

The Essential Outline: John Flaxman and Neoplatonism in early nineteenth-century manufactures.

Introduction

This essay explores the work of John Flaxman, a British sculptor of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-centuries, whose work ranged from that of a fine artist to a designer for manufactures. Flaxman was most famous as a sculptor and modeller at the end of his life, but he also worked in two-dimensions, indeed the international recognition he received early on in his career was established by the publication of several editions of illustrations.¹ These folios were drawings derived from Classical works, as well as the writings of Dante, and it is his graphic translation of the Homeric poems of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* (1793), that I shall be focussing on here. However, rather than separating Flaxman's graphic design from both his fine art and industrial sculpture, this essay will explore the relationship between his activities in two- and three-dimensions, and consider how Flaxman's understanding of both fine art sculpture and modelling within an industrial context, may have been instrumental in the construction, and an audience's subsequent 'reading', of his graphic works.

The relationship between sculpture (both fine art and industrial) and graphic line was clearly established in the period within which Flaxman worked. A contemporary text, written by the water colourist and critic George Cumberland in 1796, claimed that for the sculptor the importance of outline could not be overemphasised as "...a statue is *all* Outline".² Cumberland's *Thoughts on Outline, Sculpture and the System that Guided the Ancient Artists in Composing their Figures and Groups...* will therefore be a useful text by which to indicate some of the aspects of Flaxman's practice that reveal a deeper engagement with the paper surface, than that which might traditionally be understood as the work of graphic art. The following examination of the artist's illustrative works will take into account not only what Flaxman represented through his use of line, but also what he did not, that is, the meaning of the 'negative' ground visible in the artist's illustrations. This paper will ultimately propose that Flaxman combined the visual language of manufacturing practice with the philosophical methodology of Neoplatonism³ more usually associated with fine art, and that this was understood by an audience of artisans in particular, who saw his

work as a superior example of instructional literature for the budding designer in industry.

Context

In order to put this discussion into context, it is necessary to explore the position of industrial design in Britain in the late eighteenth-century. At this point, the disciplines broadly understood as the visual arts such as graphic design, fine art or industrial design, that we are familiar with today, did not consistently exist. I use the term ‘consistently’ because from this period, the classification and specialisms, that are part of our present day education system in particular, were beginning to develop.⁴ For instance, though the role of the designer for manufacture was starting to emerge, industrial designers were rarely trained in the eighteenth-century, but often came to the profession through economic circumstances or family connections. Flaxman is a case in point. His father ran a plaster workshop that was associated with both manufacturing companies and well-known artists, and it was from this that Flaxman was informally trained in the processes of industrial design as well as fine art.⁵ To understand both fine art and manufacturing processes, as Flaxman did, was fairly common in the eighteenth-century, yet *at the same time*, the relationship between the two disciplines was beginning to be thought of as decidedly incompatible by some. Indeed it is within the complexity of this period, that the characteristics of an industrial designer begin to be shaped, less by deliberate consensus and more through debate and disagreement brought about by necessity and demand for economically driven social improvement.

In the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-centuries, there was a general belief that Britain had lost its reputation as a creator of high quality, industrially produced goods.⁶ This was supposed by those who were involved in manufacture to be the result of a lack of quality - not in materials but of design. The answer seemed to lie with fine art, yet traditionally art had been understood as having nothing to do with manufacture.⁷ Industrialists therefore proposed a new role, that of a ‘designer’, one who represented a unification of fine art and industrial knowledge, whilst remaining outside the echelons of the fine art establishment.⁸ But this ideal was certainly not a reality and there were several major difficulties in establishing design within industry. Firstly, the early industrial designers of which John Flaxman can be counted, were

either not education at all, or like our example, were highly educated and were often well-respected fine artists. Secondly, the actual role of a designer for industry, did not sit easily with factory life. Mechanised industry seemed to have little space for a human designer whose creativity could not be strictly regulated or broken down into its component parts.⁹ Thirdly, had all these factors been resolved, there remained one overarching problem preventing the designer from taking his or her rightful place in industry. That was the fundamental question of what a designer actually did. In other words, which elements of fine art and manufacture were to be combined to create an industrial design practice?

