawing of ornament), Mary M. Boden (painting still life), Margaret D. Folkes (model drawing), Amy Hobley (freehand drawing of ornament), Augusta A. Ryder (freehand drawing of ornament), Laura E. Simpkins (freehand drawing of ornament), Gwendoline B. Selway ((freehand drawing of ornament), Florence Yeomans (painting still life; drawing from life).

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **Frederick Noke, James W. Moore, Francis R. Grice, Charles W. Smith, George Cartwright, Frederick J. Sutton.**
Note: In the 1901 PRO Census, **George Cartwright** is the son of 'glass cutter' Enoch Cartwright.

1902

Government prizes, male students: Albert H. Brunton (*geometrical drawing*)

Government prizes, female students: Elsie J. Kenworthy (shading from cast)

local prizes, male students: Frederick Baugh (advanced applied design), **Frederick Noke** (advanced design; principles of ornament), **James F. Moore** (modelled design), Harry Benson (model drawing), Albert H. Brunton (freehand drawing), **George H. Cartwright** (freehand drawing), Frederick J. Robinson (freehand drawing), Charles E. Tooby (freehand drawing), Edward R. Tooby (freehand drawing).

local prizes, female students: Esther G. Penn (advanced monochrome), Edith Palme (painting still life), Winifred J. Wooldridge (advanced shading; model drawing), Sydney Beddoes (advanced model drawing), Jessie Roberts (painting still life), **Alice M. Webb** (advanced still life), Alice Hicklin (advanced applied design), Alice M. Birt (still life in pen and ink; model drawing), Elsie J. Kenworthy (advanced shading), Emilie M. Bateman (freehand drawing), Margaret D. Folkes (painting still life), Isabella Harrison (painting still life), Grace Purkis (freehand drawing), Flora Wooldridge (freehand drawing), Florence Yeomans (memory drawing of plant form).

Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers prizes: **James F. Moore; Frederick Noke; Charles W. Smith; George Cartwright; George F. Swinnerton; Frederick J. Sutton** [the Association dissolved in 1902, so this was the last year for these prizes].

1903

Government prizes, male students: **James F. Moore** (memory drawing of plant form), **Frederick Noke** (painting ornament), Benjamin J. Herrin (perspective), Albert H. Brunton (perspective).

Government prizes, female students: Mary Penley (painting still life), Alice C. Hickin (painting still life; memory drawing, plant form), **Alice M. Webb** (painting still life), Edith F. Palme (memory drawing, plant), Florence Yeomans (memory drawing, antique; advanced design).

1903

local prizes, male students: Charles Tooby (advanced models), **George Cartwright** (glass design), **George F. Swinnerton** (modelling), Frederick J. Robinson (architectural design), Arthur Lambert (decorative foliage in colour), Frank Baugh (advanced applied design), **James F. Moore** (advanced design for glass with specimens), **Frederick Noke** (advanced design for glass with specimens), Albert H. Brunton (advanced perspective).

local prizes, female students: Christine Brettell (shading), Jessie Ford (advanced monochrome from cast), Gwendoline Selway (advanced models), Mary Penley (advanced still life, time; advanced still life, oil), Ella F. Palme (advanced foliage, pen and ink; advanced sketching from nature), Alice Hickin (advanced foliage, pen and ink), Nora Lowades (monochrome from cast), Florence Yeomans (advanced head from life, oil; advanced modelled applied design; advanced applied design with specimen; advanced foliage, pen and ink).

1904-1905

Government prizes, male students: **James F. Moore**, Government bronze medal (design for a vase in crystal glass), **Frederick Noke**, Government bronze medal (design for table glass), Frank Baugh (design), Edward Selway (not specified).

Government prizes, female students: Alice M. Birt (painting still life), Florence Yeomans (advanced design).

local prizes, male students: Claude Bartindale (model drawing), Leonard Blick (model drawing), Clarence Jeffries (model drawing), John Jones (model drawing), Edward R. D. Selway (geometrical drawing), Charles W. Twigg (model drawing), Frederick Robinson (design for wrought iron railings and lamp post), **Frederick Noke** (applied design with material), **James F. Moore** (applied design with material).

local prizes, female students: Elsie Douglas (model drawing), Jessie A. Ford (freehand drawing; still life water colours; monochrome), Winifred M. Goodyear (model drawing), Amy L. Greenfield (model drawing), Kathleen Hatton (model drawing), Ada E. Sharp (model drawing), **Alice M. Webb** (sketching from nature), Alice M. Birt (design), Gwendoline Selway (foliage from nature, pen and ink), Alice Hicklin (foliage pen and ink), Mary Penley (still life, oil), Isabella Harrison (still life, water colours), Florence Yeomans (applied design; drapery; drawing from life; foliage pen and ink).

The Department of Practical Art first provided medals in 1852.⁵ The obverse of these medals features the profile portrait of Queen Victoria designed by William Wyon that appears on British coinage and postage stamps (such as the Penny Black) along with embossed lettering: VICTORIA D: G: REGINA. Embossed letters (W. Wyon R.A.) are at the truncation. The reverse has embossed lettering (DEPARTMENT OF PRACTICAL ART), embossed Roman numerals for the year 1852 (MDCCCLII), and the phrase STUDENTS PRIZE in embossed letters within a laurel wreath. This medal is about 46 mm in diameter.

⁵ Col. M. H. Grant, 'British Medals since 1760, Part II: 1820-1861,' *British Numismatic Journal*, 23 (1938-1941), p. 146.

In 1853-1855, a similar medal was provided by the Department of Science and Art. The obverse is the same as the 1852 medal, whilst the reverse has embossed lettering (DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND ART), embossed Roman numerals (such as MDCCCLIV) for the specific year, and the phrase STUDENTS PRIZE in embossed letters within a laurel wreath.

In 1856, a larger (55 mm diameter) medal came into use for local and national awards in art or science, as embossed lettering on the reverse indicates.⁶ Also designed by William Wyon, this medal has embossed beading near its edge, the profile portrait of Queen Victoria with embossed letters (W. Wyon R.A.) at the truncation, the phrase VICTORIA BY THE GRACE OF GOD QUEEN in embossed letters and Roman numerals (MDCCCLVI) on the obverse. The reverse has a laurel wreath within two rows of embossed beads along with embossed lettering. The reverse will have one of the following designations: (1) LOCAL PRIZE FOR SUCCESS IN ART AWARDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND ART (2) NATIONAL MEDAL FOR SUCCESS IN ART AWARDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND ART (3) NATIONAL PRIZE IN SCIENCE AWARDED BY THE SCIENCE AND ART DEPARTMENT (4) AWARDED BY THE SCIENCE AND ART DEPARTMENT FOR PROFICIENCY IN SCIENCE.

Although the medal described in the paragraph above was in use from 1856 to 1896, inclusive, the 1856 date in Roman numerals (MDCCCLVI) did not change.⁷ This medal is about 4 mm thick, and specific information about recipients and their work, including the stage of the curriculum or a science subject, along with the year of the award could be engraved on the edge of the medal, as in these four examples: (1) EMMA PORTER LONDON DISTRICT ST. MARTINS STAGE 17A 1863 (2) SAMUEL ARMITAGE LINCOLN 1864 STAGE 3b (3) JOSEPH SEDDON TYRER NOTTINGHAM STAGE 15 1878 (4) CHARLES STEWART DEVONPORT STAGE 23A 1865 (5) RICHARD J. DURLEY STEAM 1893.

Another medal (145 mm in diameter), designed using repousse and chasing techniques by French artist Antoine Vechte, was made by electrotype and awarded only in the national competitions in art from 1857 to 1865.⁸ The medal has a portrait of Queen Victoria at its centre along with this lettering: VICTORIA QUEEN BY THE GRACE OF GOD 1857. There is lettering below the portrait: FOR SUCCESS IN THE NATIONAL ART COMPETITION. In 1858, the artist Antoine Vechte described the nude figures depicted on the medal as follows:

⁶ Grant, p. 148.

⁷ A similar medal, perhaps used only for national science awards, is dated 1859 in Roman numerals (MDCCCLIX) and has a larger version of Wyon's portrait of Queen Victoria (W. Wyons R.A. at the truncation) along with embossed lettering (VICTORIA BY THE GRACE OF GOD QUEEN) within a row of embossed beads on the obverse. The reverse has a laurel wreath within two rows of beads and this embossed lettering: NATIONAL PRIZE IN SCIENCE AWARDED BY THE SCIENCE AND ART DEPARTMENT.

⁸ Grant, p. 149.

The principal figure at the top of the medal is Genius, attended on his left by Justice, Truth and Science, essential to an Academy of Artists, and on his right by a student meditating. In the background crouches Jealousy or Ignorance; whilst Fame is proclaiming the merit of the successful student and Time and the youthful Genius hold the shield to receive the student's name.⁹

The lettering in the engraving in the shield is similar to that of the Wyon medals described above, but the lettering is intaglio rather than embossed. Here are two examples: (1) Edward R. White 1861 Stage VIIb (2) Edmund R. Byrne 1864 Stage IXa. The medal designed by Antoine Vechte was not well received within the schools of art, as some disliked the nude figures, whilst others objected to the awkward circumstance of a medal designed by a Frenchman for presentation to United Kingdom students who aspired to become designers to compete with the design of French manufactured goods.¹⁰

In 1897, a new medal was introduced to replace the Wyon medal that had been used from 1856 to 1896. This medal features a large portrait of Queen Victoria designed by Frank Bowcher and embossed lettering (VICTORIA BY THE GRACE OF GOD QUEEN & EMPRESS 1897) with a row of beads near the edge.¹¹ On the reverse, a row of beads near the edge encircles a laurel wreath within which is embossed lettering: NATIONAL MEDAL FOR SUCCESS IN ART AWARDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND ART

⁹ *The Engineer*, 5 (18 June 1858), p. 464, quoted in Stuart Macdonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (London: University of London Press, 1970), p. 197.

¹⁰ Macdonald, p. 197.

¹¹ Col. M. H. Grant, 'British Medals since 1760, Part III: 1862-1909,' *British Numismatic Journal*, 23 (1938-1941), pp. 321-362.

APPENDIX FIVE ENROLMENT AT THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL, 1852-1905

Student Enrolment, 1852-1863¹

1852 (104)	1853 (150)	1854 (302)*
1855 (443)*	1856 (62)	1857 (66)
1858 (79)	1859 (90)	1860 (95)
1861 (90)	1862 (141)	1863 (139)

*includes students in local elementary schools

Student Enrolment, 1864-1874²

	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869
Female Morning Class	(33)	(32)	(43)	(41)	(35)	(17)
Male Evening Class	(82)	(78)	(79)	(74)	(69)	(48)
Oldswinford Hospital School boys	(36)	(38)	(40)	(42)	(52)	(48)
	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	
Female Morning Class	(17)	(24)	(29)	(26)	(32)	
Male Evening Class	(52)	(45)	(48)	(48)	(54)	
Oldswinford Hospital School boys	(40)	(38)	(41)	(NA)*	(50)	

*not available, as pages headed 'Oldswinford Hospital Boys' for 1873 are blank

Student Enrolment, 1875-1905³

1875 (98 in evening classes)
 1876 (102 in evening classes)
 1877 (143 total, evening/day)
 1878 (145 total, evening/day)
 1879 (86 in evening classes)
 1880 (97 in evening classes; 132 total)

¹ Compiled from annual reports of the Department of Science and Art and/or accounts in local newspapers (*Advertiser* or *County Express*).

² Compiled from the handwritten *Register of Students 1864-1874* (this important document is owned by the Broadfield House Glass Museum and is available at the Dudley Archive and Local History Centre, Tipton Road, Dudley).

³ Compiled from annual reports of the Department of Science and Art and/or accounts in local newspapers (*Advertiser* or *County Express*).

Student Enrolment, 1875-1905, continued

1881 (89 in evening classes)
1882 (99 in evening classes)
1883 (101 in evening classes; 10 in modelling class)
1884 (98 in evening classes; 130 total)
1885 (156 total, evening/day)
1886 (145 total, evening/day)
1887 (189 total, evening/day)
1888 (160 total, evening/day)
1889 NA**
1890 NA**
1891 (143 total, evening/day)
1892 (162 total, evening/day)
1893 (406 total, includes local elementary schools)
1894 (140 evening/day; 350 total includes local elementary schools)
1895 (79 in evening classes)
1896 (147 total, evening/day)
1897 (83 in evening classes)
1898 (118 in evening classes, including Penny Class)
1899 (149 total, evening/day)
1900 (92 in evening classes; 132 total, evening/day; 655 total includes local elementary schools)
1901 (677 total, includes local elementary schools)
1902 (665 total, includes local elementary schools)
1903 (537 total, includes local elementary schools)
1904 (566 total, includes local elementary schools)
1905 (583 total, includes local elementary schools)

**enrolments for 1889-1890 were not reported in local newspapers or in published documents of the Department of Science and Art.

APPENDIX SIX

STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL REGISTER OF STUDENTS, 1864-1874

This appendix is a partial transcription of the original handwritten Stourbridge Government School of Art *Register of Students* ledger book covering 1864 through 1874. This *Register of Students* contains listings of student names for a morning class for females, an evening class for males (the 'General Evening Class'), a special class for boys who were enrolled at the Old Swinford Hospital School, and a few sessions of an afternoon male private class. This transcription is limited to the evening class for males and the few sessions of the afternoon male private class. Notes immediately below the entries for some students associated with the glass industry provide information about those students.

This important primary source provides a unique opportunity for a close look at many of the male students who were enrolled in the evening class from 1864 to 1874. In addition to revealing the numbers of students enrolled during 1864-1874, the *Register of Students* allows one to gather information regarding the ages of students, the occupations of students (and parent, that is, father), and, most importantly, relationships with the glass industry of the Stourbridge district. Occasional notations in the *Register of Students* reveal that fees for some students were paid by a glass industry firm in the Stourbridge district.

The handwritten names of students generally appear in sequential order as they enrolled in the school, and their ages, places of residence, and the occupation of their parent (and/or of the student) are frequently noted. The class rosters for some years are quite detailed. For example, the roster for 1864 includes names along with most places of residence, occupations and ages, whilst the 1865 roster omits many places of residence, perhaps because the Stourbridge School art master or other person doing the recording knew that many of the students had been listed previously. The 1867 roster omits most occupations, but the 1868 roster contains many listings for occupations. The 1869 and 1872 rosters list many students by name only, whilst the 1870 and 1871 rosters contain much information regarding places of residence, occupations and ages.

