

Mark of the Times: Charcoal and the Borough Group

Kate Aspinall

Introduction

There are two thrusts to this exhibition. The first, dominant one is charcoal, the fact of its dexterity and efficacy in conveying forceful emotion. The second emerges not from the medium shared by all but two of these works, but from how this medium changed with the passage of time: how its particular qualities were harnessed by particular people at particular times and places. It is therefore not a consideration of similarity but of subtle distinctions.

The pieces around us span just over ninety years, from David Bomberg's (1890-1957) ink piece *Unknown* (1914) to Dennis Creffield's (b. 1931) *Jerusalem Wedding* (2009), yet all of these pieces operate within a specific idiom in their handling of charcoal; that is, they operate within certain conventions that rely on certain gestures through certain tools and materials – for, if marks are like sounds and pictures are like language, then these pieces are a particular dialect with their own grammatical logic.¹ This logic is policed by the inherent possibilities and limitations of charcoal as a tool for making pictures. And there are strong arguments that the challenge of these material conditions creates a mental space for artists to meet outside the specificity of their time periods.² In other words, when the limits of drawing materials are engaged with, history is folded upon itself.³ Looking around this gallery it would be tempting to claim something similar for the uses of charcoal that surround us, but we are not only looking at a short segment of time – looking at just two intimately linked generations – but also noting that each piece retains important traces of its particular historical embeddedness at a volatile point for practicing drawing. Over this ninety year span and particularly in the post-war period, which I will be predominantly addressing today, seismic changes were occurring around this group of practitioners, such as those relating to the use and proliferation of charcoal, to fashions within art education, and to beliefs of what artists can and should achieve through their practices. So this talk will not only address charcoal, but also how reading with a historically informed eye can extract meaning from the different ways its inherent properties were exploited.

Charcoal the Elemental

Charcoal is elemental in many ways. Aesthetically its rich, broad blacks contain a depth that graphite and even ink struggle to contend with. It is a by-product of fire – that primary symbol of transformation and reckoning.⁴ And, it is elemental in our cultural imaginations too: coal, charcoal's close relative, was the tool used by Callirrhoe, the ancient Greek who traced her departing lover's shadow, and, for centuries has been celebrated as the mythical mother of drawing, and, by extension, of the Western European art tradition.⁵ It is elemental in an additional way – it is a tool to clarify the timid idea, as it is to train the novice hand. It is such a fragile medium, crumbling as it is pressed and thus is little more than dust lying along the top of the paper, easy to brush away unless it is worked violently into the paper's grain. For this it was a popular tool for apprentices in Renaissance studios, just as it still is in art schools today. Artists such as Durer and Leonardo Da Vinci used it to sketch in the basic shapes before switching to silverpoint, ink, or the then-harder natural chalks to work up the

details of a drawing. Until the popularisation of fixatives in the sixteenth century it was rarely used for detailed work, though when soaked or dipped in oil it could produce more durable, deep, inky marks, as Rubens did. By the nineteenth century charcoal had displaced chalks as the principle means of sketching the figure inside and outside academies. It thus represented a space of freedom and experimentation – be it pedagogic, conceptual, or chemical.

We can see this in one of the gems of this collection, Edna Mann's *Bent Figure* (undated), where the fragility of the medium enforces communication of an ephemeral moment. On the face of it, this is a conservative subject – a nude woman posing in a studio, who bends at the waist to pluck what may be a glass or a stone from the ground and as she does so, her right leg takes her weight, echoing the purpose of her left arm and causing her ankles to swivel as her feet grip the ground. It is an image so simple and yet so eloquent. Part of what I love is how elemental the resultant figure is: she could be of any age, any degree of agility or weariness, but in this fleeting moment she has all the supine grace of a Botticelli muse. It is not a masculine, voyeuristic image, but a delicately empathic one – where Mann captures the pleasure and tragedy of being embodied. This effect results in part from Mann's genius in selecting and arranging such eloquent shapes, but the power of this picture is impossible without the apt handling of charcoal. The shapes are thickly outlined in a vivid tone and you can appreciate this more if you step up to the image and see how the black is not just a pigment but a compressing of the paper, a finality that changes how it captures the light and suggests to our subconscious eye the unforgiving absoluteness of the mark, and yet it is the graininess of charcoal that softens the edges, and whose errant cloud of dust in the moment of making is worked in those spaces of white, rendering the shimmer along the muscles of the shoulder and of the twisting skin over the hip. Mann balances the line and the cloud and we feel that tension. This is present with less delicacy also in Miles Richmond's (1922-2008) *Mule Mare and Plough* (c. 1965) and Creffield's *Seated Figure* (1950), where the marks carve into a churning surface of mid tones, and it is the subject of his *Oxen Ploughing* (1953) where Creffield uses the cloud to describe the thrust of muscles against disrupted earth – we feel the struggle between these two powerful elements, ox and ground, without the need for literal representation.