There had been a long-established idea that drawing was certainly crucial to, if not synonymous with, designing. This belief was based on the concept that the activity was essential for communication and was a principle embraced in the eighteenth-century by makers such as Thomas Chippendale (the furniture designer), who encouraged the use of drawing as an essential tool for communicating with both fellow workers and clients.¹⁰ The art teacher Henry Sass put forward a similar model of design to the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures in 1835-6, explaining to that inquiry how he himself had seen the ability of artisans to ‘read’ drawing, circumventing the need for less effective verbal explanations.¹¹ As Anne Puetz (1999) notes, this was the idea of drawing as “...a kind of universal *lingua franca* which transcended language as a means of communication of ideas and was uniquely able to bridge gaps in understanding, education and experience”.¹²

The idea that a graphic language could transcend literary or verbal communication is an extremely important one to this essay, as it is the unspoken meanings shared between groups of artisans and manufacturers that are being sought. Yet Sass’ ideas only refer generally to the language of drawing, in the same way the author John Gould (1834) suggested that “[t]he pencil may be said to write a universal language”.¹³ For many theorists, and particularly educators like Sass, drawing was seen as simply another basic skill to acquire, one that should be “...learned by every person as answering the same purposes with writing”.¹⁴ Yet some manufacturers conceived of the activity as more intimately connected to the practice in hand, rather than as a universal form of language. For example, the silk manufacturer Robert Harrison,¹⁵ who presented his thoughts on the subject to the same Select Committee

on Arts and Manufactures, believed that a certain type of ‘informed’ drawing was the cornerstone of good design practice.¹⁶ His example was that, for weaving, it was essential for a designer to draw on gridded paper in order that the proposed pattern should, from its inception, be guided by the necessary restrictions of warp and weft.¹⁷ Although one could consider this to be communicative drawing to a certain extent, in that it allowed the worker who was setting up the loom to do his or her job correctly, this was fundamentally the idea of a graphic practice informed by the technical requirements of manufacture. This combination of drawing skills and practical knowledge emerged from some quarters, as a model for industrial design practice.¹⁸

Taking the principal that design in its graphic form could be shaped by a relationship to other industries, it is my intention to demonstrate that there existed in Britain an understanding of John Flaxman’s Homeric folios as ‘informed’ drawing, a perception that resonated with artisans and manufacturers in trades. Yet these illustrations did not have only one appreciative audience, and the fact that, as we shall see, a cultured European audience also embraced his drawings makes them of greater significance. This is because the ability of these graphic works to speak to a diverse audience provides us with an example of not only the early period of industrial design practice, in which one person could be both a fine artist and an industrial designer, but also of the emerging debate about what did and did not constitute design for industry.

John Flaxman’s ‘informed’ drawing

John Flaxman designed objects for ceramics and metal ware, working with a number of manufacturers, including the industrialist Josiah Wedgwood. His upbringing had made him aware of the many technical requirements of the trades,¹⁹ and this is clear as, rather than submitting drawings to his employers, Flaxman produced moulds ready for casting, and took into account practical considerations such as the possible shrinkage of certain clays during firing.²⁰ Flaxman began working for manufacturers during the 1770s and throughout this period he laid the foundations for his continuing practice, which was to be dominated by sculptural work (both fine art and manufacture), often in the form of shallow relief. The major exceptions to this were produced from 1792, and were Flaxman’s graphic illustrations of scenes from Homer’s *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, published in 1793 in two volumes whilst he was in Italy.²¹ It is significant that these illustrations emerged at a relatively early period in

Flaxman's career, because this associates them with a time of more intensive industrial design practice for the artist, in which mould-making played an important role, and perhaps informed his drawing.

When considering Flaxman's Homeric illustrations themselves what is immediately apparent is that they did not copy any particular fine art model, but created a new aesthetic that was understood broadly as 'Classical' at the time of publication. This loose labelling was not because of the subject of the works, which was traditionally Classical, but because Homer's words had been translated into the visual by Flaxman, resulting in a series of new and original graphic compositions. As such these works caused much debate on many levels, but what we shall be concentrating on here, are the comments that hint at Flaxman's Classicism being not simply the product of his study of Greek art, but also as a result of his understanding of sculptural and perhaps even industrial modelling processes. If evidence can be found, this would certainly be a radical connection as, during the eighteenth-century in Britain, the Classical style more usually signified only the highest forms of artistic endeavour. These were thought to be such lofty peaks that manufacturers could only hope to imitate them.

