The Artist Travels: Augustus Earle at Sea
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Augustus Earle is considered to be the first independent, professionally-trained artist to have travelled to all five continents. Between his first association with London’s Royal Academy in 1806 and his premature death in 1838, the British artist spent most of his life abroad (Hackforth-Jones 1980, 1–2). Yet unlike the generations of artists before him whose Grand Tour itineraries led them across the Continent, Earle spent most of his life sketching and painting in the ‘New World’—the Americas, Asia, Australasia and beyond. At a time when Britain was consolidating its global reach, and a rising leisured class was becoming increasingly curious about the world beyond Europe, Earle exemplified a new type of peripatetic artist whose role was to visualize peoples and places that were largely unfamiliar at home. Given the fact that Earle spent a great deal of time enduring the harsh conditions and tedium of shipboard life, it is perhaps not so surprising to find that this was a subject to which he returned in his watercolour sketches on a number of occasions. What is perhaps more curious is the fact that this highly unusual subject—at least for an oil painting of the period—was the one he chose to work up into a pair of highly detailed canvases for exhibition at the Royal Academy in the year before he died.

Earle’s two shipboard paintings, Life in the Ocean Representing the Usual Occupations of the Young Officers in the Steerage of a British Frigate at Sea (Plate 4), and Divine Service as it is Usually Performed on Board a British Frigate at Sea (Figure 4.1) (both c.1820–1837), are among the first British oils to represent life below deck, and they do so with an attention to everyday detail that is unparalleled. I shall argue here that they are as resolutely modern as they are unheroic, a far cry from both the exuberant history paintings and the Dutch-inspired genre scenes which continued to dominate British art into the 1830s. I show that Earle’s subjects were not designed to be recognizable as individuals despite the artist’s close attention to character, but rather, as the paintings’ titles emphasize, exemplars of type. My argument draws on Geoff Quilley’s...
assertion that the social structure on board ship, so painstakingly rendered by Earle, was conventionally understood to echo that of the nation:

[T]he ship of war is also the ship of state in microcosm. For a nation as self-consciously reliant on naval power as Britain, particularly at this time [during the Napoleonic Wars], the analogy assumed a peculiarly powerful significance, integrating the practical military, economic and political needs of the state with the cultural construction of national identity (Quilley 2011, 168).

Set in the closely inhabited spaces of a war ship, one that in the wake of the French Wars was now firmly engaged in building Britain’s mighty empire, Earle’s painterly vision of an orderly and industrious society might be understood as a profoundly nationalistic one.

The Art of Travel

Painters had travelled on seafaring voyages of exploration and scientific enquiry since the sixteenth century, yet with Cook’s South Pacific expeditions of the 1760s and 1770s the art of travel had acquired unprecedented
prominence. The substantial body of imagery associated with these voyages—watercolours, sketches, and subsequent prints and oil paintings—achieved rapid popularity, and widespread praise from both artistic and scientific quarters. The artists on Cook’s voyages (including Sydney Parkinson, William Hodges and John Webber) and those who followed in their wake (Ferdinand Bauer, William Westall and Conrad Martens among them) were of a high calibre; the visual record had become a powerful empirical tool of imperialism.

Unlike the proliferation of European artists whose images of disparate locations were derived from second-hand sources, travelling artists (and their publishers and audiences) believed strongly in the evidential value of their images. Victoria Dickenson has examined the long history of natural history illustration, noting that such imagery was drawn primarily for the purpose of communicating information, and that its key role in the shaping of knowledge has long been ignored by historians (Dickenson 1998, 5). She notes the particular significance of direct observation to natural history artists of the eighteenth century, and cites Linnaeus’s assertion that “in natural science the principles of truth ought to be confirmed by observation” (Dickenson 1998, 180). The art of travel had long been considered a form of knowledge gathering—since the sixteenth century most artists who chose to travel had been employed on scientific voyages of discovery, and their sketches (primarily pencil and watercolour) and subsequent engravings in atlases and other descriptive travel books (both official and unofficial) thus tended to follow the conventions of natural history illustration. Even those artists whose ultimate aspirations were directed more towards the world of art rather than science would conform for the most part to such empirical practices.