This ledger is owned by the White House Cone Museum of Glass (formerly Broadfield House Glass Museum) and is stored at the Dudley Archives and Local History Centre in Dudley. The pages in the original ledger book have the heading 'Stourbridge Government School of Art' across facing leaves and 'Register of Students Attendances, Fees, and Examinations for the Year 18__' immediately below. The handwriting in the *Register of Students* ledger is generally clear and relatively easy to decipher. Surnames are typically given in full, but forenames may be abbreviated ('Jno,' 'Thos,' 'Saml,' 'Benjn,' etc.) or entered simply as initials. This transcription seeks to reflect the capitalisation and abbreviations as they occur in the handwritten *Register of Students*. Insofar as possible, the spellings of the surnames and forenames of many students were confirmed by checking the 1861 PRO Census and the 1871 PRO Census using this web site: www.ukcensusonline.com

General Evening Class 1864 [Stourbridge School of Art <i>Register of Students</i>]					
name	residence	occupation/parent	occupation/student	entry date	age
King James	Dennis Park		Clerk		
<i>note: local/national prizes, 1859-1864</i>					
Moody Saml	Beauty Bank		Blacksmith		20
Adey William	Brettell Lane		Glass Cutter		20
<i>note: local/national prizes, prize student in 1858-1863, long career as glass cutter, mentioned in Health Exhibition 1884</i>					
Vaughan Chas.	Wollaston		Pupil teacher		
<i>note: serving as pupil teacher at the Stourbridge School of Art in 1864</i>					
Keen George	Cradley Heath		Clerk		19.6
Breese Edward	Brettell Lane		Glass Cutter		18.9
<i>note: paid for by 'Mr. Jos. Webb Coalbournebrook'; local prizes 1863-1864</i>					
Breese Charles	Brettell Lane		Glass Engraver		16
<i>note: apprenticed from Old Swinford Hospital School to glass engraver Cooksey Price in 1862; local medal 1864</i>					
Beard James H.	Heath		Glass Engraver		15
<i>note: probably employed at Heath Glassworks, near Stourbridge</i>					
Bristow Walter	Kidderminster	Agent	Surveyor	1864 Jany 18	13
Cooper Thomas	Hagley Road Oldswinford				14.3
Chance Henry Fredrk	Collis Street Dennis Park		Glass trade	1864 Jany 25	14.1
<i>note: paid for by 'Mr. Jos. Webb Coalbournebrook' and local medal 1865</i>					
Chaloner Jno	Wordsley		Glass Engraver		15
<i>note: local/national prizes, 1866, 1869</i>					
Carpenter James	Beauty Bank		Engine Fitter		17
Davies Benjm					
Dallow Jno	Bowling Green Lane				
Dallow Harry	do	Agent			
Hughes Henry	High Street	Publican			
Hughes Henry	Park Street	Clerk in Iron Works			
Hughes William	High Street	Publican			
Hipwood Thomas	Wollaston		Engine fitter		
Hollis Jno	Wordsley		Glass etcher		
Levi Benjn	Brettell Lane	Glass Cutter	Glass Cutter		
Levi William	Brettell Lane	Glass Cutter	Glass Cutter	1864 Jany 18	12
<i>note: Benjamin Levi and William Levi are sons of glass cutter Benjamin C. Levi</i>					
Mobberley Thomas					
Newnam Henry	Wordsley	Schoolmaster			
<i>note: local/national prizes, 1858; became schoolmaster at National School/Wordsley</i>					
Priest John Fredk	Wollaston				
Pearson Francis	Brettell Lane		Shop Keeper's Ass't.		
Parker Herbert H.	Love Lane Upper Swinford		Glass etcher	March 2nd	
<i>note: b. 1849; employed at Guest Brothers; paid for by 'Messers Guest' and local/national prizes 1864-1866</i>					
Sutton Charles	Coalbournebrook	Publican			14
Sutton James	Coalbournebrook		Glass engraver		
<i>note: probably employed at the Webb firm</i>					
Stuart Arthur	Buck-pool Wordsley	Glass manfr			11
Stuart Fredrk	ditto	do			13
<i>note: Arthur Stuart and Frederick Stuart were sons of glass manufacturer Frederick Stuart</i>					
Service Jno	Wordsley				
<i>note: local/national prizes 1868-70; pupil teacher late 1860s-early 1870s; assistant art master at Stourbridge 1873-74</i>					
Turberville Jno	Beauty Bank				
Taylor Thomas	High Street		Leather trade		16
Turner Eli	Coalbournebrook		Glass engraver		
<i>note: probably employed at the Webb firm, son of glass maker Alfred Turner</i>					
Taylor Stewart	Beauty Bank		Clerk		

continued, General Evening Class 1864 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Smith Wm James	Brettell Lane		Glass Etcher		
Adey Cornelius	Brettell Lane		Glass Cutter		
<i>note: son of glass cutter William Adey snr. and brother of glass cutter William Adey, jnr.</i>					
Marrett Jno	Holloway-end		Glass Cutter	Feby 5th 1864	13yrs
Rider Jno Charles	Wollaston		Glass engraver	Feby 5th	13yrs
<i>note: son of glass maker John Rider</i>					
Attwood Thos Chas	Coventry Street		Glass engraver		17
Nash Alfred James	Wollaston		Glass engraver		
<i>note: local/national prizes, 1861-1864</i>					
Perry James (Dead)				March 1863	18
Dallow Charles	Cradley		Cooper		
Holloway Charles	Church Street	Accountant	Scholar	Feby 24	10yrs
Holloway Harry	Church Street	do	do	"	9yrs
Edwards Samuel	Kidder Street		Glass Maker	Feby 24	
<i>note: brothers Edward and James are also 'glass maker' in 1861 PRO Census; paid for by 'Mr. Jos. Webb Cbrook'</i>					
Richardson W		Glass manufacturer			
<i>note: son of glass manufacturer William Richardson at Holloway End</i>					
Green Abraham			Vetry surgeon	Nov 9th '63	15
Ostius Robert	Heath Road	Builder			13.6
Hughes Thomas	Iron Works	Iron Trade		April 4th	13.6
Bowdler George	Bowling Gn Lane		Engineer		27
Aston Thomas	Wordsley		glass trade	April 4th	13
<i>note: son of glass maker Thomas Aston</i>					
Neal Thomas	Dennis Park		Glass Engraver	April 4th	15
Heathcock Thomas	Wollaston		Engine Fitter	April 4th	17.6
Davis Walter Saml	Worcester Street		Glass Engraver	April 4th	16
Corbe Walter	Brettell Lane		Pattern Maker	April 11th	16
Bourne Richd	Dennis Park	Glass cutter		April 11th	13
<i>note: son of glass cutter Richard Bourne</i>					
Oliver Frank	Colley Gate Cradley		Engineer		15
Hickman George	Cradley			April 11th	14
Hammond Joseph	Wollaston	Manager in glassworks		April 25th	10
<i>note: son of Joseph Hammond, clerk to glass manufacturer</i>					
Phillips Philip Danl	Wollaston			April 27th	11
Fiddian William	The Lye	Saddler			15
Nock George	Cradley Heath	Wine Merchant		May 9th	15
Hill James	Chapel Street Wordsley		Glass etcher	May 9th	14
<i>note: paid by 'Messers Northwood,' local/national prizes 1866-1885, employed at J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley</i>					
Castray George Henry	Wordsley		Glass etcher		18.6
Bailie Saml	Wordsley		Glass Engraver		17
<i>note: listed as 'glass painter' in 1861 PRO Censis, son of glass maker William Baylie</i>					
Birchall William	Brettell Lane		Glass etcher	August 1st	12.6
<i>note: son of glass cutter William Birchall</i>					
Lowe Thomas	Wordsley			August 1st	12
Cartwright Joel	Brierley Hill		Clerk		
Leach William Thomas	Cradley Heath		Fitter	August 10th	19
Legg Jno Thompson	Brettell Lane		Iron trade	Aug 15th	16
Edwards Benjn	Brettell Lane		Pattern Maker	Aug 15th	
Williams William	Church Street		joiner	Augst 20th	14
Perks George	Hagley Road		joiner	Sepr 12th	14.6
Badger Joseph	Wollaston		Glass Engraver	Sepr 12th	15
McWhirter Gilbert	Corngreaves Cradley		Smith	Sepr 14	18

continued, General Evening Class 1864 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Saunders Alfred	Bell Lane		Glass trade	Sepr 14	14
b. 1849, emigrated to the USA in the 1880s, employed at various glass manufacturing firms.					
Osborne Daniel	Hagley Road		Glass Engraver	Oct 3rd	15.9
Bird Harry	School House	Musician			12
Handley George	High Street		Painter	Octr 7	15.2
Rankeilor Wm	Wollaston		Draughtsman	Oct 24th	15.6
<i>note: local prizes 1864-1865</i>					
Horsley George			Glass trade	Oct 31st	15
Grice Edwin			Glass etcher		26
<i>note: local/national prizes 1858-1861, employed at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley</i>					
84 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1864					

Morning Class Male 1864 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Millward Henry	Wollaston		Draughtsman		
Grier Abraham	Amblecote	Clergyman			
Akroyd Willie				Augst 2nd	
<i>note: father is currier William Akroyd (Stourbridge School benefactor), mother and sisters attend Ladies Morning Class</i>					
Oates Chrisfr W	Heath Road	Auctioneer		41243	
4 = Total Enrolment Morning Class Male 1864					

General Evening Class 1865 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Adey William			glass cutter		21
Keen George			clerk		20.6
Breese Edw			glass cutter		19.9
Beard James H			glass engraver		16
Bristow Walter			surveyor		14
Chance Henry F			glass trade		15.1
Chaloner John			glass engraver		16
Carpenter James			engine fitter		18
Hipwood Thos			engine fitter		
Hollis Jno			glass etcher		
Parker Herbt H			glass etcher		
Sutton James			glass engraver		
Turberville Jno			glass engraver		
Smith W James			glass etcher		
Adey Cornelius			glass cutter		
Attwood T C			glass engraver		18
Edwards Saml			glass maker		
Ostins Robt		builder			14.6
Bowdler George			engineer		28
Heathcock Thomas			engine fitter		18.6
Davis W Saml			glass engraver		17
Bourne Rich					14
Hickman George					15
Hill James			glass etcher		15
Birchall William			glass etcher		13.6
Leach W Thos					20
Legg Jno T			iron trade		17

continued, General Evening Class 1865 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Edwards Benjm					
Williams Wm					15
Perk George					15.6
McWhirter Gilbert			smith		19
Saunders Alfred					15
Osborne Daniel					16.9
Hundley George					16.2
Rankeilor Wm					16.6
Horsley George			glass trade		16
Grice Edwin			glass etcher		27
Scott George	112 High Street			Jany 9th/65	11
Keen John	Corngreaves			Jany 9th/65	15
Brettell James	Cradley		builder	Jany 9th/65	15
Adams James	Cradley		carpenter	Jany 9th/65	17
Bowdler Jesse	Bowling Green Lanc			Jany 9th/65	14
Lucas Alfred	Oldswinford			Jany 9th/65	14
Gething James Morris	Dennis Park		architect	Jany 11th/65	13
Edwards Edwin	Brettell Lane			Jany 11th	11
Cave Edward	Brettell Lane			Jany 20th	16.6
Castray G H					
Mobberley Thos					
Stanworth Martin	Wordsley		glass engraver		17
<i>note: brother of glass maker Thomas Stanworth</i>					
Neal Thos					
Perks James				March 27	
Leonard Samuel	Cradley		surveyor	March 27	16.2
Glaze William Henry	Cradley Heath	iron trade		March 27	15
Davis Henry	Kidderminster St.	currier		March 29th	14
Baker Saml Walter	The Lye	draper		March 31st	13
Davis William	Gig Mill	glass trade		April 10th	14
Davis John	Gig Mill	glass trade		April 10th	12
<i>note: William Davis and John Davis are sons of John Davis (glass manufacturing firm Davis, Greathead and Green)</i>					
Baylie Jesse	Wordsley	glass trade		April 26	19
Hingley George	Dennis Park	clerk		May 3rd	11
Flavell Joseph	Cradley		engineer	May 15	19
Charles Jno Joshua	Cradley Heath			May 19th	13
Stewart Fredk					
Wood John	Wollaston		scholar	July 24th	13
<i>note: grandson of retired glass maker John Wood</i>					
Perry Josiah	Wollaston		glass cutter	July 24	16
<i>note: son of glass cutter Isaac Perry, local book prize 1866.</i>					
Aston Edwin	Dennis Park	mine agent		July 24	13
Marson Joseph	Foster Street		statuary	July 24	16
Hammersley Wm	High Street Brierley Hill	fitter	fitter & machinist	August 2nd	14
Wall Thomas			solicitor	Augst 9	19
Corbett Walter	Brettell Lane		pattern maker		17
Plant Joseph	Brettell Lane		carpenter	Sept 4	20
Stuart Arthur		glass trade		Sepr 11th	
Vaughan Edwd	Wollaston	teacher		Sepr 20th	14
Wall Alfred	Duke Street			Oct 9th	10
Hill Saml	Ruffords Brickyard		machinist	Oct 9th	14
Isaac Philip	Brierley Hill		Tailor	Oct 16th	15

continued, General Evening Class 1865 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Roberts Thos	Brierley Hill		glass engraver	Oct 16th	15
Gittins John				Nov 16th	
Jno Withey	Market St		coach painter		17
78 = Total Enrollment General Evening Class 1865					

Male Morning Class 1865 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Webb Fitzroy	Coalbournebrook	glass trade		Feby 6th	
Dixon Beaufort	Brierley Hill	clergyman		Augst 15th	14
2 = Total Enrollment Male Morning Class 1865					