Figure 1 shows an example of Flaxman's new style and is a scene from the *Iliad* in which Thetis is bringing armour to Achilles, who is draped in mourning over his dead friend Proclus. What is immediately apparent from this image is that Flaxman's graphic work was completely reliant on the accuracy of a very simple outline by which to portray all the necessary details of the narrative. Visually the illustrations are almost brutally simple and deny the viewer any of the traditional conventions of shading, colour and perspectival structure. Contemporary opinions on the work such as that of the artist George Romney, read this denial of graphic conventions as refreshingly primitive, claiming that the engravings were "...outlines without shadow, but in the style of antient [sic.] art...[t]hey look as if they had been made in the age, when Homer wrote".²² Other commentators believed that Flaxman had drawn from many sources for his work, and as such, the severe simplicity of the illustrations, though seemingly Classically authentic, were deemed to transcend the classification of documented stylistic periods. Indeed to some, they suggested the existence of "...a realm before history even begins"²³ - a comment that has great significance.

These responses to Flaxman's work came generally from a cultured audience of critics, writers and artists, but not all commentators were in agreement about the quality of Flaxman's work. George Cumberland criticised the Homeric illustrations for their Classical pretensions and his comments indicate that he saw the artist's work as being aimed at a completely different audience.²⁴ By considering Cumberland's comments on the artist's use of outline, it is possible to support the hypothesis that Flaxman's work was not only of interest to a fine art audience, but was also relevant to manufacturers and artisans because it was informed by his sculptural practice, and in particular by mould-making for casting. Furthermore, by exploring Cumberland's other ideas as well as the notion that Flaxman's work visualised 'a realm before history even begins', it is also possible to suggest that this informed graphic practice had another dimension in Flaxman's philosophical approach to drawing – this was the Neoplatonic.

The Classical style had long become the aesthetic synonymous with Platonic ideal form. Artists and academics had identified a pantheon of famous Greek sculptures and other collections of Classical objects, which seemed to offer the secrets to unlocking the mystery of artistic perfection.²⁵ As such the Platonic was consistently used to classify one of the most fundamental ambitions of fine art, simultaneously making the search for the ideal a way of distinguishing art from other activities, including manufacture. Yet because of the complexity of disciplinary classification in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries, it was still possible that *any* study and evocation of the Classical style could be thought of in terms of the Platonic, even if that work was for industrial design. Barbara Whitney Keyser (1998) has noted that there was "...a strain of Neoplatonism that was linked to industry" and identifies three men at the centre of this – Thomas Taylor, Josiah Wedgwood and importantly for us, John Flaxman.²⁶ I shall be considering Taylor and Wedgwood's relationship to Flaxman and attempt to highlight not only that Flaxman's illustrations were Neoplatonic, but more importantly that this Neoplatonism did not just come from his fine art education, but from the very processes of industrial design practice – a message readable to other budding industrial designers. To consider this then, we must explore Platonism, its connections with industry and Wedgwood in particular, and then review the evidence from George Cumberland and other commentators on Flaxman's work.

At the centre of Platonic thought, lay the metaphor of mould-making, a process perhaps more crucial to industry, though important also to fine art. The metaphor was used by Plato to explain the idea that essential forms or moulds residing outside the world of everyday objects, possibly in the mind or soul, had been instrumental in creating casts or copies that existed materially in the mundane world.²⁷ Yet Plato was taking the notion of an original mould or form decidedly as a metaphor. Thus rather than referring to an individual human designer, he was inferring the presence of an originating metaphysical realm in which supernatural forms existed that had engendered all the things of the world. For Plato art was just another copy.²⁸

However during the Renaissance, when there was a resurgence of interest in Platonism, this division between the human artist and the metaphysical realm from which the world originated, was compressed resulting in a sense that those who might achieve the construction of wonderful pieces of art in the human world, were able to do so *only because* they understood and knew the forms and moulds that lay within the metaphysical realm. Hence the great artist was understood as being a seer, one who had divine knowledge.²⁹ Though this philosophical concept fluctuated in popularity³⁰ it remained an inherent part of education and particularly within the teaching of art from at least the seventeenth-century in Britain.³¹ If an artist could discover the mould, or ideal, from which mundane forms were cast, went the theory, then he or she would learn the beauty and measurement of an original, rather than the much poorer qualities of a mere copy.