Yet by the early decades of the nineteenth-century, itinerant artists were often governed less by the dictates of science; they tended to look over and through groups of people and/or landscapes, rather than focusing on individual “specimens.” While scientific illustration continued to have an impact on their work, most independent artists aimed both to make good pictures according to a variety of European aesthetic conventions, and to document in good faith the peoples and places they visited. This new generation of travellers was aware that a more obviously pictorial interest in their subjects could undermine their claims to authenticity, and, therefore, maintained traditional strategies—representing themselves painting the work, inscribing it as being done “on the spot”—to bolster the perception of their work’s unmediated access to Truth. Such strategies were employed in an effort to manage the inherent paradox between art and artifice.

Earle was a key exemplar of this new type of peripatetic artist. His subjects ranged from imperial kings, governors and administrators to the marginalized members of colonial societies, including Afro-Brazilian slaves, the Aborigines of New South Wales, and New Zealand’s Maori. The
versatile painter had a keen interest in representing individuals, a sharp wit, and an empathy with the downtrodden, and his paintings provide great insights into the extraordinary diversity of cultures and the rapid impact of colonization. Yet his fascination with the colonized world was matched by an enduring concern to assert the testimonial authority of his images—their reliability as Truth. This “reality effect,” to borrow a phrase from Roland Barthes, was achieved in large part by painting himself, literally, into the picture in an effort to consolidate his status as an eyewitness (Barthes 2006, 235–241). Thus we find him, variously, admiring the view of Rio de Janeiro’s splendid Guanabara Bay, shielding his eyes from the horrors of a slave being whipped in a Cariocan prison, gazing wistfully at the horizon after being stranded with his dog on the remote Atlantic island of Tristan da Cunha, being guided by Maori locals towards the Bay of Islands in New Zealand, and painting an Aboriginal model before a spectacular vista in the Blue Mountains of New South Wales. In such images the artist serves as our de facto travel guide, leading us on a journey through time and space; “I was here,” they proclaim, “this is true.”

For an artist, there were equivalent yet culturally specific means of scoring his or her text with what Michel de Certeau has called “utterance markings”—“I saw,” “I heard,” “I was there.” First was the convention, increasingly deployed in printmaking and sketching by the late eighteenth century, of inscribing phrases such as “drawn on the spot.” Such inscriptions served ultimately as declarations of empirical reliability, apparent proof that the artist had travelled and witnessed the scene with his own eyes. In printed books an artist’s eyewitness credentials were often confirmed in writing, frequently on the title page or expanded upon in the preface. For example, the Reverend Cooper Willyams wrote in his illustrated book, A Voyage Up the Mediterranean in His Majesty’s Ship the Swiftsure … (1802):

[the author’s] destiny has afforded him an opportunity of recording as an eyewitness … . Too many books of travels and voyages are ornamented by fictitious views, as well as embellished relations. The reader may be assured that the drawings from which the plates of this volume were copied are genuine, and that they were taken on the spot by the same hand, and at the same time, which wrote the journal. This agreement of time and place will, he trusts, ensure the accuracy and peculiarity of his work (Willyams 1802, 3, 5).