General Evening Class 1866 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Keen George	Corngreaves Cradley		iron trade		21.6
<i>note: completed certificate for the 2nd grade</i>					
Bristow Walter	Kidderminster St.		surveyor		15
Chance H F	Collis St Dennis Park		glass trade		16.1
Chaloner Jno	Wordsley		glass engraver		17
Carpenter James	Beauty Bank		machinist		19
Hipwood Thos	Wollaston		machinist		
Parker H H	Love Lane		glass etcher		
Adey Cornelius	Brettell Lane		glass cutter		
Attwood T C	Coventry Street		glass engraver		19
Hickman George	Corngreaves Cradley		clerk		16
Hill James	Wordsley		glass etcher		16
<i>note: medal, stage 2b; awarded 'colours.'</i>					
Birchall Wm			glass etcher		14.6
Leach W T	Corngreaves Cradley		machinist		21
McWhirter Gilbert	Corngreaves Cradley		smith		20
Saunders Alfred	Bell Lane		glass trade		16
Handley George	Upper High St		painter		17.2
Rankeilor Wm	Wollaston		machinist		17.6
Keen Jno	Corngreaves Cradley				16
Lucas Alfred			glass trade		15
<i>note: employed as clerk in glass works</i>					
Gething Jas M	Dennis Park		architect		14
Edwards Edwin	Brettell Lane				12
Cave Edward	Brettell Lane				17.6
<i>note: local prize, 1866, listed as 'glass cutter' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Neal Thomas	Dennis Park				
Hingley George	Dennis Park	clerk			12
Flavell Joseph	Corngreaves Cradley		machinist		
<i>note: received prize as 'glassmaker' from Midland Association of Flint Glass Manufacturers in 1886</i>					
Wood Jno	Wollaston				
Perry Josiah	Wollaston		glass cutter		
Aston Edwin	Dennis Park	mine agent			
Marson Joseph	Foster Street		statuary		
Hammersley Wm	High St Brierley	machinist			

continued, General Evening Class 1866 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Wall Thomas	Duke St		solicitor		
Hill Saml			machinist		
Isaac Philip	Brierley Hill		tailor		
Roberts Thos	Brierley Hill		glass engraver		
Gittins Jno					
Withey Jno	Market St		coach painter		17.6
Green Joseph	New Street			Jany 8th	14.6
Rose Edwin George	The Heath			Jany 8th	11.9
Simms Francis Henry	High St	Professor of Music		Jany 8th	12.6
Bowdler Jesse				Jany 8th	
Baylie Jesse				Jany 8th	
Roby Fredk	High Street		engine fitter	Jany 10th	
Brettell James				Jany 10th	
Cooke Fredk				Jany 15th	
Ellis Charles Rowland	Stourbridge		pupil teacher	Jany 17th	17
Woodhall (sic) Thos	Kingswinford		glass etcher	Jany 22nd	16
<i>note: Thomas Woodall, medal, stage 3b</i>					
Hawkins Fredk	High Street Stourbridge	perfumer		Jany 22nd	15
Moore Moses	Audnam		glass engraver	Jany 22nd	16
<i>note: listed as 'glass engraver' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Bowdler George					
Hughes Henry	High St				15
Vaughan Edwd					
Davis William					
Davis John					
Edwards Saml					
Hands James	Wollaston Nat School		pupil teacher	Feby 12th	
Harris William	Cradley		school master	Feby 16th	31
Barratt Josh	Duncombe St Wollaston		moulder	Feby 26th	
Service George	Hagley Road Oldswinford	publican		March 21st	
Chamberlain Jno	Hagley Road Oldswinford	provision dealer		April 11th	14
Baldwyn Jno	Amblecote	school master		April 11th	12.6
Robinson George	Coalbournebrook	iron trade		April 16	12
Aston Thomas			glass engraver		
Robinson Benjn	Cobden Street Wollaston		glass trade	May 7th	13
Guest Arthur	Brettell Lane			May 7th	13
<i>note: listed as 'glass decorator' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Bird Harry	school house		school-boy		14
Fiddian Wm	The Lye		saddler		17
<i>note: medal, stage 3b</i>					
Cooper Samuel	Belle Vue Wordsley		glass cutter	Augst 6th	22
<i>note: listed as 'glass cutter' in 1871 PRO Census, son of glass cutter Henry Cooper</i>					
Pardoe Thos Henry	Cross Walk The Lye			Augst 8th	17
Carless Jno	Amblecote		pottery trade	Augst 8th	16
Carless Albert	Amblecote		machinist	Augst 8th	18
Edwards Benjn				Augst 15th	
Bateman Geo Henry	Union Street	timber dealer		Sept. 17	11
Lye George	Prestwood Lodge		glass engraver	Sept. 26	14
Lane Thomas				Oct 1st	
Smart Wm James	Cobden Street Wollaston		glass maker	Oct 1st	13
<i>note: listed as 'glass maker' in 1871 PRO Census, son of glass maker Joseph Smart</i>					
Service Jno A					

continued, General Evening Class 1866 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Chaloner Rich	Wordsley				
Hughes William				Oct 7th	
Woodhall (<i>sic</i>) J (<i>sic</i>)					
<i>note: probably George Woodall, brother of Thomas Woodall</i>				Nov 5th	
79 = Total Enrollment General Evening Class 1866					

General Evening Class 1867 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Chance H F	Collis Street Dennis Park				17.1
Cholner Jno	High Street Wordsley				18
Carpenter James					20
Adey Cornelius	Brettell Lane				
Hickman George					17
Hill James	Chapel Street Wordsley				17
McWhirter Gilbert	Corngreaves				21
Saunders Alfred					16
Lucas Alfred					16
Gething James M	Collis Street Dennis Park				15
Edwards Edwin	Collis Street Dennis Park				13
Cave Edward	Wollaston				18.6
<i>note: listed as 'glass cutter in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Wood Jno					14
Perry Josiah	Wood Street Wollaston			March 25	17.6
Wall Thomas					20.6
Gittins Jno					
Green Joseph	New St Stourbridge		surveyor		15.6
Rose Edwin George					11.9
Bowdler Jesse					
Woodhall (<i>sic</i>) Tho	Broad Street The Park				17
<i>note: Thomas Woodall</i>	Kingswinford				
Moore Moses					17
Hughes Henry	High Street Stourbridge				16
Vaughan Edwd	Heath Road Stourbridge				
Hands Jas	Windmill Lane Wollaston				
Harris Wm	National School Cradley				32
Barrat Josh					
Baldwyn Jno					13
Robinson George					13
Robinson Benjn	Wollaston				
Guest Arthur	Brettell Lane				
Bird Harry					
Fiddian Wm	The Lye				
Pardoe Thos H	The Walk The Lye				
Carless Jno					
Carless Albert					
Bateman Geo Harry					
Lowe Thomas					
Smart W James					
Service Jno A					
Chaloner Rich					

continued, General Evening Class 1867 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Hughes Wm					
Woodhall (sic) G	Broad Street The Park				
<i>note: 'George' in pencil</i>	Kingswinford				
Pearson Geo Earnest	Wollaston		glass cutter	Jany 7th	18
<i>note: listed as 'glass cutter' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Perry William	Old Bank High St	banker		Jany 7th	10
Green Alfred	Enville St Beauty Bank	painter		Jany 7th	13
Dutton Jno W Goode	Bell	publican		Jany 9th	12
Nash Chas Edw	New Road	maltster		Jany 9th	12
Keen Nimrod	Congreaves			Jany 14th	14
Bowdler Geo				Jany 21st	
Daley Joseph	Quarry Bank		pupil teacher	Jany 23rd	15
Hughes Thos			iron trade	Jany 23rd	
Taylor Lawrence	High Street Stourbridge		leather trade	Jany 25th	15
Daley Wm	Quarry Bank			Feb'y 8th	13
Pownall W	High Street Wordsley				
Bostock Jno	Mount Street		painter	April 3rd	18
Flavell Joseph	Quarry Bank		engineer		21
North Fredk J	gas works			April 29th	
Price Albert	High Street Quarry Bank	moulder		May 8th	12
Grainger David	Audnam Bank		glass engraver	June 3rd	15
<i>note: listed as 'glass engraver' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Finney Jabez B	Brierley Hill			Augst 7th	11
Hawkins Henry			inspector gas works	Augst 7th	20
Smith Henry W				Aug 12th	
<i>note: this is H. Watson Smith, who became a Council member and was a longtime supporter of the school</i>					
Slack Jno			machinist	Sept 2nd	
Everett Thomas	Longlands	glass trade	glass trade	Sept 9th	14
Hackwood Jas Edw	National School Wollaston			Sept 16th	13
Hackwood Wm E	do			Sept 16th	10
Vial? Rich	Oldswinford		draughtsman		14
Ryder (sic) John C	Duncombe St Wollaston		glass engraver		17
<i>note: John C. Rider listed as 'glass engraver' in 1871 PRO Census, son of glass maker John Rider</i>					
Davis James	Union St		painter &c	Oct 28th	17
Newman Edwin	Union St		painter	Oct 28th	15
Hope Thos	Netherend		manager in mines	Oct 30th	
Harris James	Netherend		do	Oct 30th	
White Alfred	Wollaston St Stourbridge			Nov 25th	17
Ayton George	Wordsley		grocer	Nov 25th	19

74 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1867

General Evening Class 1868 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Chance H F	Collis St Dennis Park		glass trade		18.1
Chaloner Jno	High St Wordsley		glass engraver		19
Carpenter James	Beauty Bank		machinist		21
Adey Cornelius	Brettell Lane		glass cutter		

continued, General Evening Class 1868 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Hickman George	Corngreaves Cradley		clerk		18
Hill James	Chapel St Wordsley		glass etcher		18
<i>note: awarded 'Burchett's Perspective.'</i>					
Saunders Alfred	Bell Lane		glass trade		17
Gething Jas Morris	Dennis Park Stourbridge		architect's asst		16
Cave Edward	Wollaston		glass cutter		19.6
<i>note: listed as 'glass cutter' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Gittins Jno	King St Wollaston		machinist		
Green Joseph B	Midland House		surveyor		16.6
Woodhall (sic) Thos	Broad Street The Park		glass engraver		18
Hughes Henry	High Street Stourbridge		attorneys clerk		17
Vaughan Edward	Heath Road Stourbridge		pupil teacher		
Hands James	Windmill Lane Wollaston		pupil teacher		
Harris Wm	National School Cradley		school master		
Barratt Josh	Duncombe St Wollaston		hardware trade		
Robinson Benjn	Duncombe St Wollaston		glass trade		
Guest Arthur	Brettell Lane		glass etcher		
Pardoe T H	The Cross Walk The Lye		machinist		
Smart W J	Brettell Lane		glass maker		
Service Jno A	John Street Wordsley		glass engraver		
Chaloner Rich	High Street Wordsley		stone mason		
Pearson G E	Wollaston		glass cutter		19
Green Alfred	Enville St Beauty Bank	painter			14
Keen Nimrod	Corngreaves Cradley	builder			15
Hughes Thos	Iron Works Stourbridge		iron trade		
Bostock Jno	Mount St		painter		18.9
North Fredk	gas works	gas trade			
Grainger David	Audnam		glass engraver		15.6
Finney J B	Brierley Hill	relieving officer			11.6
Smith H W	The Beeches Oldswinford	iron trade			
Everett Thos	Longlands		draughtsman/glass trade		14.6
Neal Rich	Oldswinford		draughtsman		14.3
Ryder (sic) Jno C	Duncombe St Wollaston		glass engraver		17.3
Hope Thomas	Netherend		manager in mines		
Harris James	Netherend		do		
White Alfred	Wollaston St Stourbridge	engaged in rope manf	shop-keepers asst		17
Ayton George	Wordsley		grocer		19
Service Walter	Wordsley		glass engraver	Jany 6th	16
<i>note: brother of Stourbridge School student/assistant art master John A. Service, son of glass cutter William Service</i>					
Meese Jas	Camp House Wordsley		machinist	Jany 6th	15
Pilsbury Jos	Wordsley		glass etcher	Jany 6th	15
<i>note: Government prize 1868.</i>					
Oakes Oscar	High Street Stourbridge		stone-mason	Jany 6th	19
Hill William	Dennis Park		glass engraver	Jany 6th	19
<i>note: listed as 'glass maker' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Hingley George	Dennis Park		glass trade	Jany 6th	14
Kindow Alfred	The Heath	boat-maker		Jany 15th	13
Morgan George	ChurchStreet Oldswinford		glass cutter		
<i>note: listed as 'glass cutter' in 1871 PRO Census, son of glass cutter Thomas Morgan</i>					
Wall Alfred	Duke Street Stourbridge	brewer		Jany 22nd	
Cook Edwin	New Street Oldswinford		glass engraver	Feb'y 3rd	
<i>note: listed as 'painter' in 1871 Census, brother Samuel is glass engraver</i>					

continued, General Evening Class 1868 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Bourne Horace	Brettell Lane		glass cutter		14
<i>note: Government prize 1868, listed as 'glass cutter' in 1871 PRO Census, father Joseph Bourne is glass cutter</i>					
Wilkes Charles	Coventry St		surveyors asst	Feb'y 26th	13
Thompson Alfred	Brettell Lane	publican		Feb'y 28th	12
Eley Arthur				March 2	32
Spencer Herbert	Olswinford Hse Stourbridge			March 1	25
Dickens Fredk	The Heath		glass engraver	April 1st	15
Woodhall (sic) G	The Park Kingswinford		glass engraver		18
<i>note: prize for sepia landscape</i>					
Ray William	Audnam		glass engraver	April 20th	13
<i>note: listed as 'glass engraver' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Jones Walter	Envile St Stourbridge		blacksmith	April 20th	22
Fenn Henry	Amblecote			April 20th	12
Wall Thos					
Prescott Geo Wm	Hagley Road	solicitor		May 7th	12
Prescott Chas Victor	Hagley Road			May 11th	
Matthews	Coatley	machinist		May 11th	
Hackwood Jas E	Wollaston		pupil teacher		14
Hackwood Wm E	ditto				12
Skidmore William	Oldswinford			May 17	11
Hipwood Thos	Duncombe St Wollaston		machinist		21
Simms Geo Fredk	High St	teacher		Oct 5th	11
Scott Chas Henry	Brettell Lane	iron trade		Oct 7th	13
Ife Alfred	Beauty Bank	builder		Oct 19th	11
69 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1868					

General Evening Class 1869 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Chaloner Jno					
Hill James					
<i>note: '£3 paid by S&A Dept. Free Student for 1 year.'</i>					
Saunders Alfred					
Gething Jas M					
Cave Edward					
Green Josh B					
Woodhall (sic) Thos					
Vaughan Edw					
Barratt Josh					
Robinson Benjn					
Guest Arthur					
Smart Wm J					
Service J A					
<i>note: '£3 Free Student for 1 year'</i>					
Green Alfred					
Hughes Thos					
North Fredk					
Grainger David					
Neal Rich					
Pilsbury Jos					
<i>note: '£3 Free Student for 1 year'</i>					