It was with Bomberg and his followers such as Mann, Creffield and Richmond that charcoal became a key material of mature practice and was used in ambitious presentation drawings – a marked difference from its earlier deployment for studies or sketches. Despite charcoal's proliferation in the class- and life-rooms, embracing its fragility and messiness often interfered with calligraphic elegance or naturalistic detail in drawings intended for display. Bomberg's approach not only navigated these inherent limitations but also used them to ensure that his process involved an authentic engagement with his subject – charcoal became not an impediment but an enabler of artistic insight.

Charcoal for Bomberg and His Teaching

Bomberg's *Rhonda Bridge and Tajo* (1935) is an early example of Bomberg's manipulating the mass of charcoal on the page to create a vertiginous sense of structure within and through the febrile charcoal marks. It is a remarkable feat to fill a page with monochromatic tone that crowds its surface, denies perspectival depth and yet still describes its subject. For anyone

who has walked in Bomberg's footsteps and looked up from the gorge at these Spanish mountaintop cities, you'll know that the subject's scale and grandeur are impossible to convey through traditional representational means, much as the skilled draftsman and water-colourist, John Ruskin (1819-1900) wrote in *Modern Painters IV* (1856): 'It is not possible to get the complete expression [...] of the apse of a Gothic cathedral, into a picture as the elevation cannot be drawn as a vertical plane in front of the eye, the head needing to be thrown back in order to measure their heights, or stooped to penetrate their depth.'⁶ This is precisely the type of representational problem Bomberg sought to solve through his approach to drawing with charcoal, and it is one that he refined through his teachings here at the Borough Polytechnic (now London South Bank University), which in turn spawned what one student and chronicler called 'the Bombergians', a coterie invested in extending Bomberg's late method.⁷ Creffield, Mann and Richmond were not only important 'Bombergians' but also principal members of an exhibition collective formed by Bomberg and another student Cliff Holden (b. 1919), called the Borough Group, which was active between 1946 and 1951 and whose other members included Dorothy Mead (1928-1975) and the later inventor of 'Auto-Destructive Art' Gustav Metzger (b. 1926) among others.⁸ For these artists Bomberg exuded, according to Holden, 'a Messianic feeling' in large part because he taught outside of what Creffield called 'debased academicism', an approach to draughtsmanship then taught in art colleges that relied on learning to see.⁹ Bomberg in turn called this a 'corruption in the name of Drawing – the "Hand and Eye" disease.'¹⁰ This tradition had a long history in Britain, dating back to the establishment of the Royal Academy in 1768 when naturalistic drawing was treated as a proof of professional credibility.¹¹ The subsequent national examinations in drawings, first established in 1837, also privileged drawing as a quantifiable visual literacy.¹² And in the post-war years a new fashion was gaining momentum from the teachings of an erstwhile Euston Road realist, William Coldstream (1908-1987), whose method of careful measuring, so as to obliterate the taint of guesswork, took hold first at Camberwell and then at the Slade. By the 1960s it was known simply as the 'Slade Style'. Simultaneously abstraction, from the post-war St. Ives School and then the influence of Dutch Concrete Art and American Abstract Expressionism increasingly moved towards pictorial experimentation without reference to nature. What Bomberg taught was a compromise, grounded on the material possibilities of charcoal, between the needs of the material on the page and the needs of a rigorous engagement with the outside world.