Even in the rarefied world of Fine Art, in which the imagination was so often heralded above what was considered the slavish imitation of Nature, we find cases of artists attempting to verify the empirical authority of their paintings. In 1824, for example, when Earle submitted to the Royal Academy a dramatic oil of an open-air Brazilian slave market in which slaves are being violently mistreated, he recorded in the accompanying catalogue the key words, “Painted in Brazil.”
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A second key means for a travelling artist to affirm his authority as an eyewitness beyond his “I was there” inscription, was to represent himself as a subject within the scene. Drawing the act of drawing had been a concern of artists since at least the seventeenth century, and in the art of travel the self-portrait is a particularly common trope. As we have seen, Earle was prone to inserting his own image into his colonial views, but he was also keen to represent the very means of his global mobility. In the watercolour *Scudding Before a Heavy Westerly Gale off the Cape, Lat. 44 deg. (1824)* (Plate 5) for example, the figure in the left foreground reading a book is most likely the artist himself, a deduction made largely on the basis of the dog lying in front of him, which we recognize from other acknowledged self portraits to be Earle’s faithful companion, Jemmy.8

This is artistic license at its most playful, and it encapsulates one of the greatest paradoxes in the art of travel: that the artist could establish his credentials as a reliable eyewitness by inserting himself into his scenes. In other words, that he could appear to be both subject and object simultaneously, and in so doing assert his epistemological authority. Such modes of emphasizing the subjectivity of the itinerant eyewitness—the visual equivalent of a first-person narrative—seem on one level to contradict the coexistent desire to present an objective representation of observed facts, a device which, as Nigel Leask has described, “anxiously sought ‘to obscure the production of those representations’” (Leask 2002, 7).9 Nonetheless, both approaches were ultimately means of privileging visual testimony and, despite their apparent incompatibilities, were by the early nineteenth-century increasingly deployed in tandem.

Earle’s efforts to record (largely in watercolour) his individual experiences of specific places, peoples and situations, as well as his penchant for representing his life at sea, may even anticipate some of the maritime paintings of J.M.W. Turner. As Michael Rosenthal has noted:

> Turner understood that painting had to stem from direct experience and evidently had no truck with the attitude that held topography in contempt. His elevation of an art form that was previously exclusive to work on paper to the superior medium of oil paint confirms this. Instead, he was prepared to validate the fundamental truth of his inventions by deploying one of its conventions, representing the vessel on which the artist had been when observing what he then depicted for the spectator, thus authenticating something that the spectator was never likely to witness themselves … (Rosenthal 2013, 60–69).

**Piety and Discipline: Earle’s Shipboard Canvases**

Earle’s lively and engaging oil painting, *Life in the Ocean Representing the Usual Occupations of the Young Officers in the Steerage of a British Frigate at Sea*,...
portrays a busy profusion of midshipmen and others occupying themselves on the lower deck of a ship of war. In its visual complexity, it might easily be overlooked that at its very centre sits an artist painting portraits. Virtually the only figure with his back to us, he leans over in an effort to capture a good likeness of the sailor to his left. The man standing opposite gesticulates in response to his own portrait, which is being held up for consideration. In an open folio on the ground we see an array of small tropical landscape sketches (which must surely allude to Earle’s own extensive travels in the tropics). In this vignette, Earle appears to comment on the capacity of art to imitate nature, as well as its power to affect viewers. If we are to accept Quilley’s analogy of the ship of war with the ship of state, it also follows that in placing the artist at the centre of life on board the lower deck, the painter is casting a powerful role for himself and his profession. Typically, Earle challenges us to view the figure as a self portrait, for to do so demands that we suspend our belief, once again, in the image’s verisimilitude; for how can the artist be both inside and outside his picture? Earle’s lively mind clearly delighted in playing such games, and in the end, his challenges can be met with no definitive answer.