But according to the Classical art historian John Onians (1991), Platonism was not naturally connected to fine art.³² Onians suggests that the very notion of an essential form existing outside the material world in some transcendent realm, was created by Plato as a result of his experience of the Greek ceramics trade, in which a client, potter and salesman would communicate a design for a product. All members of the transaction would refer to a pot before its construction, resulting in the existence of the object as an idea, prior to the physical creation of it.³³ As such Onians situates the emergence of Platonism within the realm of trade and business, and more importantly design. It is interesting to consider then whether there existed any such notion of Platonic theory within nineteenth-century British trades and industries.

Neoplatonism and Manufacture

Leaving aside the issue of a design communicated between client, maker and salesman for a moment, what is apparent is that the staple metaphor of Platonism, mould-making was a very important part of British industry in the nineteenth-century. The evidence submitted to the Select Committee on Art and Manufactures in 1835-6 mentions this process extensively with regard to copyright. The Sheffield iron manufacturer, John Jobson Smith, bemoaning the lack of copyright laws, noted that any product cast by his firm was then used to create a mould by another less reputable company, which was then in turn used to cast more copies of his original product. This resulted in not only direct copies of his work that were sold at a cheaper price (as no expense had been outlaid in design), but also in those copies being of a poorer quality. This was because when one makes a mould from a cast, the definition and detail of the original is not as finely wrought.³⁴ This was a point upheld by the modeller John Henning Snr., who alongside his son had completed a copy of the Parthenon frieze for the newly built Hyde Park Corner screen. He similarly noted how the inferior copies attributed to him were bad for business.³⁵ What is therefore clear is that manufacturers and artists were very well aware of the qualities of an original and a copy. But did this relationship between original mould and cast copy have more profound meanings?

Possible evidence for this can again be sought through the words of the manufacturer Jobson Smith. He claimed, when the Committee questioned how one would judge an original from a copy, that "...the particular mind and style of the artist" was always evident in the form of a mould, so much so that there was no mistaking a copy from an original.³⁶ This is a significant point because it suggests a clear sense that in the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-centuries, some manufacturers at least saw a relationship between the physical defining of a mould and the designer's original artistic intention. In a sense the original mould was understood to be synonymous with the original thought – design as both an object and an intention or idea. But in Onians' theories, the Greek craftsman understood the process of making to be the realisation of an object, rather than the creation of it, thus we must ask similarly of British industry, was there the same notion that the idea of a form was prior to its construction? In other words, were ideas communicated in the same way as they had been between tradesmen and consumers in ancient Greece and did this fuel a belief

that good industrial design came, like great art, from a knowledge of virtual Platonic forms?

In the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries in Britain there were many publications of what one might consider to be the equivalent of virtual forms communicated between maker and consumer. These were printed pattern books - collections of design ideas or models - that were intended to either aid designers working in industry or buyers in their choice of product. These books or catalogues offered simple images of different styles. In an 1824 pattern book entitled *The Smith and Founder's Director*, its author L. N. Cottingham³⁷ noted how much such texts had encouraged improvement in the iron trade, suggesting that praise was particularly due to those that had offered help in the education of the Classical style. Cottingham explained that design of "...the articles which were formerly considered as merely gross and ponderous" had been improved by the application of "...the lightness and elegance of classical design",³⁸ and one can sense from the vocabulary the change was not simply about aesthetics. What the author seems to have been suggesting was that the adoption of the Classical represented the emergence of an enlightened designer, one who had evolved from producing a 'ponderous' to a 'light' and 'elegant' style. We already know that the Classical was synonymous with the ideal Platonic form in fine art. Therefore could these comments inferring improvement, even enlightenment in design practice, indicate that there was indeed a similar assumption that a knowledge of superior forms was necessary within industry as within fine art, that these were understood as Platonic, and that they were communicated virtually through a particular graphic language? One might argue that the best evidence that this was so can be found by considering the actual illustrations contained within Cottingham's book.