General Evening Class 1869 [Stourbridge School of Art <i>Register of Students</i>]					
name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Hill William					
<i>note: possibly a member of the Woodall cameo team</i>					
Hingley George					
Morgan George					
Bourne Horace					
Thompson Alfred					
Ray William					
Prescott Chas Victor					
Skidmore Wm					
Hipwood Thos					
Simms G F					
Scott Chas H					
Ife Alfred					
Henry Perry	Wollaston			Jany 13th	
Dickenson Thos	Envile St Beauty Bank			Jany 13th	
Service Walter					
Chaloner Rich					
Jones Walter					
Seaman N					
Fenn H					
Northwood H [Harry]	Wordsley	glass decorator		March 15	
<i>note: b. 1860, eldest son of John Northwood, partner in J. & J. glass decorating firm in Wordsley</i>					
Crump Wm					
Clare Fredk H	Church Lane Oldswinford	painter		May 31st	11
Hillman Fredk	Holloway End		worker of iron	Aug 2nd	17
Webb J	Coalbournebrook				
Hammond Josh	Coalbournebrook				
Chance H F	Wollaston				
Hall Jno				Aug 16th	
Gething W				Oct 4th	
Lewis Walter	King Street Wollaston		pupil teacher	Nov 1st	
48 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1869					
General Evening Class 1870 [Stourbridge School of Art <i>Register of Students</i>]					
name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Chaloner John	High St Wordsley		glass engraver		21
Hill James	Chapel St Wordsley		glass etcher		20
Gething James M	Dennis Park Stourbridge		architects asst		18
Green Josh B	Nodland House New St		surveyors asst		18.6
Barratt Josh	Duncombe St Wollaston		iron worker		16
Robinson Benjn	do		glass trade		
Guest Arthur	Brettell Lane		glass etcher		
Service John A			glass engraver		
Green Alfred	Envile St Beauty Bk		painter		16
Hughes Thos	iron works Stourbridge		iron trade		18
Neal Rich					
Pilsbury Jos	Wordsley		glass etcher		
Hingley Geo	Collis Street Dennis Park	glass trade			16
<i>note: listed as employed in glass trade in 1871 PRO Census, son of Mary Ann Hingley, employed in glass trade</i>					

continued, General Evening Class 1870 [Stourbridge School of Art *Register of Students*]

name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Thompson Alfred	Brettell Lane	publican			14
Hipwood Thos					
Simms G F	High Street	teacher			12
Scott Chas H	Brettell Lane				14
Ife Alfred	Enville Street Beauty Bank	builder			12
Dickenson Thos	do		pattern maker		16
Chaloner Rich					
Crump W					17
Webb Joseph	Coalbournebrook near Stourbridge		glass trade		
Hammond Joseph	Cobden St Wollaston		glass trade		
Chance H F	Collis St Dennis Park		glass trade		
Gething Wm	do	architect			11
Lewis Walter	King St Wollaston				
Gyngell Albert	High St Wordsley		glass etcher	Jany 17	28
<i>note: '£3 paid by Art Dept to June 1871,' employed at J. & J. Northwood; 'etcher on glass' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
<i>note: Government bronze medal in 1871 for design for fan painted on silk.</i>					
Smith Edw	Bridgenorth Rd Wollaston		machinist	Jany 17	16
Perry Henry	Wollaston				13
Gower Henry	Brettell Lane	painter		Jany 24th	10
Taylor Daniel	Longlands	frying pan maker		Jany 24th	12
Fredk North					
Stringer Fredk					
Perks Edwin	Hagley Street		carpenter	Feby 9th	20
Woodhall (sic) T					
Trotter Geo	Enville Villa Envile Street	brickmaker		March 21st	11
Gadsby Harry	Hagley near Stourbridge			April 13th	
Troth John	Beauty Bank	publican		April 27th	
Hipwood George	Duncombe St Wollaston		glass	May 18th	15
<i>note: listed as 'assistant in glass trade' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Drewry Philip	Coventry St Stourbridge	publican		June 1st	13
Locke Joseph	Cobden Street Wollaston		glass etcher	June 1st	22
<i>note: listed as 'designer on glass' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Allsop Frank	Hagley Road Stourbridge	builder		Aug 3rd	10
Guest Richd Jno	Brettell Lane	bricklayer		Aug 8th	9
Penn? Thos Harry	Lower High St	corn dealer		Aug 10th	16
Joscelyne Geo E	High Street			Aug 15th	16
Davis Geo Henry	Coalbournebrook			Aug 29	13
Brooks Eliseus	Hay Green The Lye		builder	Oct 3rd	17
Rhodes Thos	Hay Green The Lye		glass engraver	Oct 3rd	17
Lavender Henry	The Lye		tailor	Oct 3rd	17
Hingley Wm	Collis St Dennis Park	glass trade		Oct 10th	11
<i>note: local book prize 1872-1873.</i>					
Beck Samuel	Lower Lye		engine tender	Oct 12th	31
Groves Alfred			glass engraver		
52 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1870					

General Evening Class 1871 [Stourbridge School of Art <i>Register of Students</i>]					
name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Chaloner John	High St Wordsley		glass engraver		22
Hill James	Chapel St Wordsley		glass etcher		21
<i>note: 'For one year Paid by Science & Art Dept.'</i>					
Barratt Josh	Duncombe St Wollaston		iron worker		16
Service John A	Brettell Lane		glass engraver		
Pilsbury Josh	Wordsley		glass etcher		
Scott Chas H	Brettell Lane				15
Dickenson Thos	Beauty Bank		machinist		
Gething Wm	Amblecote	architect			
Gyngell Albert	High St Wordsley		glass etcher		29
<i>note: employed at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley</i>					
Smith Edward	Bridgnorth Rd Wollaston		machinist		17
Gower Henry	Brettell Lane	painter			11
North Fredk	Kidderminster St Sbridge	manager gas works			
Perks George	Hagley St		carpenter		21
Gadsby Harry	Hagley near Stourbridge				
Troth John	Beauty Bank	publican			
Hipwood George	Duncombe St Wollaston		glass trade		16
Drewrey Philip	Coventry St Stourbridge				14
Locke Joseph	Cobden St Wollaston		glass etcher		23
Allsop Frank	Hagley Rd Stourbridge	architect			11
Fenn Thos Henry	Lower High St				17
Brooks Eliseus	Hay Green The Lye		builder		18
Rhodes Thos	do		glass engraver		18
Lavender Henry	The Lye		tailor		18
Hingley William	Collis Street Dennis Park		glass trade		
Groves Alfred			glass engraver		
Perks Wm Henry	Longlands		glass engraver		13
Allen George	Gig Mill				12
Gee John	Audnam		glass cutter	Jany 20	15
<i>note: nephew of glass cutter Alfred Gee (PRO Census 1871)</i>					
Joscelyne Geo E					
Hankins Alfred	Brierley Hill		surveyors asst	March 22	21
Hillman Fredk					19
Fiddians Saml	The Lye	saddler		Apri l5th	12
Allsop Philip James	Hagley Road	architect		April 17th	
Hyrons Ernest	High St The Lye	boot maker		Aug 7th	13
Turner Herbert	Coalbournebrook	glass maker		Aug 7th	14
Aston Edwd	The Lye		surveyors asst	Aug 7th	21
Fiddian Samuel	The Heath		plumber & painter	Aug 7th	15
Davis William	High St	confectioner		Aug 9th	13
Turner John	Union Street	painter		Aug 11th	11
Marshall Jas	Duncombe St Wollaston	glass trade		Aug 28th	13
McEwen Chas John	Oldswinford Stourbridge	iron trade		Sept 11th	11
Short Francis	Wollaston	insurance agent		Oct 2nd	14
Darby Jas Jno Holland	Norton nr Stourbridge	gentleman		Oct 4th	12
Northwood Wm	Rectory St Wordsley		glass etcher	Oct 9th	13
<i>note: listed as 'glass ornamentor' in 1881 PRO Census, employed at J. & J. Northwood in Wordsley</i>					
Everett Robert	Longlands		glass trade	Oct 20th	15
45 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1871					

General Evening Class 1872 [Stourbridge School of Art <i>Register of Students</i>]					
name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Hill James					
<i>note: 'Free Student --S & A Dept.'</i>					
Barratt Joseph					
Service Jno A					
Dickenson Thos					
Gething William					
Gyngell Albert					
Smith Edward					
Hipwood George					
Allsop Frank					
Hingley Wm					
Perks Wm Henry					
Allen Geo					
Joscelyne Geo E					
Allsop Philip James					
Hyrons Ernest					
Turner Herbert					
Aston Edwd					
Davis William					
Turner John					
Marshall Jas					
Short Francis					
Darby Jas John H					
Northwood Wm					
Everett Robert					
Bloomer Hugh Wm					
Bloomer Howard Kossuth					
Catterall Arthur					
Catterall Albert					
Northwood Harry					
Clarkson C					
Robinson Thomas			architects asst	Jany 26th	18
Thomas W J					
Hennessy Alfred				Aug 26th	
McEwen					
Hitchen Edward	Brettell Lane		glass etcher	Feby 12th	
Beech Daniel	Rectory St Wordsley		machinist	Mar 18th	28
<i>note: employed in machine shop at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley</i>					
Pilbury Joseph	Wordsley		glass etcher		
Turner Albert				March 25th	
Jordan H	Ridge Top Wollaston			April 3rd	12
Fenn Benjn	Rectory St Wordsley		glass engraver	April 8th	17
<i>note: employed at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley</i>					
Garland Thos	Wood St Wollaston		clerk	April 8th	18
Gillam James Henry	Union St	slater		April 8th	11
Parker Chas W	Hagley Rd			Aug 12th	13
Ireland Wm Walter	Wood St Wollaston		surveyors asst	Sept 25th	17
Godfrey	High Street	florist		Sepr 30th	
Yates Geo Mallar	Longlands	rate collector		Sep 30th	10
Droy Job	Mount Pleasant Kingswinford		glass etcher	Nov 11th	17
<i>note: listed as 'glass engraver' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Fiddian S	The Lye			Nov 13th	14
48 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1872					

General Evening Class 1873 [Stourbridge School of Art <i>Register of Students</i>]					
name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Hill James	Chapel St Wordsley		glass etcher	May 9th 1864	23
<i>note: 'paid for by Dept. £3.'</i>					
Barratt Josh	Wollaston		iron worker	Feby 26 1870	18
Dickinson Thos	Beauty Bank		machinist	Jany 13 1868	19
Gething Wilm	Amblecote	architect		Oct 4th 1869	14
Smith Edward	Bridgnorth Rd Wollaston		machinist	Jany 7th 1870	19
Hipwood Geo	Duncombe Rd Wollaston		glass trade	May 1870	18
Hingley Wilm	Collis St Dennis Park		glass trade	Oct 10th 1870	14
Perks W H	Longlands		glass engraver	Jan 16th 1871	15
Allen Geo	Gig Mill	chainmaker		Jany 16 1871	17
Allsop P J	Hagley Rd	architect		Ap 17th 1871	11
Turner Herbt	Coalbournebrook	glass maker		Aug 7th 1871	16
Marshall Jas	Duncombe Rd Wollaston	glass trade		Aug 28 1871	16
Darby J J H	Norton near Stourbridge	gentleman		Oct 1st 1871	14
Northwood W	Rectory Wordsley		glass etcher	Oct 9th 1871	15
Bloomer H W	Porto Bello	dealer		Jany 7th 1872	15
Bloomer H H	Porto Bello	dealer		Jany 7th 1872	13
Caterall	Hagley Road	architect		Jany 19th	
Thomas W J	Ridge Top Wollaston		machinist	Jan 22nd 1872	18
Hennessey A	Holloway End		glass cutter	Jan 22nd 1872	22
Hitchens E	Brettell Lane		glass etcher	Feb 12th 1870	18
Beech Daniel	Rectory St Wordsley		machinist	Mar 8th 1872	30
Turner Albert	Brettell Lane			Mar 25th 1872	13
Jordan H	Ridge Top Wollaston			Ap 3rd 1872	14
Fenn Benjn	Rectory St Wordsley		glass engraver	Ap 8th 1872	19
<i>note: employed at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley</i>					
Garland Thos	Wood St Wollaston		clerk	Ap 8th 1872	20
Godfrey	High St	florist		Sep 30 1872	
Yates G M	Longlands	rate collector		Sep 30 1872	11
Droy Job	Kingswinford			Nov 11th 1872	18
Fiddian S	The Lye	saddler		Nov 13th 1872	13
Pagett Walter H	138 High St		engineer	Jan 14	15
Cooksey William	Dennis Park	glass engraver		Jan 19	13
Bird H	Longlands		clerk	Jan 19	19
Davis William	High St		confectioner		14
Harris Arthur	Wordsley		glass trade	22 Jany	17
<i>note: listed as 'assistant in glass works' in 1871 PRO Census</i>					
Scott Jas Edwd	Longlands		do	22 Jany	14
Sutton Thos	New Street Wollaston		glass trade	22 Jany	14
Westwood Joseph	The Lye	engineer		27 Jany	13
Ireland W			surveyors clerk		
Hackwood Alfred N		school master		27 Jany	12
Burnam Francis				27 Jany	18
Clarkson C					
Fenn Wm	Amblecote		glass engraver	11th Aug	15
Wakeman Jno	Wollaston			11th Aug	14
White Ernest	Union St		carpenter	Aug 12	15
Fenn Henry	Amblecote		carpenter	Aug 12	17
Schreibner Francis	Wordsley		glass engraver	Aug 25th	20
Price W C				Aug 4th	13
Allsop Frank	Hagley Rd		architects asst	Nov 17th	
48 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1873					

General Evening Class 1874 [Stourbridge School of Art <i>Register of Students</i>]					
name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Hill James					
Gething Wm					
Hipwood Geo					
Hingley Alfred					
Perks W H					
Allsop P J					
Turner Herbert					
Marshall J D					
Darby J J H					
Northwood Wm					
Catterall A					
Thomas W J					
Hennessey A					
Beech Daniel					
Jordan H					
Droy Job					
Pagett W W					
Clarkson C					
Fenn W					
White Ernest					
Schiebner F					
Price W C					
Allsop Frank					
Reading Joseph P					
Harrison Harry					
Wood James					
Weston Geo					
Cox Edw H					
Collins John					
Bennett Geo					
Gittins Jno					
Child John				March 4th	
Northwood Harry	Kingswinford	glass decorator		March 9th	13
<i>note: employed at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley; emigrated to USA in 1881</i>					
Fenn Benjn	High St Wordsley		glass engraver	Mar 9th	15
<i>note: 'Paid by Dept. for Free Studentship,' employed at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley</i>					
Hodgetts Joshua	California Kingswinford		glass engraver		
<i>note: listed as 'glass engraver' in 1871 PRO Census, employed at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley</i>					
Bourne Harry	Cal Inn Wordsley	publican		March 11th	12
Gissler Joseph	Brettell Lane		glass engr	Mar 11th	21
Pilsbury Joseph					
Blurton Walter R	High St Stourbridge	watchmaker		Mar 27th	11
Hill Joseph	Wordsley	glass maker		Mar 30th	11
<i>note: employed at J. & J. Northwood glass decorating firm in Wordsley; father is glass maker Thomas Hill</i>					
Beckley Benjn	Kingswinford	maltster & farmer		April 28th	16
Elwell Thos D	Kingswinford		printer	April 28th	16
Green Cornelius	Union St Stourbridge	painter		May 6th	12
Carey William Henry	Wordsley		clerk	May 13th	13
Guest William H.	Wordsley	employ in glass works		May 18th	13.6
<i>note: listed as 'scholar' in 1871 PRO Census, son of glass engraver Thomas Guest</i>					
Webb Frank	Wordsley		glass engraver	June 10th	15

continued, General Evening Class 1874 [Stourbridge School of Art <i>Register of Students</i>]					
name	residence	occupation/parents	occupation/student	entry date	age
Edwards Joseph	High Street Stourbridge	grocer		Aug 19th	11
Tooby Reed	Gig Mill		painter	Sept 4th	16
Hinds James	Coventry St	solicitors clerk		Oct 9th	18
Mathew James R A		brick maker		Oct 9th	
Barrett Harry	Middle Street Stourbridge	relieving officer		Oct 12th	12
Berrington Albert	Amblecote	carpenter		Oct 21st	
Williams					
Pardoe Charles	22 High Street	painter &c		Nov 2nd	14
54 = Total Enrolment General Evening Class 1874					

APPENDIX SEVEN

BIOGRAPHICAL PROFILES OF KEY SUPPORTERS OF THE STOURBRIDGE SCHOOL OF ART, 1850-1905

James Foster (1786-1853) and **William Orme Foster** (1814-1899). In 1816, James Foster took control of the James Bradley and Co. ironworks on the banks of the River Stour, and, over the next few decades, both greatly expanded that enterprise and became active in other business endeavours, including collieries and the building of steam locomotives. James Foster served on the Stourbridge Improvement Commission, and he was involved with the establishment of the Market Hall in 1826-1827. In 1831-1832, he was a Member of Parliament representing Bridgnorth. His philanthropic activities included St. Mary's church at Old Swinford and a new church at Amblecote along with the Stourbridge Institute for Working Men and the Mechanics' Institution. He was among the initial benefactors of the Stourbridge School of Art. When James Foster died in 1853, his nephew, William Orme Foster, inherited the various businesses in which he had already been involved. He attended meetings of the Stourbridge School as early as 1852, and he was a member of the Council of the school for nearly two decades. His contributions to the civic culture of Stourbridge included a substantial donation to the 1887 Town Hall project and to Corbett Hospital as well as donations to support churches and schools in Wollaston. William Orme Foster was a Member of Parliament (Liberal, South Staffordshire) from 1857-1868. Sources: *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 9 September 1852; *County Express*, 30 September 1899; Roy Peacock, *James Foster of Stourbridge 1786-1853: Industrialist and Benefactor* (Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 2006); Norman Mutton, 'The Foster Family: A Study of a Midland Industrial Dynasty 1786-1899' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1974); www.historyofwollaston.info and www.historyofparliamentonline.org.