Yet Earle’s playful probing of the fine line between object and subject, art and life, is complicated even further when one realizes that this oil, and its pendant *Divine Service as it is Usually Performed on Board a British Frigate at Sea*, which were not submitted to the Royal Academy until 1837, were both based closely on watercolours probably painted on board HMS *Hyperion* in 1820 as it was travelling between Lima and Rio de Janeiro. It is widely believed that Earle had intended that these pictures would eventually be published as part of an illustrated travel narrative (Hackforth-Jones 1980, 45). As we have seen, it was considered vital that such imagery held epistemological authority. However, in the more elevated world of ‘high’ art, no such requirement existed. Indeed, as far as the influential President of the Royal Academy, Sir Joshua Reynolds, was concerned, the best art was, of necessity, dependent upon the unlimited power of the imagination rather than the world of sensory experience.10 We shall see shortly that in transforming his detailed observational—and thus highly specific—watercolours, into oils suitable for display at the Royal Academy, Earle made a sequence of vital adjustments and additions. In short, he transformed scenes which were temporally and spatially contingent into canvases which could be appreciated for their moral and symbolic significance.

Earle had made other watercolours which would arguably have provided more obvious candidates to work up into finished oils. *Scudding* is one example, with its propensity for symbolism and elevated themes, and its obvious associations with the multitude of squall and shipwreck subjects being widely exhibited by Turner and others at the time; it would not have looked particularly out of place at the Royal Academy in 1837. Its passengers

---
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inhabit a narrow and uncomfortable liminal space that for metropolitan viewers at least separated a known world—Britain—from the myriad of perceived dangers and challenges presented by its colonial ‘other.’ As the majestic vessel surges towards a fractured horizon line, its passengers gaze anxiously out to sea, or in the case of the self-portrait figure, make clumsy attempts to read as the ship lurches on the swell. Had this observational watercolour been transformed into an oil painting, the figures’ role would have been simply reduced to one of staffage, providing human interest and scale to a larger narrative of humanity’s conquest of the ocean at a time when Britain’s maritime power was rising to its peak.

For his two oil paintings however, Earle shifted his sights below deck, settling on his sketches of a largely (although not solely) male community, a highly stratified floating microcosm which had been virtually ignored as a serious subject for oil painting. The two watercolours, *Divine Service on Board a British Frigate, H.M.S. Hyperion, 1820* and *View of the Midshipmen’s Quarters on Board a Ship of War*, reveal a remarkable level of detail considering their modest size, portraying naval officers, marines and others going about their daily business in cramped quarters below deck. Engaged in pious (*Divine Service*) and genial (*Midshipmen’s Quarters*) pursuits to occupy the long and often tedious hours at sea, the paintings (in both media) appear to provide a close and detailed picture of life as it was lived on a British frigate in the post-war period following the Battle of Waterloo.

Let me examine each oil in greater detail. *Divine Service as it is Usually Performed on Board a British Frigate at Sea* shows a gathering of some fifty men (naval officers to the left, marines to the right) and a single woman (seated with the marines, arms folded) attending a Christian service on the gun deck of the frigate. The admiral reads from what is presumably a Bible, and seated behind him are several naval officers, including one who appears to have fallen asleep (to the right), and another two (foreground left) deeply absorbed in their own books. The centrally-placed admiral visually divides the two attentive groups which occupy the background, while just above him daylight from a hatch illuminates an otherwise gloomy interior. Several key details were altered or added in the vital transformation from watercolour to oil. The subtle change of title removes the specificity of the watercolour, transforming reference to a particular time and place (1820, HMS *Hyperion*) into a generality. Significantly, the union flag has been draped over the admiral’s chair, and the general sense of claustrophobia (although somewhat diminished in comparison to the watercolour), has been enhanced by the addition of figures, particularly a young boy seated in the foreground, and a sick man lying in a cradle (upper right). The low beams and bulkheads are now hung with a range of utilitarian objects: baskets of cannonballs and a military drum, a tropical bird in a cage, axes, a slate, hourglass, key and lantern. While these were not observed in the watercolour, Earle has added
them to the oil for their power as symbols: of war; shipboard life as a form of captivity; and, in particular, individual and collective enlightenment through learning and spiritual devotion.