Bomberg legitimised his own underappreciated innovations through teaching.¹³ In doing so, he has left us through his students and his notes with a record of his approach, which sought to unlock 'the spirit in the mass': a concept that Creffield has defined as 'that animating principle found in all of nature – its living vibrant being – not simply the sheer brute physicality of the object'.¹⁴ Unlocking this was to become one with the thing drawn, by acknowledging the impossibility of objective knowledge and relaxing into the chaos of sensation. Drawing does not make a statement about the object being drawn, but about an artist's conscious and unconscious feelings for that object as she uses the drawing process to explore that relationship, which another student, Roy Oxlade (1929-2014), called 'the gestural accompaniment of a perceptual exploration', where 'we are not removed from the object of our perception, but brought to a much closer union'.¹⁵ From Bomberg's own notes it is clear that mass was a way of returning perceptual forms to an intellectual innocence –

not reading distance according to rules of perception, but instead groping with a great, immediate vision of pulsing matter – experiencing the world as if it were as immediate and two dimensional as the paper before him.¹⁶

Not only in *Rhonda Bridge* but also in *Bomb Store* (1942) it is evident how charcoal lends itself to this type of process – fleeting impression after fleeting impression can be noted down and then massaged with thumb, stump, eraser, or more marks to reveal the structure or uniting spirit within the chaos of impressions. But, more than facilitate this type of perceptual engagement, charcoal necessitates it. In Oxlade's phrase, using charcoal on paper 'insists upon rhythmic coherence as a necessary but not sufficient characteristic'; in other words, it forces an attentiveness to the interaction of marks on the page and yet at the same time these marks dissolve to muddy meaninglessness without careful attention to the structure of the thing drawn. Thus it is the malleability of charcoal itself that enforces both an abandon into emotive abstraction and a check on that abandon through a need for rigour in reading structural tensions and continuities along the mass. For, to quote Oxlade again, 'however rhythmic, a mere skein of lines and smudges will remain relatively arbitrary unless particularised in relation to nature or things'.¹⁷ This is exemplified in the shimmer of shoulder muscles on Mann's *Bent Figure* just as it is in the delicate control over the riotous facets of the Rhonda cliff wall or the menacing angularity in *Bomb Store*.

Charcoal and the Cathedrals

Some of Bomberg's first works in this idiom were his pictures of bombed London, where he used charcoal to depict dusky moonlight and smoke-blackened walls first of Queens Gate Mews and then in a series of varied views of St. Paul's looming, intact, amongst the wreckage. It is apt that charcoal here becomes the means of wringing structure from mass, finding succinct feeling in a riot of fear, anticipation, disappointment and trauma that accompanied movements through London in the Blitz.¹⁸ Bomberg was himself a firewatcher, and was drawn to those who, like him, lined the galleries of St. Pauls kicking and sweeping incendiary bombs as they fell.¹⁹ It was during this time that St. Paul's became a symbol of inexplicable survival – a great phoenix, born from the ashes of the Great Fire of 1666, and surviving night after night of bombardment.²⁰ Bomberg's use of charcoal here conjures simultaneously its fragility as a cloud of smoke hanging momentarily in the air and its monumentality, a great mass girded by strong supports. Charcoal becomes the means of conveying the potency of that which we build to protect ourselves yet can be pierced in a mere moment.

To understand the historically precise tension within Bomberg's *St. Paul's Cathedral, London* (1944) it is illuminating to compare it to Creffield's own image of St. Paul's, undertaken forty-four years later, and which despite the similar idiom and subject reveals crucial differences that reflect the major shifts that occurred in that time.

The most dominant shift between these two works is in what is communicated to the viewer through the use of charcoal. Where Bomberg communicates a sub-verbal feeling – vulnerability and impotency in the face of an impoverished and yet nonetheless alienating higher power – Creffield focuses on conveying to the viewer the nature of the process of