Robert Wellbeloved Scott (1803-1856). The son of Unitarian clergyman Charles Wellbeloved and his wife Ann, Robert Wellbeloved was born in York, where his father was divinity chair at Manchester College and was a member of the governing council of the York School of Art and was active in various archeological, literary and philosophical societies. Robert Wellbeloved trained as a barrister. After he married Sarah Scott, the daughter and heiress of wealthy Stourbridge and Great Barr landowner John Scott in 1830, he took the Scott surname. Robert Scott served as MP (Liberal) for Walsall in 1841-47 and had a residence called Red House in Great Barr and another in Regents Park, London. He was a Justice of the Peace in Stourbridge, where he and his wife Sarah had a home in the Lower High Street. Scott took great interest in civic and social affairs in Stourbridge and was active in the founding of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution in the 1830s and its development in the 1840s, especially the drawing class that commenced in 1848. He was among the first financial benefactors of the Stourbridge School of Art and served as chairman of the school Council from its inception in 1851 until the time of his death about five years thereafter. Sources: *The Spectator*, 17 December 1836; 'Death of Robert Scott, Esq.' *Worcester Chronicle*, c. early March 1856; *Christian Reformer*, New Series, XII (March 1856), pp. 229-237; John Kenrick, *Biographical Memoir of the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved* (London: Edward T. Whitfield, 1860); www.wellbelove.org.

John Hodgetts Hodgetts-Foley (1797-1861). Grandson of the first Lord Foley, this descendent within the established, wealthy Foley family, was educated at Christ Church College, Oxford. J. H. Hodgetts-Foley served in Parliament for Droitwich in 1822-34 and, during 1847-1861, when he represented Worcestershire East. In the Stourbridge district, Foley lived at Prestwood House in Kinver and was well known locally for his philanthropic activities associated with Holy Trinity Church in Wordsley and the Foley Infants School in Kinver as well as his leadership as president of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution. He also championed efforts for improvements in housing and sanitation. During an address in January 1846, Foley said that 'the influential People of England are not now indifferent to the condition of the Labouring Classes,' and he pledged a £50 prize for the best plan to improve sanitation in Stourbridge. He was a strong supporter of the drawing classes in the Mechanics' Institution in 1848-50 and was instrumental in securing the Government grant that led to the founding of the Stourbridge School of Art as a provincial school. He was among the initial financial benefactors and served as a vice-president on the school Council. A member of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, Foley often spoke at annual meetings of the Stourbridge School, particularly about the need for employers to support art education and to encourage their employees to attend such classes. Sources: J. H. H. Foley, MP, *Address to the Members of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution* (Stourbridge: Thomas Mellard, 1847); *The London Review*, 30 November 1861, p. 699 and www.historyofparliamentonline.org

Lord Lyttelton (1817-1876). The Lyttelton family is long associated with Hagley Hall near Stourbridge, and George William Lyttelton became the 4th Baron Lyttelton in 1837. Educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, he married Mary Glynne in a double wedding ceremony as her sister Catherine married William Ewart Gladstone, who became an esteemed MP and served as Prime Minister. Mary Glynne Lyttelton died in 1857, and Lord Lyttelton married Sybella Clive in 1869. Lord Lyttelton entered the House of Lords in 1838 and became Lord Lieutenant of Worcestershire in 1839. A classical scholar, he wrote several books devoted to religious subjects and was involved with the restoration of the cathedral at Worcester. Lord Lyttelton was among the first contributors to the Stourbridge School of Art in 1851, and he served as a vice-president on the school Council from its inception until his death. His brother, Rev. W. H. Lyttelton, was also active on the Council. Lord Lyttelton championed many educational and social reform efforts throughout his life. The *Dictionary of National Biography* makes mention of his advocacy for 'night schools and working men's institutes' and describes him as 'an educationist.' Lord Lyttelton was the first president of the Birmingham and Midland Institute in 1854, and he was Chief Commissioner of Endowed Schools from 1869 to 1874. After Lord Lyttelton died in 1876, his son Lord Cobham often attended the meetings of the Stourbridge School, and Lord and Lady Cobham were involved with the grand opening of the Stourbridge Free Library and Technical Institute in 1905. Sources: Oliver Lyttelton (Lord Chandos), *From Peace to War: A Study in Contrast 1857-1918* (London: Bodley Head, 1968); Betty Askwith, *The Lytteltons: A Family Chronicle of the Nineteenth Century* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1975); and Sheila Fletcher, *Victorian Girls: Lord Lyttelton's Daughters* (London: Hambledon Press, 1997). Peter Gordon, 'Lyttelton, George William, fourth Baron Lyttelton and fourth Baron Westcote (1817-1876)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17307>, accessed 6 March 2015].

Lord Ward, Earl of Dudley (1817-1885). William Ward, the 11th Baron Ward, became the Earl of Dudley in 1860. Educated at Eton and at Christ Church and Trinity Colleges, Oxford, he inherited large estates and business interests when his father's second cousin (John William Ward, First Earl of Dudley) died in 1833 and when his father, William Humble Ward (10th Baron Ward), died in 1835. In 1837, Lord Ward purchased Witley Court from the Foley family and was actively involved in renovating the manor house and grounds. Lord Ward was among the initial financial benefactors of the Stourbridge School, and he served as Council president from its inception in 1851, presiding at many annual meetings until his death in 1885. Lord Ward had great interest in fine art and owned such pictures as Raphael's *Three Graces*, J. M. W. Turner's *The Grand Canal, Venice*, and works by Correggio, Fiesole, Giotto, Hogarth, Landseer, Reynolds, and Titian. He served as trustee of both the National Gallery and the National Portrait Gallery. Lord Ward also had a large collection of porcelain. He contributed regularly to the schools of art at Dudley, Kidderminster, and Worcester. His extensive business interests included canals and coal, but he is probably best known as owner of the Round Oak iron works. He donated greatly to the restoration of the cathedral in Worcester, and his remains are interred there. Lord Ward died on 7 May 1885, and an obituary appeared in *The Times* the next day. Sources: Gustav Waagen, *Treasures of Art in Great Britain* (London: John Murray, 1854), vol. 2, pp. 229- 238 and *Galleries and Cabinets of Art in Great Britain* (London: John Murray, 1857), pp. 102-103; Richard Trainor, *Black Country Elites: The Exercise of Authority in an Industrialized Area 1830-1900* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) and 'Peers on an Industrial Frontier: the Earls of Dartmouth and of Dudley in the Black Country, c. 1810 to 1914,' in *Patricians, Power and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Towns*, ed. by David Cannadine (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982), pp. 70-132; articles by Trevor J. Raybould in *The Blackcountryman* (Spring and Summer 2007) provide an interesting overview of the life of Lord Ward.

James Evers-Swindell (1817-1910), **Charles Evers-Swindell** (1819-1891), and **Frank Evers** (1828-1912). These three brothers were the sons of Samuel Evers, a prosperous industrialist who had extensive interests in ironworks, collieries, and the manufacturing of firebrick. James and Charles married sisters Annie and Elizabeth Swindell and took on the surname Swindell after the death of their father-in-law. Upon the death of Samuel Evers in 1849, the three brothers continued the enterprises, especially Cradley Forge, although Frank participated less than his elders. When the Stourbridge School of Art was founded in 1851, the brothers were occupied with their businesses, although one or more of them probably made financial contributions, and Frank had been a supporter of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution. By the early 1880s, however, Charles Evers-Swindell was a vice-president on the Council of the school, and Frank Evers led the fundraising effort to retire the mortgage debt. Charles made a donation for the establishment of a museum that was not to be, but the monies were used to endow scholarships for local elementary school students to attend the Stourbridge School of Art. Obituaries described each of the brothers as Liberal in their political affiliations. Sources: *County Express*, 13 June 1891, 26 November 1910, 3 December 1910, and 6 January 1912; and Elliot Evers, *Butterflies in Camphor: A Family Chronicle* (London: Research Publishing Co., 1974).

Alfred W. Worthington (1828-1907). Born into a Manchester family with substantial business interests, Worthington's religious education included Manchester College as well as a B.A. earned in London. His first pastorate was in Stourbridge at the High Street Chapel during 1852-1854. He had an interest in the Stourbridge School of Art, but pastoral duties took him to Bridgewater in 1855 and later, in 1858, to the Old Meeting House in Mansfield where he remained for about two decades before returning to Stourbridge. In religious life, he identified as Presbyterian and, later, as Unitarian. Whilst at Mansfield, he married Mary Letitia Scott, the daughter of the late Robert Wellbeloved Scott, who had been a leading advocate for art education in Stourbridge and was active in the Mechanics' Institution and in the founding and early operations of the Stourbridge School. Beginning in the early 1880s, Worthington was elected to the Council of the Stourbridge School, and he served as Honorary Secretary until the time of his death. He was instrumental in retiring the mortgage debt and in making successful application for a Government grant that provided funds for building renovations in the mid-1880s. A Justice of the Peace and political Liberal, Worthington also held many public posts, including the Stourbridge Improvement Commission, the Stourbridge Board of Guardians, the Stourbridge Urban Council, the Stourbridge and District Technical Board, and the Worcester County Council. Sources: *Berrow's Worcester Journal*, 26 November 1853 and *County Express*, 23 June 1907.

H. Watson Smith (1853-1926). Educated at the King Edward VI School in Stourbridge, Henry Watson Smith also attended the Male Evening Class at the Stourbridge School of Art, where he was listed on the *Register of Students* for 1867-1868. According to the 1881 PRO Census, Smith, whose occupation was then 'cashier,' lived at 14 Lion Street with his father Richard Henry Smith, a banker who purchased the Eliza Tinsley ironworks, and his mother, Hannah Best Smith. The PRO Census rolls for 1891, 1901 and 1911, show him residing at Longlands House in Lion Street in Stourbridge and record his occupation with Eliza Tinsley and Co. of Old Hill as 'nail and chain manufacturer.' Smith had great interest in art and music, and he contributed much to the civic culture of Stourbridge, founding the Stourbridge Concert Society in the 1880s and occupying leadership positions in the Clef Club, the Chamber Music Society, the Amateur Operatic Society, and the Literary and Philosophical Society. A member of the Council of the Stourbridge School from 1881 until his death in 1926, Smith was largely responsible for the hiring of George Henry Cromack as art master in 1893. Artist Frank Short was a lifelong friend, and Smith organized several exhibitions of Short's work in Stourbridge, including the art section of the Stourbridge Art and Industrial Loan Exhibition for the opening of the Free Library & Technical Institute in 1905. In 1904, when the Stourbridge School was scheduled to relocate, Smith purchased the school building in Theatre Road, and, known thereafter as the Music Rooms, it was a venue for concerts, art exhibitions and lectures for several decades. Sources: *County Express*, 22 May 1926; Elliot Evers, *Butterflies in Camphor: A Family Chronicle* (London: Research Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 96-109 and 177-201; and H. J. Haden, *Street Names of Stourbridge and its Vicinity* (Dudley: Dulston Press, 1988).

Joseph Silvers Williams-Thomas (1848-1933). Born in Brierley Hill and educated at King Edward VI grammar school in Stourbridge and at Bromsgrove, he was first employed at age 16 in the Stevens and Williams glass manufactory where his father, Samuel Cox Williams, was a partner in the firm. He assumed increasing management duties after his father's retirement, and, in 1882, he employed John Northwood I as works manager and art director. Elected to the Council of the Stourbridge School of Art in late 1881, he attended regularly and often spoke at the annual meetings, particularly in regards to the relationship of art education and manufacturing. He was an important influence in the start of art education at Brierley Hill and a strong supporter of the Wordsley School of Art, where Frederick Carder, a Stevens and Williams employee, served as art master in the 1890s and developed a curriculum focused upon glass manufacturing and decorating. Williams-Thomas served as chairman of the Stourbridge and District Higher Education Committee and as president of the Old Edwardian Club, and he was an officer in both the Stourbridge and the Brierley Hill Conservative Clubs. He was an officer in several industrial associations, such as the British Flat Glass Manufacturers and the Pottery and Glass Trades Benevolent Institution. Sources: *County Express*, 10 January 1926 and 14 October 1933; R. S. Williams-Thomas, *The Crystal Years* (Brierley Hill: Stevens and Williams, 1983); Charles R. Hajdamach, *British Glass, 1800-1914* (Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 1991); and Jason Ellis, *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002* (Harrowgate: by author, 2002).

APPENDIX EIGHT
JOHN A. SERVICE'S LETTERS TO THE ROYAL COMMISSION

[15 February 1883 to Gilbert R. Redgrave from Thomas Webb & Sons per J. A. Service]¹

Stourbridge School of Art has undoubtedly had some little influence upon the trade of the district, as evidenced by the fact that many of the leading artists in this district had their earlier training there; but that its influence upon the glass trade direct has been what it was originally intended it should be, is very doubtful. In the first place, the masters not having a practical knowledge of the trade, cannot impart it to the student; his efforts, therefore, are confined to the simple rudiments of drawing, leaving the pupil to form his own ideas, or copy those of his fellow workman away from the school. Secondly, the examples at the school of art have not been selected with a view to specially assist the worker upon glass. The Science and Art Department from time to time have sent down examples on loan for the use of the students, but, beyond the Mulreadys, I never recollect anything useful to the glass decorator coming down. I should imagine this is, in a great measure, owing to the fact that the gentlemen who form the committee of the Stourbridge School of Art are, with one exception, totally ignorant of the requirements of the glass trade. After a student has passed the elementary stages, there is no inducement held out to him to attend the schools; there are no examples or models for him to copy which would be of use to him, and the school is then only a place of practice, with this disadvantage, that the bulk of the students connected with the glass trade live at such a distance from the school that to simply practice drawing they will not travel the distance.