As the descriptive title of Earle’s watercolour makes clear, HMS Hyperion was a war ship; it had seen active service in the recent French Wars. Divine Service does not bury the memory of war: it is, after all, set on the frigate’s gun deck, and contains a large cannon in the left foreground (as well as the military drum and cannon balls). Yet Earle’s placid scene of communal devotion is a world away from the heroic maritime battles which adorned so many British canvases during and immediately following the Revolutionary Wars. Rather, in his portrayal of devout naval officers and marines at sea during peacetime he created a metaphor for an industrious and harmonious British society which was well equipped to build and administer a global empire. In draping the admiral’s chair with the union flag, Earle was confirming that it was not only God that was inspiring such devotion, but Britain itself.

In the early years of the nineteenth century there was an unprecedented rise in the status of religion in the navy, in part a response to Nelson’s overt piety, but also as a result of the rise of evangelical admirals. Known as the “Blue Lights,” these men were devoted to the spreading of Scripture, and in particular the reinvigoration of collective worship at sea. Recently, Richard Blake has demonstrated that ship-board services were rare in the 1780s, but were far more common by the time Earle was travelling on Hyperion in 1820 (Blake 2008, 69–74). He argues that it was these men who were able to support the growing reforms in discipline, working conditions, manning and education that allowed the Royal Navy to thrive during the Napoleonic Wars. In addition to such institutional reforms, the moral authority of the navy was impressing itself upon the British public in other ways. In 1819 it had established the West Coast of Africa Squadron, and treaties were made with African and European leaders giving the squadron the power to blockade slave depots and arrest suspected slavers of various nationalities (Morgan 2007, 202). Thus taking an active role in enforcing the international abolition of the slave trade, the navy was seen by many to be leading the moral charge.

The subject of divine service at sea also made its way into popular literature of the period, as in the ‘novels’ of the naval officer, Frederick Chamier (1796–1870). In The Life of a Sailor (1832) he wrote:

The captain read the regular church service in a proper religious manner; and it was a sight which came home to the feelings and devotion of every man, to see the seamen returning thanks to God for all his protection and fatherly care. … Few people who have not witnessed a church service on board a ship, would believe how properly and orderly seamen behave. They are particularly attentive to the service; and however rough and uncouth may be their outward appearance, they have very feeling hearts, upon which religion operates very strongly. Very many retire after service and read their Bibles, and profit by the instruction (Chamier 1850, vol. 2, 73–74).
While evangelicalism among the higher naval ranks can be clearly witnessed in *Divine Service*, its broader effects on the morals and discipline of a ship’s lower ranks are evidenced in its pendant, *Life in the Ocean Representing the Usual Occupation of the Young Officers in the Steerage of a British Frigate at Sea*. Here the setting is an equally cavernous space, the lower deck, which is filled with an array of midshipmen and others most of whom are diligently occupied—a young man lying on deck in the foreground pores over calculations using a slate and rule, behind him the aforementioned artist paints watercolour portraits, a sailor to the right takes a break from playing his fiddle, a black boy to the right of the vertical anchor chain grinds coffee (a clear reference to plantation slavery), while others in the background work on calculations or sketch. As he had in *Divine Service*, Earle retained most of his composition and individual subjects from his initial watercolour, although again he made minor adjustments and added key symbolic details which helped to transform an informational sketch into social commentary with the kind of lofty aims that would satisfy the demands of the Royal Academy. Such additions include a writing slope resting on the deck, sextants and a telescope, the folio of landscape watercolours, and a South American monkey and parrot on a perch.