creation itself. Where Bomberg was documenting his subject, Creffield documents the interplay between artist, drawing, and subject. This is most evident each man's use of layers. Despite Bomberg's call for manipulating the mass on the page, he deposits layer after layer of marks, creating a rich depth in the process, but I have not yet found evidence of his using a kneaded eraser. His process is an additive one. And, this is not merely a preference but an important reflection of an earlier conception of drawing as having ethical codes of creation. This pertained generally to avoiding erasing, since drawing was not so much an exploration but a statement of insight. Bomberg's layers, however, also resonate with the theories of drawing as if carving proposed by the artist and critic Adrian Stokes and influential in the inter-war period. For Stokes to draw as if carving away at the surface of the paper, like he claimed Cezanne did, activated the vitality of the image and respected the authenticity of one's materials.²¹ The aim was a truth to materials that was similar to Bomberg's spirit in the mass, though the results were quite different. Perhaps paradoxically Coldstream also drew on this method in formulating his own measuring method. He sought a true statement of an artist's relationship to her subject by minimising subjective interference by measuring precise distances between points within the subject. Bomberg sought a true statement of an artist's relationship to her subject by maximising subjective interference.

Creffield went a step further and made this interference, or mutual experience, the subject of his pieces. In doing so he threw off the last vestigial prejudices against erasing. In *Beauvais Cathedral (East End II)* (1990) he not only adds layers of marks but also rubs at the charcoal until the ghosts of marks emerge as scratches in the paper and little more. In *Rouen Cathedral (West Front I)* (1990) a kneaded eraser swoops among the rough, rich stabs of charcoal, like a single high note, apart from the rest but changing it, interweaving it and activating the great shimmering verticals into a tangle of the mind struggling to take it all in. In *Bourges Cathedral (West Front)* (1990) chalk rolls over the image as if obscuring it under an opaque veil or thick mist. And in *Rouen Cathedral (West Font II)* (1990) raindrops join the marks, leaving almost ink-like stains. This is perhaps one of the most powerful passages in these pieces, for here we feel not only the grandeur and humility of the artist in conversation with ancient monumentality, but also the physical exposure to the wind and rain knitting them into one moment in time and place. This is an extension of Bomberg's method, but it is also an emphasis on the process of creation that responds to the growing fashion for process and conceptual art, beginning in the mid-1960s, which in their own ways emphasised thought processes and methods of production as the value of the work. The rubric of evaluation had changed between Bomberg's *St. Paul's* of 1944 and Creffield's *Rouen Cathedral* of 1990. The foregrounding of process in Creffield's work does not negate the aesthetic of this same work. There is an affinity here with Turner in affect and Ruskin in subject, which is not accidental. It was not enough for Creffield to emphasise topicality, he did so with a critical emphasis. Creffield is noted to have seen resonances between Ruskin and Bomberg.²² This is just considering the similarity between Bomberg's spirit in the mass and Ruskin's 'vital facts of form', which were essential details visible to the trained eye that demonstrated not only what a tree looks like but the forces acting upon and within it and thus to convey them not only captured the tree's appearance in space but also portrayed its duration in time. Creffield nods to this lineage in his foreword to the *English Cathedrals* exhibition catalogue (1987), claiming that Bomberg's method had fulfilled Ruskin's desire to capture the full gravitas of monumental architectural space, writing: 'Yes, Ruskin – it is possible. To look up

and to look down – and to unite these separate moments of time and physical movement.’²³ A different kind of drive emerges from the combination of emphasising both process and tradition. Modernism as truth to materials was waning and critics were fighting over where new fields for aesthetic exploration might lie.²⁴ From amidst this climate, Creffield argues in these pieces for his, Bomberg’s, and the Borough Group’s pride of place in an indigenous British tradition, which was not only relevant to an international avant-garde but also challenged the dominance of Paris and New York in narratives of post-war art.

Coda

In arguing for this national tradition, in a way, Creffield also argues for charcoal’s supremacy, supplanting the picturesque prerogatives of delicate and tactful watercolour with the brooding fragility of charcoal at its most monumental. Cathedral and charcoal emerge as complements: for both involve accumulation and duration.²⁵ The cathedral, with its waves of alteration, grows like charcoal is layered. What better subject for the humility involved in Bomberg’s ‘spirit in the mass’ – that intellectual innocence before the chaos of sensation – than the greatest symbol of unknowability portrayed in a medium rooted in a tradition of learning. The significance of these images is as layered and interwoven as its marks: on one level it is a dialogue between man and mortality, on another it is one between student and master, and on another altogether, it is a sensitive proposition for the wider recognition of the Bombergians as the heirs of an older tradition of travelling intellectuals, who used their art to comprehend the edge between mind and matter.