Plate 33 (figure 2) is particularly useful because it not only illustrates a series of Greek vases, which were drawn from the author's own collection, but because the objects are depicted in a similar graphic style to the work of Flaxman. As in figure 1, here we are given only the crucial information about form and moulding through simple outlines, devoid of shadow, perspective and colour. If, as we have established, Flaxman's designs had been interpreted as in a style from ancient times, perhaps even a realm before history began, then it is possible to suggest that this later adoption of a similar graphic style for industrial purposes, also implied that what was being

represented was an ‘ideal’. This is particularly so with this example as Greek vases, being Classical, were thought to be archetypal in themselves. That such a manufacturing pattern book had a relationship with work as it was understood by a fine art audience, such as Flaxman’s Homeric illustrations, has been previously suggested by Barbara Maria Stafford (1993). She has commented that the “...striking mutuality and reinforcement between the high conceptual abstraction... with its Neoplatonic precepts of subtraction [and] withdrawal...and the diagrammatic techniques evident in the most mundane drawing...manuals” should be considered as more than stylistic coincidence.³⁹ Thus one could argue that manufacturing pattern books were, for designers, the graphic equivalents of museum collections of statues studied by fine artists, and that, as such, they were considered equally as Platonic.

Thus, if we accept that a similar notion of a collection of ideal forms existed in manufactures, as well as fine art, then our next task is to consider whether Flaxman’s Homeric illustrations were thought of in such a way. There is some evidence of this in the book *Household Furniture and Interior Design* of 1807, written by the interior designer Thomas Hope, who had commissioned Flaxman on many occasions. The target audience for Hope’s own book were artisans and manufacturers who were keen to improve their products but needed guidance.⁴⁰ In the text in which the illustrations are also similar to Flaxman’s work, being simple, uncoloured outline drawings, Hope suggested that the reader should also use Flaxman’s Homeric illustrations, alongside his own work, as a guide to designing furniture and other objects of Classical style.⁴¹ This overt comment does therefore suggest that the habit of using Flaxman’s work in an industrial setting was established by the first decade of the nineteenth-century, but can the argument be supported that from the publication of the illustrations, they were understood within this arena? Evidence for this can be found in section 1 of *Thoughts on Outline* by George Cumberland.

In his introduction, Cumberland provided his reasons for writing the book. He noted that as well as the lack of effective education provided by the Royal Academy, it was the “...clumsy patronage of traders”, in attempting to improve manufactures that had encouraged him to tackle the subject.⁴² For Cumberland, the manufacturing interest in Classical sculpture as a source for designed goods had resulted in the misunderstanding of Classical form. Without proper instruction, suggested the author,

the designer for manufactures had created abominable works that had been labelled Classical art. There are two elements of evidence that suggest Cumberland counted Flaxman's work as part of this 'clumsy' manufacturing patronage. Firstly, in his criticism of manufacturers, the author seemed to be referring directly to one person, this was the ceramics industrialist Josiah Wedgwood. Though Wedgwood was not mentioned by name, his business and particularly his design process were heavily inferred by Cumberland's comments that the worst of the manufacturers was "...the potter, who greedily seizes on the vases of the ancients, *instead of seeking for the principles of their workmen*, makes sometimes partly a good thing, but oftener a bad one...".⁴³ Wedgwood had certainly employed the Classical style in his manufactures, and the inference that it was this particular manufacturer that the author was referring to is made more likely by Cumberland's praise of James Tassie, who was a collector of Classical intaglios.⁴⁴ The support for this collector and designer may indicate some opposition to Wedgwood, as Tassie was a rival in manufacture.⁴⁵

That Wedgwood was 'the potter who greedily seizes...' was a description earned because of the manufacturer's design process and employment of Classical sources. In contrast to Tassie's use of his *own* collection, Wedgwood had drawn on the vast storehouse of Greek vases owned by Sir William Hamilton. By doing this, not only had Wedgwood used a collection that was not his own, but he had committed the greater crime of not even studying the vases themselves. Instead the industrialist had consulted volumes of engravings illustrating the collection, taking in effect a short cut, by using these texts as 'pattern books', and literally copying them for his products.⁴⁶ But Wedgwood explained that he had not copied the designs "...with absolute servility"⁴⁷ because the engravings he studied were in themselves not completely accurate copies, but rather were stylised versions printed alongside instructions to the reader on how to adapt and *correct* Classical vase paintings for modern manufacture.⁴⁸ Note here how industry demanded certain requirements of the Classical that purists like Cumberland would see as most arrogant indeed. Thus it does indeed seem likely that Wedgwood was being referred to by Cumberland, and used as an example of the evils of inaccurate engravings and their influence on manufactures. The reason for establishing this is that, if Wedgwood was singled out, then Flaxman was also implicated.