While the animals lend the scene a sense of geographical specificity, they also allude to the important scientific work that had traditionally been undertaken on such voyages. The Linnaean taxonomic project had, since the mid-eighteenth century, led armies of “scientific gentlemen” to explore the “New World.” While the imperative of global taxonomy was arguably less urgent than it had once been, the impact of the great naturalist Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859) continued to inspire learned Europeans to travel widely into the middle of the nineteenth century (including Charles Darwin, with whom Earle later travelled on the famous voyage of the *Beagle*). Earle’s added objects also draw attention to other scientific matters, particularly navigation, a branch of knowledge which relied considerably on the seaman. An earlier captain of *Hyperion*, William Pryce Cumby (1777–1837), described how important such knowledge was to all members of the navy, urging his midshipmen to:

> send in to the Captain each day, at sea, as soon as may be after noon, their own account, of the ship’s way and position as ascertained by log, chronometer and lunar observation. The latter methods of measuring longitude are most earnestly recommended to the constant practice and attention of all the Mates and Midshipmen, as a branch of professional knowledge not only highly creditable, but absolutely and indispensably necessary to the character of a British Naval Officer (Cumby 1811, 342).11

Yet while scientific knowledge is a strong sub-text of *Life in the Ocean*, the painting also emphasizes other diversionary and improving past-times,
particularly sketching and playing music, and the general effect is one of amiable self-discipline. There is a minor exception to this: a single marine in the upper right corner, barely perceptible, swills liquor. Yet almost as a corrective Earle adds immediately below him another figure clearly suffering the effects of over-consumption, as he holds his throbbing head over a bucket. Perhaps this is Earle’s little joke at the marines’ expense, but however one reads this minor plot-line, it does not detract from the sense of orderliness and good humour which pervades the scene.

These men are clearly not the Jack Tar of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century stereotype. Quilley has shown that by the late eighteenth century, the figure of the sailor—not only in visual art but in literature too—was highly problematic. He writes that it comprised a range of contradictory personal traits:

[The sailor] is variously the untameable brute, to be beaten into submission; the rough diamond, gross but quick-witted and true; the dull but loyal servant of the crown, laying down his life for the nation; the sensualist, boozing and whoring his way to his next passage, living for the moment; or the faithful Jack seeking wealth to claim his true love back home (Quilley 2011, 171).

Earle’s sailors, on the contrary, fit none of these stereotypes. Rather, they are at once sober and lively, industrious in their leisure time, model British citizens well equipped to represent their nation on the global stage. Earle’s was not an art of stereotype. In fact, in aspiring to the kind of verisimilitude demanded of the travelling artist, his paintings provide a sharp contrast to the kind of stereotypical tars which the satirists—George and Isaac Cruikshank, James Gillray and Richard Newton among them—had so often portrayed.

Significantly, Earle’s inhabitants of the lower deck are not engaged in physical work—the labouring sailor is virtually absent from the visual archive (Quilley 2011, 169–170). These are men whose identities are expressed not through their corporeality, but rather through the strength of their minds—whether solving mathematical problems, playing a musical instrument, or painting a companion’s portrait, such activities required not only the benefits of leisure time (usually well beyond the preserve of the poor), but the kind of mental discipline that was required of a loyal British citizen. Loyalty and discipline had long been troublesome issues for the British Navy, particularly since 1797 when, in the midst of the Revolutionary Wars, its officers had mutinied. Yet we saw earlier how, as Christian piety took a greater hold of the navy, and as reforms continued to improve conditions for many in the lower ranks, the navy’s reputation was rising in the eyes of many. Naval officer Frederick Chamier for example, wrote:

I saw with my own eyes that after having so long left a midshipman’s birth, that that which all officers of rank in the navy had formerly wished, had come
to pass—that the grade of midshipman had become synonymous with that of gentleman. No man can now consider his son degraded by going into the navy, or associating with the inhabitants of the cockpit (Chamier 1850, 68).¹³

Earle’s paintings clearly support this loyalist view, although the subject continued to be hotly debated throughout the early decades of the century.¹⁴ One thing is clear however: that much still rested on the perceived loyalty and patriotism of the British sailor, and it is in this light that we might come to understand the artist’s decision to take this highly unusual subject for a pair of oils.