This paper by was commissioned as part of the public programme to accompany the exhibition, *The Elemental Force of Charcoal: Drawing at the Borough*, and was presented as a tour at Borough Road Gallery on Friday 29 January, 2016. Text © Kate Aspinall 2016.

¹ Roy Oxlade, a former student who compiled Bomberg’s papers as part of a doctoral thesis for the Royal College of Art (RCA) calls the ‘use of charcoal as the most direct extension onto paper of gestural involvement with the physical world’ an ‘idiomatic practice’, accepting semiotic connotations. Roy Oxlade, ‘Bomberg’s Papers: The Spirit in the Mass’ (PhD diss., Royal College of Art, 1980), xvi.

² A leading proponent, of which, is the artist and theorist Deanna Petherbridge who noted that the drawn aesthetic affinities of Romney in the 18th century and Matisse in the 19th and 20th centuries represents a transhistocial exchange. Deanna Petherbridge, *The Primacy of Drawing: An Artist’s View* (London: Southbank Centre, 1991), 17. A form of this ‘transnationalism’ is reiterated in *The Primacy of Drawing: Histories and Theories* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2010), 12-3.

³ This both defies and conforms to Thierry de Duve’s distinction between ‘métier’ and ‘medium’: ‘the former has a historical existence and the latter a transhistorical existence. The Academy classified the fine arts according to the *métier* and everything the notion entails: specialised skills, artisan habits, sleights of hand, rules of composition, canons of beauty, in short, a specific tradition. Modernism classifies the arts according to the medium and everything this notion entails: particular materials, supports, tools, gestures, technical procedures, and conventions of specificity. [...] The *métier* gets practiced, the medium gets questioned; the *métier* gets transmitted, the medium communicates or gets communicated; the *métier* gets learnt, the medium gets discovered; the *métier* is a tradition, the

medium is a language; the *métier* rests on experience, the medium relies on experimentation [...]'. Thierry de Duve, 'When Form Has Become Attitude – And Beyond' in *The Artist and the Academy: Issues in Fine Art Education and the Wider Cultural Context*, ed. Nicholas de Ville and Stephen Foster (Highfield: University of Southampton and John Hansard Gallery, 1994), [23-40], 27.

⁴ It is made from carefully charring and then slowly cooling the wood of vines or limber trees, such as willow. Other trees were myrtle, plum, linden or birch.

⁵ Callirhoe (also known as Kora), daughter of Dibutades (also known as Butades), a potter of Sikyon (c. 600BC). Also referenced is charcoal's use by Apelles (Greek, 400 BC) and by Gyges (Lydia, 650BC). Joseph Meder, *The Mastery of Drawing*, trans. Winslow Ames (New York, N.Y.: Abaris Books, c1978), 80 and 107 respectively.

⁶ John Ruskin, *Modern Painters IV* (London: Spottiswoode, 1856), 266 and quoted by Dennis Creffield in 'The Project' in *English Cathedrals*, exh. cat. (London: Southbank Centre, 1987), 7.

⁷ I take usage of the term, 'Bombergians' from Roy Oxlade, to indicate those who were inspired and developed upon Bomberg's mature approach to the creative process – this is not to imply homogeneity or a lack of personal interpretation for each former student nor does it reference those with aesthetic affinities, but no connection to Bomberg, which were all reasons Cliff Holden has criticized use of this term: 'Any black charcoal drawing or any turgid thick paint, no matter what the quality or kind of image, was termed Bombergian and the critics then began to talk about the 'Bomberg School,' which was an invention by the critics and only served to further obliterate any achievement of the original Borough Group, who had by now been completely forgotten.' Oxlade, 'Bomberg's Papers', xvi; and Cliff Holden, 'Work in Progress', manuscript (1999, accessed 10 January 2016) www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents_1999_10_02.shtml, page 25.