Flaxman had worked with Josiah Wedgwood, creating pieces that the manufacturer had marketed as ‘art’, such as the vase of the *Apotheosis of Homer* from 1786 (figure 3).⁴⁹ This design was a copy of one of the plates of Hamilton’s collection,⁵⁰ and thus, even though William Hamilton himself approved,⁵¹ its use must have indicated to Cumberland that Flaxman, like Wedgwood, was guilty of taking designs from the works of engravers, who in turn had misinterpreted the actual graphic skill of the Grecian vase painters. Although Cumberland acknowledges that Flaxman had finally gone to Italy to study Classical works in the ‘flesh’,⁵² the inference was that the artist had already become associated with this earlier practice of imitating engravings, resulting in his own contribution to that body of work, i.e. the Homeric illustrations, being fundamentally flawed.

Graphic Design and Mould-Making

The second part of the evidence not only supports the notion that Flaxman’s illustrations were understood as a pattern book for artisans, but also explains how his graphic line may have been readable to them by considering the relationship between his two-dimensional outline and casting. This section is based on the direct criticism that Cumberland made of Flaxman’s Homeric illustrations, which was that the artist’s use of line was “...*thick and thin alternately*”.⁵³ Cumberland’s complaints highlight the fact that by using an inconsistent line, Flaxman revealed ignorance of Classical sources. According to the author, this was either because he had not carefully studied the vases of the Greeks, like Wedgwood, or worse still, that he was not interested in making an accurate copy of Classicism, which was therefore an abuse of the Classical style. Whatever the reason, Cumberland explained that no Grecian painter would have deliberately and systematically used the alternation of thick and thin lines as a graphic device. Rather, the author pointed out, a Greek artist preferred instead to employ a constant “...*fine, firm, flowing and faint*” outline.⁵⁴

In relation to Flaxman’s own work, this contrast can be seen if one compares the illustration in Figure 4 showing a scene from the *Odyssey*, with Figure 5, an example produced by Cumberland at the end of his book in which he aimed to show the beauties of a much subtler line. Figure 5 shows Cumberland presenting an illustration of the words from the poet Ovid in which a group of figures are portrayed with consistent faintness of outline and flowing lines where robes, hair and fire echo the

forms of each other. In contrast, it is clear that Flaxman used a variation of dense lines to provide some sense of depth and emphasis in his illustration.⁵⁵ Flaxman's work, through thickness of the mark, draws one's attention to the practicalities of the scene, the use of muscle to lift the central figure, the bend of the back and the steadying of the leg. In contrast, Cumberland provides no illusion of weight or resistance.

This difference is due perhaps to Cumberland's desire to have his illustration float on air by making the "...contour so softened into the background, that the ground appear[s]... detached, and as it were unconnected with it".⁵⁶ This he saw in opposition to the aims of Flaxman, whose hard and sharp lines "...have the effect of attaching to the ground the forms they describe".⁵⁷ What seems to underlie this distinction is that Cumberland believed Greek artists to be 'speaking' to an educated and cultured audience, whilst Flaxman's work suggested the reality and practicality of the mundane world, subjects unsuitable for such a clientele. Such a distinction is emphasised by Cumberland's comments that to use a "...course, thick and irregular Outline, is, like a course mode of expression, fit only for the rabble of mankind".⁵⁸ This 'rabble' that the author refers to could indeed be the manufacturing community as later in a note he suggests that the use of hard and sharp line is a mistake commonly made by the manufacturer in an attempt to educate their employees in the Arts.⁵⁹