Finally, it seems important also to acknowledge that Earle’s decision surely had a personal significance. For this peripatetic artist, life at sea was a subject he knew much about, and about which he surely felt strongly. Only a few years before these paintings were displayed, he had been forced to withdraw from the voyage of the Beagle due to ill health, and in December 1838 it is recorded that he died of “asthma and debility” (Hackforth-Jones 1980, 149–150). In this context then it would seem reasonable to speculate that in selecting these two oils to work up from his extensive portfolio of watercolours, and in submitting them for public display in 1837, the ailing Earle may well have been distilling his own experiences as a travelling artist, reminiscing about the submarine world which was, at least visually, largely hidden from public view.¹⁵ That he installed his own image into the very centre of Life in the Ocean would seem to support this view.

Conclusion

Exhibited in the year of Queen Victoria’s ascension to the throne, Earle’s paintings seem to presage the Victorians’ obsession with the stratifications of British society. It would be another twenty years before William Frith would exhibit his great panorama of modern Victorian life, The Derby Day (1856–1858), but Earle’s glimpse into a highly ordered and hierarchical society on board a ship of war is in some ways a harbinger of things to come. 1837 was also the year that the Royal Academy relocated from its Somerset House premises to a temporary residence in the National Gallery at Trafalgar Square, where only a few years later the great monument to Nelson would be erected. This was a period in which the French Wars—and indeed maritime subjects more generally—continued to inspire enormous national pride. Here, then, were Her Majesty’s sailors traversing the globe, fit for purpose, pious, highly disciplined, and above all else, loyal to their nation. However antithetical they are to the proliferation of heroic battle scenes and tableaux of imperial diplomacy which characterized the era, these two modest paintings cut straight to the heart of empire.
Notes

1. Earle exhibited a precocious talent for painting from an early age. He was only 13 when his painting, *Judgement of Midas*, was exhibited at the Royal Academy, and between 1806 and 1815 he exhibited there regularly. While not formally enrolled at the Academy, it is believed he probably took lessons there.

2. There are precedents, including William Hogarth’s *Captain Lord George Graham, 1715–47, in his Cabin* (1742–1744), also in the collection of the National Maritime Museum, but these are rare, and do not show the wide range of social strata that preoccupy Earle’s paintings.


5. One of Earle’s best-known works, and perhaps his most complex subject, is the remarkable oil (and subsequent prints), *Portrait of Bungaree* (c.1826). Bungaree was a widely known Aboriginal Australian identity who had, by the late 1790s, settled in Sydney with the remnants of his Broken Bay–West Head clan.

6. For further discussion of the significance of “on the spot” witnesses, see Quilley 2011, chap. 1; and the work of John E. Crowley, such as Crowley 2005, 1–28. See also Thomas 2012, ch. 2.

7. For more on this painting, see Thomas 2012, ch. 6.

8. *Solitude, watching the horizon at sun set, in the hopes of seeing a vessel, Tristan de Acunha [i.e. da Cunha] in the South Atlantic*, National Library of Australia (nla.pic-an2818137).


10. For example in his Second Discourse Reynolds declared: “How incapable those … who have spent much of their time in making finished copies,” in Reynolds 1798, 32.

11. Cumby was Captain of *Hyperion* between 1811 and 1815. See also PRO ADM37/4313.

12. It should be noted that both draughtsmanship and mathematical ability were vital tools of trade on board a ship, despite the fact that Earle shows them here being deployed during a period of leisure.

13. The cockpit was the area of the ship in which the midshipmen and master’s mates were berthed.

14. For further discussion of the range of popular views (including those of sailors themselves) see Land 2009, esp. ch. 5.

15. It seems unlikely that Earle’s purpose was to promote the kind of evangelism that he portrays in *Divine Service*. While of Christian faith, he was not a deeply religious man, and in fact was highly critical of the Church Missionary Society’s activities in New Zealand. For more on this, and Earle’s connections with Charles Darwin on board H.M.S. *Beagle*, see Thomas 2009, 26–37.
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