I think, until the students can obtain more practical assistance from the department in the shape of loan objects of art, bearing upon the trade, together with lectures from time to time by competent lecturers, that there is very little hope of the school finding its way out of the Slough of Despond in which it has been floundering so long. To call it a school of design is a perfect farce. The bulk of the most successful students of the school have been connected with the glass trade, but their success is to be attributed more to their own skill and industry, and the genius and enterprise of their employers, than to any connexion with the school of art, which can only claim to have taught them the rudiments of drawing.

The desire to produce pretty landscapes or handsome portraits seems to be encouraged too much to the exclusion of the more vigorous and practical style of drawing which is so essentially necessary in the training of the artizan.

¹ For these two letters, see *Second Report of the Royal Commissioners on Technical Instruction*, vol. III (London: HMSO, 1884), pp. 657-658.

[15 February 1883 to Gilbert R. Redgrave from John A. Service]

Pray pardon the liberty I take in addressing you, but seeing from the circular addressed to my firm that you are desirous of obtaining information with reference to schools of art, &c., and having been connected with our local school for many years, I may be able to give you useful information, and for this purpose place myself at your command.

The Stourbridge School of Art may have, and would have, a great influence on the trade of this district if conducted in a proper manner. It is really pitiable to see what it has degenerated into as of late. Within my knowledge the results have never been so poor as at the present time. A goodly portion of the work of training the younger students devolves upon the assistant master, and the majority of the most successful persons who have held this appointment have been artizans connected with the glass trade. Mr. John Northwood and Mr. Thomas Woodall, who are now, without a doubt, at the very top of their profession, being notable instances.

Men who would be of use at the school as assistant masters cannot afford to give the time and attention required for the miserable salary attached to the post. I myself held the position for two separate periods, devoting three nights per week (2 ½ hours each) to assistance at the school of art, besides giving instruction at three separate local schools in the daytime (necessitating my absence from my usual employ) for the handsome sum of 15/. per year.

I know there are several gentlemen on the local committee working very hard to keep the concern up, and I sincerely trust they will have such help from the department that their efforts may meet with success. I consider, with reference to the local committee, that it would be far better to have a few members, directly connected with the glass trade, men who would take an interest in the concern and assist in guiding it into the proper practical channel. I must plead my anxiety for the fate of our school as my excuse for troubling you with these few remarks.

I am, &c. John A. Service

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: Archival Materials at the Stourbridge Public Library

Account of the Old Swinford Hospital Charity, booklets from various years, 1858-1905.

Addison, John. 'History of Stourbridge,' undated clippings, c. 1872.

Pargeter, Philip. Diary, 1896-1906 (handwritten).

Stourbridge School of Art. Letter/envelope, 21 May 1883 addressed to 'P. Pargeter, Esq., Coalbournbrook, Stourbridge.'

Stourbridge School of Art. Printed sheet, c. 1862-1863.

Stourbridge School of Art. 'Proposed Museum,' circular letter, April 1885.

Note: During 2016, some archival material in the Stourbridge Public Library was relocated to the Dudley Archives and Local History Centre.

Primary Sources: Archival Materials at the Rakow Library (Corning Museum)

Carder, Frederick. 'The Autobiography of an Englishman in the United States of America,' typescript dated 1957.

Primary Sources: Archival Materials at the National Art Library (V&A Museum)

MacCallum. Andrew. Manuscript with illustrations, 'Report of a sojourn in Italy, from the year 1854 to 1857 for the purpose of making studies of the modes of execution and treatment of works of ornamental art, compiled from notes, memoranda and sketches made on the spot.'

Report of a Public Meeting held at the Corn Exchange, Stourbridge, on Monday, Feb. 3, 1851; the Right Honourable Lord Ward in the chair; to consider the best means of promoting a School of Design for Stourbridge and Kingswinford. Worcester: Knight and Arrowsmith, 1851.

Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution, *Annual Report with a List of Officers and Members*. Stourbridge: J. Heming, 1850.

Stourbridge Mechanics' Institution, *Annual Report for the Year ending 31st December, 1851*. Stourbridge: J. Heming, 1851.

Stourbridge School of Art, *Trustee's Remarks on the Report of the Stourbridge School of Design for the Year 1855*.

Primary Sources: Archival Materials at the Broadfield House Glass Museum

'*New Art School, Wordsley.*' 20 June 1899.

'*Proposed New Art School, Wordsley, Subscription List,*' 30 September 1897.

Sanders, John. Correspondence, 12 September 2007.

Note: Broadfield House Glass Museum closed in December 2015, and archival materials are being relocated to the new White House Cone Museum of Glass during 2016.

Primary Sources: Archival Materials at The Hive, Worcester

Stourbridge and District Technical Board. *Committee Minute Book*.

Primary Sources: Archival Materials at the Dudley Archives & Local History Centre

Stourbridge Government School of Art. *Register of Students*, 1864-1874 (handwritten).

Primary Sources: Archival Materials at the National Archives at Kew

Stourbridge School of Art. Miscellaneous correspondence relating to application for building grant in the 1880s and *Annual Report*, 10 October 1883. File ED 29/176.

Primary Sources: Map

Wood, John. *Plan of Stourbridge from Actual Survey 1837*. N. p.: Turner & Co., 1837.

Primary Sources: Directories

Bentley's History, Guide, and Alphabetical and Classified Directory of Stourbridge. Birmingham: Bull and Turner, 1841.

Corporation General and Trades Directory of Birmingham. Birmingham: William Cornish, 1861.

Jones's Mercantile Directory of the Iron District of South Staffordshire and East Worcestershire. London: Jones and Proud, 1865.

Kelly's Directory of Worcestershire. London: Kelly and Co., Limited, 1896.

M. Billing's Directory and Gazetteer of the County of Worcester. Birmingham: M. Billing, 1855.

Melville & Co.'s Directory of Dudley and the Mining District. Worcester: Melville & Co., 1852.

Noake, John. *Noake's Guide to Worcestershire*. London: Longman and Co., 1868.

Pigot and Co.'s National Commercial Directory for 1828-29. London:
J. Pigot and Co., 1829.

Pigot and Co.'s National Commercial Directory. London: J. Pigot and Co., 1835.

Post Office Directory of Birmingham, with Staffordshire and Worcestershire.
London: W. Kelly and Co., 1850.

*Slater's Classified Directory of the Extensive and Important Manufacturing District 15
Miles Round Birmingham.* Manchester: Isaac Slater, 1851.

Slater's Royal National and Commercial Directory and Topography. London:
Isaac Slater, 1850.

A Survey of the County of Worcester. N. p.: n. d., 1788.

Worcestershire General and Commercial Directory. N. p.: S. Lewis, 1820.

Primary Sources: Official Papers

‘An Act for the Preservation of the Health and Morals of Apprentices,’ in John Raithby,
The Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, vol. I. London:
George Eyre and Andrew Strahan, 1822.

Department of Practical Art, *First Report of the Department of Practical Art.*
London: HMSO, 1853.

Department of Science and Art, *Calendar and General Directory of the Science and Art
Department for the Year 1885.* London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1885.

Department of Science and Art, *Calendar, History and General Summary of Regulations.*
London: HMSO, 1900.

Department of Science and Art, *Fifteenth Report of the Science and Art Department.*
London: HMSO, 1868.

Department of Science and Art, *Second Report of the Department of Science and Art.*
London: HMSO, 1855.

Department of Science and Art, *Tenth Report of the Science and Art Department.*
London: HMSO, 1863.

Department of Science and Art, *Third Report of the Department of Science and Art.*
London: HMSO, 1856.

Fifth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the Year 1845-46.
London: HMSO, 1846.

Fourth Report of the Council of the School of Design for the Year 1844-45.
London: HMSO, 1845.

Public Record Office (PRO). *Census* (the years 1841, 1851, 1861, 1871, 1881, 1891, 1901 and 1911 were consulted using the website www.ukcensusonline.com).

Report of the Council of the School of Design, 1842-3. London: HMSO, 1843.

Report of the Second Special Committee of the Council of the Government School of Design. London: HMSO, 1847.

Report from the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures, 4 September 1835.
London: HMSO, 1835.

Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their connexion with Manufactures,
16 August 1836. London: HMSO, 1836.

Report from the Select Committee on the School of Design. London: HMSO, 1849.

Report from the Select Committee on the Schools of Design together with the proceedings of the committee, minutes of evidence, appendix, and index. London: HMSO, 1849.

Report of a Special Committee of the Government School of Design, to consider and report upon the state and management of the school. London: HMSO, 1847.

Reports and Documents exhibiting the State and Progress of the Head School and Branch Schools of Design during the last Twelve Months. London: HMSO, 1850.

Reports and Documents exhibiting the State and Progress of the Head School and Branch Schools of Design, in the Year 1850-1851. London: HMSO, 1851.

Second Report of the Royal Commissioners on Technical Instruction, vol. III.
London: HMSO, 1884.

Third Report of the Council of the School of Design for the Year 1843-4. London:
HMSO, 1844.

Primary Sources: Newspapers

Advertiser (formerly *Brierley Hill Advertiser*), various issues, 1857-1905.

Birmingham Daily Post, various issues, 1858-1891.

Birmingham Post and Mail, 26 July 1949 and 4 January 1952.

Berrow's Worcester Journal, various issues, 1852-1894.

Caledonian Mercury, 31 January 1850 and 2 February 1852.

County Express, various issues, 1867-1936.

Daily News (London), 7 and 11 February 1851 and 12 October 1857.

Examiner (London), 15 February 1851.

Express and Star, 26 July 1949.

Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser (Dublin), 3 September 1853.

Liverpool Mercury, 11 November 1851.

Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper (London), 11 September 1853.

Manchester Guardian, 12 February 1838 [as cited in David Jeremiah, *A Hundred Years and More: A History of Art and Design Education in Manchester*. Manchester: Manchester Polytechnic, 1980].

Morning Chronicle, (London), 5 September 1853 and 13 October 1857.

Stourbridge Mercury, 15 December 1865.

Stourbridge Observer, various issues, 1864-1874.

The Times, 13 May 1852.

Worcester Chronicle, various issues, 1853-1856.

Worcester Herald, various issues, 1850-1851.

Primary Sources: Periodicals

Architect, 13 January 1883.

'Art in the Provinces,' *The Art-Journal*, New Series, VI (1854), p. 56.

The Artist (15 March 1880).

The Art-Journal, New Series, II (1856), VII (1868) and IX (1870).

Art Journal, 16 (1877), 19 (1880) and 32 (1895).

The Art-Union, vol. I, No. 2 (March 1839).

British Architect, 11 January 1883.

British and Foreign Review, 6 (January-April 1838).

Builder, 22 August 1846.

Building News and Architectural Review, 9 (19 December 1862).

Building News and Engineering Journal, 44 (19 January 1883).

The Critic, 1 March 1851.

Dafforne, James. 'The Works of Andrew Mac Callum,' *Art Journal* (November 1877), pp. 321-324.

'Design in Glass: Products of the Stourbridge School of Arts and Crafts,' *Pottery Gazette and Glass Trade Review*, March 1944, pp. 142-143.

Furniture Gazette, 21 (19 April 1884).

The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Review (April 1856).

Journal of Design and Manufactures, 1 (March 1849).

Journal of the Society of Arts, 30 (18 November 1881).

The London Review, 30 November 1861.

The Pottery & Glass Trades' Journal (1878) and *Pottery Gazette* (1879 and thereafter).

Powell, Harry. 'On Table Glass' [paper first read on 28 April 1903], *Journal of the Society of Arts*, 51 (June 12, 1903), pp. 638-641.

Powell, Harry J. 'Technical Education in Relation to Glass Manufacture,' *Journal of the Society of Arts*, 45 (July 23, 1897), pp. 849-851.

Saturday Review, 18 September 1858.

Stourbridge Almanack, various issues, 1885-1905. Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1885-1905.

'Thomas Bott,' obituary in *The Art-Journal*, New Series, vol. X (1871), p. 42.

Tweedie, William King. *Youthful Diligence and Future Greatness: A Book for the Young*. London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1882.

Vidgen-Jenks, J. C. 'Stourbridge Glass,' *Pottery Gazette and Glass Trade Review*, 1 April 1938, p. 567.

Vidgen-Jenks, J. C. 'Co-Operation between Art Schools and Glass Manufacturers,' *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 86 (29 April 1938), pp. 590-606.

Vidgen-Jenks, J. C. 'Art Schools and Glass Manufacture: What is being done at Stourbridge,' *Pottery Gazette and Glass Trade Review*, 1 June 1938, pp. 814-815.

'The Weather and Workmen in the Glass Trade,' *Pottery Gazette*, September 1884.

Primary Sources: Books and Pamphlets

Bartley, George C. T. *The Schools for the People*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1871.

Brougham, Henry. *Practical Observations upon the Education of the People, Addressed to the Working Classes and their Employers*. London: Longmans, 1825.

Browne, Edith Ophelia and John Richard Burton (eds.), *Short Biographies of the Worthies of Worcestershire*. Worcester: privately printed, 1916.

Catalogue of the Exhibition of Works of Modern Artists. N. p.: n. p., 1879.

Cole, Alan S. and Henrietta Cole (eds.), *Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole, K.C.B.* London: George Bell and Sons, 1884.

Cr., W. [Crane, Walter], 'Art Teaching,' *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. II. New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica Co., 1910.

Chisholm, Hugh. 'Short, Francis Job,' *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 24. New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica Co., 1910.

A Descriptive Account of Stourbridge Illustrated. Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1894.

Exhibition Catalogue: Stourbridge Art and Industrial Exhibition (Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, Ltd., 1905).

The Exhibition of the Royal Academy of Art. London: Royal Academy, 1887.

The Exhibition of the Royal Academy of Arts. London: Wm. Clowes and Sons, 1889.

Secondary Sources: Books

Allthorpe-Guyton, Marjorie. *A Happy Eye: A School of Art in Norwich 1845-1982*. Norwich: Jarrold & Sons, Ltd., 1982.

Armytage, W. H. G. *Four Hundred Years of English Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Ashwin, Clive. *Art Education: Documents and Policies* (London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1975).

Beard, Geoffrey W. *Nineteenth Century Cameo Glass*. Newport: Ceramic Book Co., 1956.