In this comment Cumberland was clearly referring to those texts such as Cottingham's, produced by manufacturers and tradesmen as an aid to designing goods, as well as catalogues that illustrated their products for sale to a buying public. Figure 6 is an earlier version of one of these texts and is an illustration of a design for a fireplace from the catalogue of the artificial stone merchants Coade and Sealy (1777-1778). The fireplace was probably designed by the sculptor John Bacon who like Flaxman worked for industry but was also a Royal Academician. One will immediately note that the catalogue similarly employed a graphic simplicity, in this case to convey a clear message to a buyer, in the same way that Flaxman's work is economically direct. It is certainly tempting, not only to see a relationship between Flaxman's art work and this illustration, but even perhaps to suggest that Flaxman was influenced by such work, but there are clearly differences in style. Bacon's design embraces a more rhythmic, almost Rococo style, whilst Flaxman's work is

rigid by comparison. Yet in the use of line, perhaps the two sculptors share more than Bacon's work does with Cumberland's illustration (Figure 5). Cumberland's drawing of Ovid's words may represent a flowing and rhythmic composition more reminiscent of Bacon's work, but the use of outline in the latter is far bolder, using line alternatively thickly and thinly, though rather less dramatically than Flaxman. Note particularly the two main figures and the relationship of torso to clothing in each. In short, what is apparent is that where a suggestion of pictorial depth is required, Flaxman and Bacon have both used a thicker line.

In reference to this type of catalogue or manual, Cumberland claimed that "...a sharpness cuts on the eye, and renders objects more visible, so it is apt to bring the line itself to be more noticed than the form it describes..."⁶⁰ This comment is interesting because it highlights the point that it is the quality of line that puts the emphasis on itself rather than on the delineation of form. But there could have been a very practical reason for this thick and sharp line when used in pattern books and catalogues for manufacturers. Figure 7 shows a mould for shallow relief used by Bacon. One will note that it is an object in the negative, giving the illusion of material having been removed in order to allow another substance to be placed into the space, to be moulded to create a positive shape. If one considers therefore what a drawing of a mould may be indicating, it would be the points at which the material of the main body of the mould had been cut away in order to provide the potential for casting. In the case of figure 4, this material was artificial stone invented by Eleanor Coade, and was a special formula of ceramic body that would have had to be cast rather than carved.⁶¹ Literally Bacon's illustration of the product would indicate the 'cut' line of the mould from which the decorative fire surround was to be made.

It is interesting, from this to return to the criticism levelled at Flaxman by Cumberland. The author stated that in the Homeric illustrations Flaxman had used "...*outlines thick and thin alternately*", resulting in the author's claim that this made the artist a "penman".⁶² However, rather than revealing the dominance of the pen, I would suggest that Flaxman's expressive quality of line was rather a suggestion of depth (for shallow relief), one that was literally translated into three dimensions when the drawings were engraved for printing by Piroli. But this translation onto an engraving plate was not the only relationship Flaxman's work had with three-

dimensions. The artist himself noted that on composing his Homeric illustrations, he had intended not that they would be published as graphic works, but that they should become shallow relief sculptures.⁶³ Thus, Flaxman's work from its inception was conceived as being three-dimensional, adding further support to the interpretation of the thick and thin outline as an indication of depth, readable to modellers and casters. There is one other graphic suggestion of this. Figures 1 and 4 not only reveal that Flaxman used very bold, even harsh lines in his work, but also that he used a series of horizontal lines to indicate when a figure was placed in the background. These lines could be interpreted as shadow, but equally, they could be interpreted as an emphasis on the shallowest part of the relief. If one reads the Homeric images as instructional for casting, then one could suggest that the lines represented the depth relationship of the figures to the background where they were to form part of the body of the background rather than the play of equal shadow and light that would articulate the main, detailed and more modelled central characters. Thus Flaxman's graphic line used in the Homeric illustrations may not, in principle, have been as original as some fine art commentators understood, because it was part of a tradition of graphic representation, aimed at manufacturers and readable by artisans. However, though the understanding that Flaxman's work was applicable to a manufacturing audience has been established, the actual process by which this visual collection of forms was read as Platonic has not been outlined. This is therefore the next stage.