⁸ Members included: Cliff Holden, Edna Mann, Dorothy Mead, Gustav and Max Metzger, Dennis Creffield, Dorothy Missen, David Scott, Ian Gordon, Don Bradman, and Cecil Bailey. Richard Cork, *David Bomberg* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 261. According to Holden, Auerbach and Kossoff were never members, but were students of Bomberg and were influenced also by the Group as well as by their shared teacher. See: Cliff Holden, 'The History of the Borough Group' (2004, accessed 10 January 2016, http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents_2004_10.shtml)

⁹ Regarding 'messianic feeling' see: Holden as quoted in Oxlade, 'Bomberg Papers', 185. Regarding 'debased academicism' see: Creffield in conversation with Richard Cork (11 April 1985) quoted in Cork, *Bomberg*, 262. Oxlade called this conventional drawing 'Slade LTS', a concept taken from Jolly Koh: 'Koh says that academic drawing or Learning-to-See (LTS) method of drawing [...] the visual configuration of the LTS method, conforming as it does, to a narrowly defined notion of Western naturalism, is inadequate against a wider historical and cultural background. Very importantly, Koh points to the danger presented by the LTS method of drawing in that it appears to stand aloof from the formation of value criteria while enjoying the widespread belief that verisimilitude is axiomatic.' Jolly Koh 'The Drawing lesson', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 20:3 (Summer 1980); discussed in Oxlade, 'Bomberg Papers', 180-1.

¹⁰ David Bomberg unpublished writings, quoted in Cork, *Bomberg*, 263

¹¹ See: Susan Owens, *The Art of Drawing: British Masters and Methods since 1600* (London: V&A Publishing, 2013), 98.

¹² See: Nigel Llewellyn, ed., *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now* (London: Tate Publishing, 2015); Stuart Macdonald, *A Century of Art and Design Education: From Arts and Crafts to Conceptual Art* (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2005); Clive Ashwin, *Art Education: Documents and*

Policies 1768-1975 (London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1975); and Quentin Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963).

¹³ Among the papers found at Bomberg's death in 1957 was the lament: 'I am perhaps the most unpopular artist in England – and only because I am a draughtsman first and a painter second'; quoted in Margaret Garlake, *The Drawings of Peter Lanyon* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 1.

¹⁴ Dennis Creffield in conversation with Richard Cork (11 April 1985) quoted in Cork, *Bomberg*, 263.

¹⁵ (1) Oxlade wrote: 'Bomberg's "spirit in the mass" is close to Matisse's idea of the "arabesque". What both Matisse and Bomberg identified with, in cave drawing, is the tension between delineated volume and the space it occupies. There is, in authentic drawing, a quality of expansion, which overcomes the limitations of the actual physical surface. This should not be confused with largeness; the mere representation of bulk is irrelevant in this context. The quality for is an encompassing holistic definition, made possible only through a person summing up the elements introduced (Bomberg's "collisions"). I have described this as making a "throw" at totality, an attempt to find an "allness" which finalises the drawing.' Oxlade, 'Bomberg Papers', xix and 146-7. (2) Holden has proffered another: that the spirit in the mass is the melting of the artist into the creative act, where the sensation, which are all any of us are, are felt and thus existence and perception fuse and the artist becomes one with the spirit through participating with the mass Cliff Holden, 'Bomberg's Teachings – Some Misconceptions' (accessed 25 January 2016)

http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents_2004_30.shtml#spi

¹⁶ This is particularly evident in how 'spirit in the mass' relates to 'scale' and 'structure', see: David Bomberg, 'The Open Letter to the Universities' (1953); transcribed in Oxlade, 'Bomberg Papers', 229-230.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, xvi.

¹⁸ For more on the psychological experience of Second World War London, see: Lyndsey Stonebridge, *The Writing of Anxiety: Imagining Wartime in Mid-century British Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

¹⁹ Quoted in Cork, *Bomberg*, 254.

²⁰ Other artists such as Oskar Kokoschka and John Piper were also drawn to this symbolic deployment in wartime art.

²¹ See: Adrian Stokes, *Stones of Rimini* (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), 110, 119, 144.

²² Peter Fuller, *Rocks and Flesh: An Argument for British Drawing*, exh. cat (Norwich: Norwich School of Art. Gallery, 1985), 12.

²³ Creffield, *English Cathedrals*, 7.

²⁴ Creffield's English cathedrals were endorsed by R.B. Kitaj as he was generally championed by the critic Peter Fuller, both of whom sought a return to skilled figuration in their seminal, respective exhibitions: *Rocks and Flesh* of 1985 and *The Human Clay* of 1976.