- Bell, Quentin. *The Schools of Design*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.
- Berg, Maxine. *The Age of Manufactures, 1700-1820: Industry, Innovation and Work in Britain*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Bishop, A. S. *The Rise of a Central Authority for English Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Bonython, Elizabeth and Anthony Burton, *The Great Exhibitor: The Life and Work of Henry Cole*. London: V&A Publications, 2003.
- Dorothy Bosomworth, 'Design Education in the Provinces: Converting Principles into Practice,' *Prince Albert and the Development of Education in England and Germany in the 19th Century*, ed. Franz Bosbach (Munich: Saur, 2000).
- Briggs, Asa. *The Making of Modern England 1783-1867: The Age of Improvement*. New York: David McKay Co., 1959.
- Buechner, Thomas S. *Frederick Carder: His Life and Work*. Corning: Corning Museum of Glass, 1952.
- Burton, Anthony. 'Richard Redgrave as Art Educator, Museum Official and Design Theorist,' in *Richard Redgrave 1804-1888*, ed. by Susan P. Casteras and Ronald Parkinson. London: V&A Museum, 1988.
- Burton, Anthony. *Vision & Accident: The Story of the Victoria and Albert Museum*. London: V&A Publications, 1999.
- Byard-Jones, Janet. *A History of Wollaston Schools 1859 to 1984*. Wollaston: History of Wollaston Group, 2007.
- Carline, Richard. *Draw They Must: A History of the Teaching and Examining of Art*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd., 1968.
- Chambers, R. L. *The History of King Edward's School Stourbridge*. Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1988.
- Chancellor, Valerie E. (ed.), *Master and Artisan in Victorian England: The Diary of William Andrews and the Autobiography of Joseph Gutteridge*. New York: Augustus Kelley, 1969.
- Clarke, Ronald. *Cast in the Same Mould: The Origin and History of Coventry School of Art 1834-1895*. Coventry: Herbert Art Gallery and Museum, 1979.
- Collins, Paul. *By Tram from Dudley*. Stroud: The History Press, 2013.
- Cotgrove, Stephen F. *Technical Education and Social Change*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1958.

- Cottle, Simon. *Sowerby Gateshead Glass*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Tyne and War Museums Service, 1986.
- Denvir, Bernard. *The Late Victorians: Art, Design and Society, 1852-1910*. London: Longman Group Limited, 1986.
- Dimitroff, Thomas P. 'The Journey: The Life of Frederick Carder,' in *Frederick Carder and Steuben Glass*. Atglen: Schiffer Publishing, 1998.
- Edwards, Anthony David. *The Role of International Exhibitions in Britain, 1850-1910*. Amherst: Cambria Press, 2008.
- Ellis, Jason. *Glassmakers of Stourbridge and Dudley 1612-2002*. Harrowgate: by author, 2002.
- Evans, Eric J. *The Forging of the Modern State: Early Industrial Britain 1783-1870*, second edition. London: Longman, 1996.
- Evers, Elliot. *Butterflies in Camphor: A Family Chronicle*. London: Research Publishing Co., 1974.
- Fairburn, Miles. *Social History: Problems Strategies and Methods*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Ferguson, Hugh. *Glasgow School of Art: The History*. Glasgow: The Foulis Press of the Glasgow School of Art, 1995.
- Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole, K. C. B.* London: George Bell and Sons, 1884.
- Finlayson, Geoffrey. *Citizen, State and Social Welfare in Britain 1830-1990*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Fisher, Graham. *Jewels on the Cut: An Exploration of the Stourbridge Canal and the Local Glass Industry*. Kingswinford: Sparrow Publishing, 2010.
- Flores, Carol A. Hrvol. *Owen Jones: Design, Ornament, Architecture and Theory in an Age of Transition*. New York: Rizzoli, 2006.
- Frayling, Christopher. *The Royal College of Art: One Hundred & Fifty Years of Art & Design*. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1987.
- Gardner, Paul V. *The Glass of Frederick Carder*. New York: Crown, 1971.
- Gillard, Derek. Web site: educationengland.org.uk (accessed 13 Feb. 2013).
- Gittins, Chris. *Theatres and Cinemas of Stourbridge 1752-1952*. Dudley: Dudley Teachers' Centre, 1980.

- Grover, Ray and Lee Grover. *English Cameo Glass*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1980.
- Guttery, D. R. *From Broad-Glass to Cut Crystal: A History of the Stourbridge Glass Industry*. London: Leonard Hill, 1956.
- Haden, H. Jack. *Artists in Cameo Glass Incorporating Thomas Woodall's Memoirs*. Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 1993.
- Haden, H. J. *1882 and All That: A Survey of Events in the Dudley Area 100 Years Ago*. Dudley: Dudley Teachers' Centre, 1982.
- Haden, H. J. *The Borough of Stourbridge 1914-1964*. Stourbridge: Stourbridge Borough Council, 1964.
- Haden, H. J. *Notes on the Stourbridge Glass Trade*. Dudley: Dudley Public Libraries, 1977.
- Haden, H. J. *Street Names of Stourbridge and its Vicinity*. Dudley: Dulston Press, 1988.
- Haden, H. J. *The Stourbridge Glass Industry in the 19th Century*. Halesowen: Reliance Printing Works, 1971.
- Haden, H. J. *The Stourbridge Scene 1851-1951*. Dudley: Dudley Teachers Centre, 1976.
- Haden, H. J. *Stourbridge in Times Past*. Brinscall: Countryside Publications, 1980.
- Haden, H. J. *Through the Years: Stourbridge 1851-1951*. Stourbridge: Marks & Moody, 1951.
- Hadfield, Charles. *The Canals of the West Midlands*, 3rd edition. Devon: David & Charles, 1985.
- Haggard, Reginald G. *A Century of Art Education in the Potteries*. Stoke-on-Trent: Webberley Limited, 1953.
- Hajdamach, Charles R. *British Glass, 1800-1914*. Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 1991.
- Hajdamach, Charles. 'The English Years, 1880-1903: Carder's Artistic Milieu and Early Success,' in *Frederick Carder and Steuben Glass*. Atglen: Schiffer, 1998.
- Hajdamach, Charles R. *20th Century British Glass*. Suffolk: Antique Collectors' Club, 2009.
- Hann, Andrew. 'Industrialisation and the Service Economy' in Jon Stobart and Neil Raven (eds.), *Towns, Regions and Industries: Urban and Industrial Change in the Midlands, c. 1700-1840*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- Hardie, Martin. *Etchings, Dry-points, Lithographs by Sir Frank Short*. London: Print Collector's Club, 1940.

- Hardie, Martin. *The Liber Studiorum Mezzotints of Sir Frank Short*. London: Print Collector's Club, 1938).
- Hardie, Martin. *The Mezzotints and Aquatints of Sir Frank Short*. London: Print Collector's Club, 1939.
- Haydon, Fredrick Wordsworth. *Benjamin Robert Haydon Correspondence and Table-Talk*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1876.
- Heacock, William, James Measell and Berry Wiggins. *Harry Northwood: The Early Years, 1881-1900* (Marietta: Antique Publication, 1990).
- Heacock, William, James Measell, and Berry Wiggins. *Harry Northwood: The Wheeling Years, 1901-1925*. Marietta: Antique Publications, 1991.
- Hill, Kate. *Culture and Class in English Public Museums, 1850-1914*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2005.
- Hill, Stan. *Wordsley Past and Present*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2005.
- Hilton, Boyd. 'Government and Politics 1783-1846,' in *The Cambridge Historical Encyclopedia of Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. by Christopher Haigh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Hilton, Boyd. *A Mad, Bad and Dangerous People? England 1783-1846*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Revolution 1789-1848*. New York: Mentor Books, 1962.
- Honey, W. B. *English Glass*. London: Collins, 1946.
- Hopkins, Eric. *Childhood Transformed: Working-Class Children in Nineteenth-Century England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- Hopkins, Eric. *Industrialisation and Society: A Social History, 1830-1951*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Hopkins, Eric. *The Rise and Decline of the English Working Classes, 1918-1990: A Social History*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991).
- Hopkins, Eric. *A Social History of the English Working Classes: 1815-1945*. London: Arnold, 1979.
- Hopkins, Eric. *Working-class Self-help in Nineteenth-Century England: Responses to Industrialization*. London: UCL Press, 1995.
- Hoppen, K. Theodore. *The Mid-Victorian Generation 1846-1886*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

- Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Hunt, Tristram. *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2005.
- Hurt, John S. *Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes, 1860-1918*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Jackson, Lesley (ed.), *Whitefriars Glass: The Art of James Powell & Sons*. Somerset: Richard Dennis, 1996.
- Johnson, J. and A. Gruetzner (eds.), *British Artists 1880-1940*, vol. V of the *Dictionary of British Art*. Suffolk: Antique Collector's Club, 1994.
- Jones, Ray. *Porcelain in Worcester, 1751-1951: An Illustrated Social History*. Worcester: Parkbarn, 1993.
- Klein, Dan and Ward Lloyd (eds.), *The History of Glass*. London: Macdonald & Co., 1991.
- Langford, Ian and H. Jack Haden, *Dudley and Stourbridge Canals*. Birmingham: Lapal Publications, 1979.
- Lawson, John and Harold Silver, *A Social History of Education in England*. London: Methuen and Co., 1973.
- Locke, Joseph H. and Jane T. Locke, *Locke Art Glass: A Guide for Collectors* (New York: Dover Publications, 1987).
- Macdonald, Stuart. *A Century of Art and Design Education*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2005.
- Macdonald, Stuart. *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*. London: University of London Press, 1970.
- McCarthy, Fiona. *Anarchy & Beauty: William Morris & His Legacy*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2014.
- McCarthy, Fiona. *William Morris: A Life for Our Time*. London: Faber, 1994.
- Matsumura, Takao. *The Labour Aristocracy Revisited: The Victorian Flint Glass Makers 1850-80*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983.
- Minihan, Janet. *The Nationalization of Culture*. New York: New York University Press, 1977.
- Morris, Barbara. *Inspiration for Design: The Influence of the Victoria & Albert Museum*. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1986.

- Morris, Barbara. *Victorian Table Glass and Ornaments*. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1978.
- Munford, W. A. *William Ewart, M. P. 1798-1869: Portrait of a Radical*. London: Grafton & Co., 1960.
- Munford, W. A. *Penny Rate: Aspects of British Public Library History 1850-1950*. London: The Library Association, 1951.
- Musgrave, P. W. *Society and Education in England since 1800*. London: Methuen and Co., 1968.
- Neale, R. S. *Class in English History 1680-1850*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.
- Northwood, John II, *John Northwood: His Contributions to the Stourbridge Flint Glass Industry 1850-1902*. Stourbridge: Mark and Moody, 1958.
- Owen, David. *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960*. Cambridge: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Papworth, Wyatt. *John B. Papworth... A Brief Record of his Life and Works*. London: privately printed, 1879.
- Peacock, Roy (ed.). *James Foster of Stourbridge 1786-1853: Industrialist and Benefactor*. Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 2006.
- Peacock, Roy. *The Origins of Stourbridge: From the Stone Age to the Middle Ages*. Old Swinford, Stourbridge: Rector and Parochial Church Council of St. Mary, 2014.
- Peacock, Roy. *The Seventeenth Century Foleys: Iron, Wealth and Vision*. Kingswinford: Black Country Society, 2011.
- Perry, Christopher Woodall. *The Cameo Glass of Thomas and George Woodall*. Somerset: Richard Dennis, 2000.
- Perry, Nigel. *A History of Stourbridge*. West Sussex: Phillimore & Co., 2001.
- Pevsner, Nikolaus. *Academies of Art: Past and Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.
- Pointon, Marcia. *William Dyce, 1806-1864*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Quinn, Malcolm. *Utilitarianism and the Art School in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2013).
- Redgrave, F. M. *Richard Redgrave: A Memoir, Compiled from his Diary*. London: Cassell & Company, 1891.

- Redgrave, Gilbert. *Manual of Design, Compiled from the Writings and Addresses of Richard Redgrave, R. A.* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1876).
- Reid, Wemyss (ed.), *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lyon Playfair*. London: Cassell and Company, 1899.
- Romans, Mervyn. 'Introduction: Rethinking Art and Design Education Histories,' 'A Question of "Taste": Re-examining the Rationale for the Introduction of Public Art and Design Education to Britain in the Early Nineteenth Century,' in *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays*, ed. by Mervyn Romans. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005.
- Romans, Mervyn. 'Social Class and the Origin of Public Art and Design Education in Britain,' in *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays*, ed. by Mervyn Romans. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005.
- Rowlands, Marie B. *Masters and Men in the West Midland Metalware Trades before the Industrial Revolution*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975.
- Royle, Stephen. 'The Development of Small Towns in Britain,' in *Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, ed. Martin Daunton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Smith, Charles Saumarez. *The National Gallery: A Short History*. London: Frances Lincoln, 2009.
- Strange, Edward F. *The Etched and Engraved Work of Frank Short, A.R.A., R.E.* London: George Allen & Sons, 1908.
- Sutherland, Gillian. *Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Historical Association, 1971.
- Sutton, Gordon. *Artisan or Artist? A History of the Teaching of Art and Crafts in English Schools*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1967.
- Thistlewood, David. 'The Early History of the NSEAD: the Society of Art Masters (1888-1909) and the National Society of Art Masters (1909-1944),' in *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays*, ed. by Mervyn Romans. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005.
- Thompson, F. M. L. *The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain 1830-1900*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Thomson, David. *England in the Nineteenth Century*. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1950.
- Tosh, John. *The Pursuit of History*, fifth ed. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd., 2010.

Trainor, Richard. *Black Country Elites: The Exercise of Authority in an Industrialized Area 1830-1900*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Trainor, Richard. 'Peers on an Industrial Frontier: Earls of Dartmouth and of Dudley in the Black Country, c. 1810-1914,' in *Patricians, Power and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Towns*, ed. by David Cannadine. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982.

Turpin, John. *A School of Art in Dublin since the Eighteenth Century: A History of the National College of Art & Design*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1995.

Tylecote, Mabel. *The Mechanics Institutes of Lancashire and Yorkshire before 1851*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957.

Watts, David C. *A History of Glassmaking in London*. London: Watts Publishing, 2009.

Whitehouse, David. *English Cameo Glass in the Corning Museum of Glass*. Corning: Corning Museum of Glass, 1994.

Williams-Thomas, R. S. *Crystal Years: A Tribute to the Skills and Artistry of Stevens & Williams Royal Brierley Crystal*. Brierley Hill: Stevens & Williams, 1983.

Woodward, E. L. *The Age of Reform 1815-1870*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

Woodward, H. W. *Art, Feat and Mystery: The Story of Thomas Webb & Sons, Glassmakers*. Stourbridge: Mark and Moody Limited, 1978.

Wright, Christopher and Catherine Gordon *et al.* (eds.), *British and Irish Paintings in Public Collections: An Index of British and Irish Oil Paintings by Artists Born before 1870 in Public and Institutional Collections in the United Kingdom and Ireland*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006)

Secondary Sources: Articles

Ames, Winslow. Review of Quentin Bell's *Schools of Design*, *Victorian Studies*, 8 (1965), pp. 295-296.