²⁵²⁵ For more on the loaded history of the Gothic as a conduit to a constructed past, see: Michael Charlesworth, ed., *The Gothic Revival 1720-1870: Literary Sources and Documents, vol. I, Blood and Ghosts* (Mountfield: Helm Information, 2002), 5-51.

Bibliography

- Ashwin, Clive. *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768-1975*. London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1975.
- Bell, Quentin. *The Schools of Design*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.
- Charlesworth, Michael, ed. *The Gothic Revival 1720-1870: Literary Sources and Documents, vol. I, Blood and Ghosts*. Mountfield: Helm Information, 2002.
- Cork, Richard. *David Bomberg*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
- _____. 'Creffield's Cathedrals' in *French Cathedrals: Drawings by Dennis Creffield*, exh. cat. London: Albermale Gallery, 1991.
- _____. 'Introduction' in *David Bomberg: Spirit in the Mass*, exh. cat. Kendal: Abbot Hall Art Gallery, 2006.
- Creffield, Dennis. 'The Project' in *English Cathedrals*, exh. cat. London: Southbank Centre, 1987.
- _____, in conversation with Lynda Morris. *Dennis Creffield: a Retrospective*, exh. cat. London: Flowers Art Gallery, 2005.
- de Duve, Thierry. 'When Form Has Become Attitude – And Beyond' in *The Artist and the Academy: Issues in Fine Art Education and the Wider Cultural Context*, ed. Nicholas de Ville and Stephen Foster. Highfield: University of Southampton and John Hansard Gallery, 1994.
- Fuller, Peter. *Rocks and Flesh: An Argument for British Drawing*, exh. cat. Norwich: Norwich School of Art. Gallery, 1985.
- Garlake, Margaret. *The Drawings of Peter Lanyon*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Holden, Cliff. 'Work in Progress', manuscript. 1999. Accessed 10 January 2016: www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents_1999_10_02.shtml, page 25.
- Holden, Cliff. 'The History of the Borough Group'. 2004. Accessed 10 January 2016: http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents_2004_10.shtml
- Kitaj, R. B. *The Human Clay: An Exhibition*, exh. cat. London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1976.
- Koh, Jolly. 'The Drawing lesson', in *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 20:3. Summer 1980.
- Laughton, Bruce. *The Euston Road School: A Study in Objective Painting*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1986.
- _____. *William Coldstream*. London: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Llewellyn, Nigel, ed. *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now*. London: Tate Publishing, 2015.
- Macdonald, Stuart. *A Century of Art and Design Education: From Arts and Crafts to Conceptual Art*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2005.
- Meder, Joseph. *The Mastery of Drawing*, trans. Winslow Ames. New York, N.Y: Abaris Books, c1978.
- Morris, Lynda, ed. *Henry Tonks and the 'Art of Pure Drawing'*, exh. cat. Norwich: Norwich School of Art Gallery, c1985.
- Owens, Susan. *The Art of Drawing: British Masters and Methods since 1600*. London: V&A Publishing, 2013.
- Oxlade, Roy. 'Bomberg's Papers: The Spirit in the Mass'. PhD diss., Royal College of Art, 1980.

-
- Petherbridge, Deanna. 'Nailing the Liminal: The Difficulties of Defining Drawing' in *Writing on Drawing: Essays on Drawing Practice and Research*, ed. Steve Garner. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2008: 27-41.
 - _____. *The Primacy of Drawing: An Artist's View*, exh. cat. London: Southbank Centre, 1991.
 - _____. *The Primacy of Drawing: Histories and Theories*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2010.
 - Ruskin, John. *Modern Painters IV*. London: Spottiswoode, 1856.
 - Stokes, Adrian. *Stones of Rimini*. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
 - Stonebridge, Lyndsey. *The Writing of Anxiety: Imagining Wartime in Mid-century British Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
 - Trewhela, Paul. 'The Borough Group in its Time and Now' in *Borough: David Bomberg and his Students at Borough Polytechnic*, exh. cat. London: Waterhouse & Dodd, 2015.
 - Watrous, James. *The Craft of Old-Master Drawings*. Madison: Univeristy of Wisconsin Press, 1957.