Argles, Michael. 'The Royal Commission on Technical Instruction, 1881-4: Its Inception and Composition,' *Journal of Education & Training*, 11 (1959), pp. 97-104.

Bailey, Bill. 'The Technical Education Movement: A Late Nineteenth Century Educational "Lobby."' *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 7 (1983), pp. 55-68.

Beard, Geoffrey W. 'George Woodall's Cameo Glass,' *Country Life*, 11 February 1954, p. 347.

Beard, Geoffrey W. 'XIX Century Cameo Glass,' *Apollo*, 63 (1 February 1956), pp. 51-53.

Betts, Robin. 'Persistent but Misguided? The Technical Educationists 1867–89,' *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society*, 27 (1998), pp. 267-277.

Black Country Bugle, 29 October 2009.

Boase, G. C. 'Chamberlain, John Henry (1831–1883)', rev. Michael W. Brooks, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5047>, accessed 26 Nov 2015].

Cooper, Ann. 'Cole, Sir Henry (1808–1882),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5852>, accessed 6 March 2015]

Cummings, Keith. 'Born of Industry: The First 150 Years of Glass Education in Stourbridge, England,' *Glass* (Spring 2005), pp. 40-45.

Donnelly, J. F. 'The Origins of the Technical Curriculum in England during the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,' *Studies in Science Education*, 16 (1989), pp. 123-161.

'Exhibition of Glass and Painted Pottery,' *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 82 (2 November 1934), p. 1257.

Farrell, S. M. 'Ewart, William (1798–1869),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, January 2010
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9011>, accessed 30 June 2013].

Fletcher, John. 'Public Libraries Legislation and Educational Provision in Nineteenth-Century England,' *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 28 (1996), 97-113.

Godden, Geoffrey. 'Worcester Enamels,' *Apollo*, 63 (1 April 1956), pp. 122-124.

Godden, Geoffrey. 'Victorian Ceramic Artists-III,' *Apollo*, 69 (1 June 1959), p. 183.

Godden, Geoffrey. 'A Century of Worcester Porcelain,' *Country Life*, 21 June 1962, pp. 1518-1519.

Gooday, Graeme J. N. 'Playfair, Lyon, first Baron Playfair (1818–1898),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22368>, accessed 5 June 2015].

Goodwin, Gordon. 'Millingen, James (1774–1845),' rev. Elizabeth Baigent, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18758>, accessed 7 June 2015].

- Gordon, Peter. 'Lyttelton, George William, fourth Baron Lyttelton and fourth Baron Westcote (1817–1876)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17307>, accessed 6 March 2015].
- Haden, H. J. 'Artist-Craftsmen of Stourbridge School of Art Glass Department, *The Glass Cone* (Summer 1988), pp. 3-6.
- Haden, H. J. 'The Woodall Brothers: Cameo Glass Artists,' *Glass Technology*, 27 (October 1986), pp. 151-158.
- Hajdamach, Charles. 'The Discovery of Frederick Noke,' *Cameo*, 8 (Winter 1995-1996), p. 5.
- Hajdamach, Charles R. 'Northwood, John (bap. 1836, d. 1902)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, April 2016
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/104919>, accessed 30 April 2016].
- Hajdamach, Charles R. 'Woodall, George (1850-1925)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, April 2016
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53599>, accessed 30 April 2016].
- Hanson, Derek. 'The Art Masters,' *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 19 (February 1971), pp. 40-50.
- Harper, C. W. 'Making Glass,' in *Black Country Folk at Work*, ed. by Ned Williams. Wolverhampton: Uralia Press, 1989.
- Harrison, Brian. 'Philanthropy and the Victorians,' *Victorian Studies*, 9 (1966), pp. 353-374.
- Heleniak, Kathryn Moore. 'Redgrave, Richard (1804–1888),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23254>, accessed 6 March 2015].
- Heward, Christine M. 'Industry, Cleanliness and Godliness: Sources for and Problems in the History of Scientific and Technical Education and the Working Classes, 1850-1910,' *Studies in Science Education*, 7 (1980), pp. 87-128.
- Hill, Stan. 'Black Country Personalities No. 36 H. Jack Haden,' *The Blackcountryman*, 30 (Summer 1997), pp. 10-16.
- Hill, Stan. 'More Black Country People No. 11 Jack H. Haden,' in *57 More Black Country People*. Kingswinford: The Black Country Society, 2009.
- Hill, Stan. 'Wordsley School of Art,' *The Blackcountryman*, 34 (Winter 2000), pp. 73-82.

- ‘Historic glass records and artifacts secured,’ *Dudley Archives Journal* (Summer 2008), pp. 6-7.
- Hogan, James H. ‘The Development in the Design of English Glassware during the last Hundred Years,’ *Journal of the Society of Glass Technology*, 20 (December 1936), pp. 735-740.
- Hopkins, Eric. ‘A Charity School in the Nineteenth Century: Old Swinford Hospital School, 1815-1914,’ *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 17 (1969), pp.177-192.
- Hopkins, Eric. ‘Small Town Aristocrats of Labour and Their Standard of Living, 1840-1914,’ *Economic History Review*, New Series, 28 (May 1975), pp. 222-242.
- Hopkins, Eric. ‘Working Conditions in Victorian Stourbridge,’ *International Review of Social History*, 19 (December 1974), pp. 401-425.
- Hopkins, Eric. ‘Working Hours and Conditions during the Industrial Revolution: A Re-Appraisal,’ *Economic History Review*, New Series, 35 (February 1982), pp. 52-66.
- Hoskins, Leslie. ‘Jones, Owen (1809–1874),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15066> [accessed 5 June 2015].
- Hughes, G. Bernard. ‘A Rainbow with a Sparkle: Stourbridge Glass,’ *Country Life*, 3 December 1964, pp. 1498-1503.
- Hussey, Christopher. ‘The Art Industry Exhibition: Some Preferences at Burlington House,’ *Country Life*, 19 January 1935, p. 78.
- Inkster, Ian. ‘The Social Context of an Educational Movement: A Revisionist Approach to the English Mechanics’ Institutes, 1820-1850,’ *Oxford Review of Education*, 2 (1976), pp. 277-307.
- Ivy, Judy Crosby. ‘Short, Sir Francis Job (1857–1945),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, October 2007 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36074>, accessed 11 December 2013].
- Katoh, Shoji. ‘Mechanics’ Institutes in Great Britain to the 1850s,’ *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 21 (1989), pp. 1-7.
- Lobban, Michael. ‘Brougham, Henry Peter, first Baron Brougham and Vaux (1778–1868),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3581>, accessed 30 June 2013].
- Long, B. S. ‘MacCallum, Andrew (1821–1902),’ rev. Mary Guyatt, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34675>, accessed 10 Aug 2013].

- McCarthy, Fiona. 'Morris, William (1834–1896),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19322, accessed 5 June 2015].
- Northwood, John II. *Journal of the Society of Glass Technology*, 8 (June 1924), pp. 85-91.
- Northwood, John II. 'Stourbridge Cameo Glass,' *Journal of the Society of Glass Technology*, 33 (June 1949), pp. 106-113.
- 'Obituary [Richard Redgrave],' *The Times* [London, England] 15 Dec. 1888: 10, *The Times* Digital Archive, Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- 'Old Swinford,' *Victoria History of the County of Worcester*, vol. 3, ed. by J. W. Willis-Bund and William Page. London: A. Constable, 1913.
- Quinn, Malcolm. 'The Disambiguation of the Royal Academy of Arts,' *History of European Ideas*, 37 (2011), pp. 53-62.
- Quinn, Malcolm. 'The Political Economic Necessity of the Art School 1835-52,' *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 30 (2011), pp. 62-70.
- Radford, Ernest. 'Bott, Thomas (bap. 1828?, d. 1870),' rev. Amanda Girling-Budd, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2965, accessed 2 Jan 2014].
- Rawson, George. 'The Glasgow Government School of Design, 1845-1853,' *Journal of the Scottish Society for Art History*, 4 (1999), pp. 18-25.
- Raybould, T. J. 'The Development of Lord Dudley's Mineral Estates, 1774-1845,' *Economic History Review*, New Series, 21 (Dec. 1968), pp. 529-544.
- Raybould, T. J. 'William, First Earl of Dudley and 11th Lord Ward (Part 1),' *The Blackcountryman*, 40 (Spring 2007), pp. 60-64.
- Raybould, T. J. 'William, First Earl of Dudley and 11th Lord Ward (Part 2),' *The Blackcountryman*, 40 (Summer 2007), pp. 31-34.
- Romans, Mervyn. 'An Analysis of the Political Complexion of the 1835/6 Select Committee on Arts and Manufacture,' *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 26 (2007), pp. 215-224.
- Romans, Mervyn. 'Living in the Past: Some Revisionist Thoughts on the Historiography of Art and Design Education,' *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 23 (2004), pp. 270-276.
- Royle, Edward. 'V. Mechanics' Institutes and the Working Classes, 1840-1860,' *The Historical Journal*, 14 (1971), pp. 305-21.

- Sharp, P. R. 'Victorian Values and the Private Funding of Art Education—the Case of the Schools of Art in the 1860s,' *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 21 (1989), pp. 18-27.
- 'Short, Francis Job,' *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed. New York: Encyclopedia Britannica Co., 1911), vol. 24, p. 1007.
- Silverman, Alexander. 'Frederick Carder, Artist and Glass Technologist,' *American Ceramic Society Bulletin*, 18 (1 January 1939), pp. 343-349.
- Silverman, Alexander. 'Joseph Locke, Artist,' *The Glass Industry*, 17 (August 1936), pp. 272-275.
- 'Sir Henry Cole,' *The Times* [London, England] 20 Apr. 1882: 6, *The Times Digital Archive*, Web. 6 Mar. 2015.
- Smith, E. J. Milton. 'Art Teacher Training in Britain (1852-1985) with special reference to Leeds,' *Journal of Art and Design Education*, 4 (1985), pp. 103-146.
- Stephens, M. D. and G. W. Roderick, 'The later Victorians and Scientific and Technical Education,' *Annals of Science*, 28 (1972), pp. 385-400.
- Stephens, W. B. 'The Victorian Art Schools and Technical Education: A Case Study, 1850-1889 [Warrington School of Art],' *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 2 (December 1969), pp. 13-19.
- Stobart, John. 'Cultural Space and Civic Boosterism in a "New" Industrial Town: Burslem, 1761-1911,' *Social History*, 29 (November 2004), pp. 485-498.
- Swift, John. 'Birmingham and its Art School: Changing Views 1800–1921,' *Journal of Art and Design Education*, 7 (1988), pp. 5–29.
- This England* (Autumn 1986).
- Trainor, Richard. 'The Middle Class,' in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, vol. III 1840-1950, ed. by Martin Daunton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Turpin, John. 'The School of Design in Victorian Dublin,' *Journal of Design History*, 2 (1989), pp. 243-256.
- Turpin, John. 'The Royal Dublin Society and its School of Art, 1847-1877,' *Dublin Historical Record*, 36 (December 1982), pp. 2-20.
- Vaughan, William. 'Bowler, Henry Alexander (1824–1903)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32004>, accessed 10 Aug 2013].

Walker, Martyn. 'Encouragement of Sound Education amongst the Industrial Classes: Mechanics' Institutes and Working-class Membership 1838–1881,' *Educational Studies*, 39 (2013), pp. 142-155.

Werner, Alex. 'John Charles Lewis Sparkes 1833-1907,' *Journal of the Decorative Arts Society 1850 - the Present*, 13 (1989), pp. 9-18.

Whitty, Audrey. 'Frederick Carder's Years at Stevens & Williams,' *Journal of Glass Studies*, 56 (2014), pp. 370-374.

Williams-Thomas, Lt.-Col. R. S. 'Six Generations Reflected in Glass,' *Glass* (February 1983), pp. 54, 56, and 58.

Williams-Thomas, R. S. and Sam Thompson. '19th Century Cameo Glass,' *The Antiques Journal* (September 1979), pp. 30-32 and 49.

Secondary Sources: Dissertations and Theses

Bird, Edward. 'The Development of Art and Design Education in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century.' Unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University of Technology, 1992).

Butterworth, Harry. 'The Science and Art Department 1853-1900.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1968.

Cooksey, Helena Jane. 'The Impact of Educational Reform on the Wolverhampton School of Art and Design.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wolverhampton, 2006.

Cunningham, Peter James. 'The Formation of the Schools of Design, 1830-1850, with special reference to Manchester, Birmingham and Leeds.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 1979).

Denis, Rafael Cardoso. 'The Educated Eye and the Industrial Hand: Art and Design Education for the Working Classes in mid-Victorian Britain.' Unpublished PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute, University of London, 1995.

Duce, J. E. 'A History of the Leamington School of Art from its Original Foundation in 1866 to the Year 1914.' Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1969.

Duke, Christopher. 'The Department of Science and Art: Policies and Administration to 1864.' Unpublished PhD thesis, Kings College, University of London, 1966.

Fletcher, John, 'A Study in Educational Development and Civic Pride in the City of Worcester during the 19th Century.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Bristol, 1979.

Gray-Fow, Michael J. G. 'Lincoln School of Art: From its Beginnings to the close of the Nineteenth Century' (Nottingham: University of Nottingham, 1978 [M. Ed. paper].

Hartnell, Roy. 'Edward R. Taylor and the Birmingham Municipal School of Art.' Unpublished MA thesis, Royal College of Art, 1976.

Hipwell, M. E. 'A Survey of the Work of the Science Division of the Department of Science and Art, 1853-1899.' Unpublished MEd thesis, University of Nottingham, 1964.

Hopkins, Eric. 'The Working Classes of Stourbridge and District, 1815-1914.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1972.

Levine, Arnold S. 'The Politics of Taste: The Science and Art Department of Great Britain, 1952-1873.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1972.

Matsumura, Takao. 'The Flint Glass Makers in the Classic Age of the Labour Aristocracy, 1850-1880, with Special Reference to Stourbridge.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Warwick, 1976.

Mutton, Norman. 'The Foster Family: A Study of a Midland Industrial Dynasty 1786-1899.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1974.

Romans, Mervyn. 'Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Determinants in the History of Early to Mid-Nineteenth Century Art and Design Education in Britain.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Central England in Birmingham, 1998.

Sandilands, D. N. 'Thesis on the history of the Midland (Stourbridge) glass industry: with special reference to the flint glass section.' Unpublished thesis, University of Birmingham, 1927.

Walker, Martyn. 'Solid and Practical Education within reach of the Humblest Means: The Growth and Development of the Yorkshire Union of Mechanics' Institutes 1838-1891.' Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Huddersfield, 2010.

Secondary Sources: Websites

www.jamesdjulia.com/item/lot-1546-important-frederick-carder-presentation-vase-66805/

www.cradleylinks.org

www.educationengland.org.uk

www.oldstourbridgemaps.kjdocs.co.uk

www.ukcensusonline.com