We now understand the illustrations of Flaxman to be portraying not simply a line printed onto a page, but a line indicating a 'cut' into material, and therefore a subtraction from the page, as one would subtract material in order to form a mould or engrave a plate. The evidence of the Select Committee witness Jobson Smith suggested that when an original mould or pattern was formed by the subtraction of material, that the physical act of creation was simultaneously evidence of a superior artist's design intention, one that clearly distinguished an original from a copy. Thus, we could suggest that, the line indicates both superior design and a concept of subtraction, which as Stafford described it, also points to some form of Platonic interpretation. Therefore simultaneous to the graphic line indicating both removal and a sign of artistic creativity, we must ask whether the outline also signifies the deeper, more profound rendering of ideal form and how this relates to the individual maker.

The answer to this question seems best answered by exploring firstly how Platonic forms were thought to be communicated.

Drawing Practice and Neoplatonism

Neoplatonic theory suggested that an understanding of the ideal was brought about through the faculties of the eye and the memory, a concept that drew on a long-standing relationship between the human eye and the mind.⁶⁴ Within art education, the process by which one began to seek the ideal was through observation of the visual arts and the physical world itself. By this visually dominated study, suggested the art teacher and calico printer Charles O'Brien (1789), a student could create a "...mental repository", in which "the fancy" stored various ideas "...to be ...made use of".⁶⁵ In his book *The Callico Printer's Assistant*, he represented this store house in the form of a table, its gridded format and numbering system echoing earlier Platonic memory treatises.⁶⁶

But importantly a student did not simply look, but also drew. This physical drawing practice was essential to the creation of a mental repository because it was the method by which the works of art and nature began to be ordered in relation to each other.⁶⁷ This was the practice of earlier Platonic theorists who graphically demonstrated the existence of formal relationships between diverse subjects, drawing from these underlying similarities, a set of quintessential forms (moulds) from which all things, it was proposed, were derived. An example of this type of publication in Britain, was Henry Peacham's 1634 text *The Gentleman's Exercise* which was the first book in the country to suggest that it was the activity of drawing itself that allowed an artist to probe into "...the metaphysical essence of things".⁶⁸ Peacham expressed this visually by reducing complex forms to geometrical figures that he could demonstrate underlay a variety of apparently different objects.⁶⁹ From this period geometry and the ability to compose through mathematically accurate calculations became synonymous with a mastery of Platonic form, but this association was to shift later in the eighteenth-century.⁷⁰ If one considers Flaxman's own practice, then it is clear that he represents the new development of the earlier Platonic tradition.

Carlo Ginzburg (1998) has identified that Flaxman gained his education from drawing on an unusually broad range of objects, including 'primitive' clubs, spears and axes.⁷¹

Though he did not dwell on any geometrical skeleton in his drawing, he did as Ginzburg describes, confidently employ his "...fluid, undulating line" as an analytical tool by which to study and classify the art works and objects he encountered. Thus, following the tradition of Peacham, Flaxman used drawing as a way of physically identifying the similarities and differences in style that contributed to his knowledge of an "...astonishing range of visual idioms".⁷² Indeed for Ginzburg, the artist was one of the first commentators on art to gather such a diverse series of objects into a coherent and systematic set of relationships, denoted by "...the term Style".⁷³ Like Peacham, Flaxman's drawing aided his analysis of essential form, allowing the artist to 'see' beneath the superficiality of surface. Later in his career Flaxman was characterised as an artist who had a profound visual understanding because of his study.⁷⁴ Studying through drawing was equated with the faculty of memory and its close ally invention.⁷⁵

On memory, Walter Melion (1991) has noted that from the sixteenth-century, there was an understanding that the actual process of remembering became intimately linked to this artistic practice. In effect theories of memory took art practice as a metaphor, explaining remembering as the action of inscribing or drawing, the memory or 'store' itself being conceived of as the surface.⁷⁶ Indeed the metaphor extended to employing all sorts of mark-making imagery, including imprinting, printing, making an impression, moulding or writing on a wax tablet. These were used broadly to denote the interaction of seeing, thinking and remembering, and thus the eyes saw as the hand recorded and the mind remembered through one simultaneous action, uniting eye, hand and mind's eye.⁷⁷ One could therefore suggest that Cumberland was referring to this inscribing of the memory when he described the observer's eye as being 'cut' by the line on the page in some harshly defined pattern books. This inference is confirmed by the author's later comment that studying good examples of sculpture would "...imbue [students']... souls with the traces of great and noble forms".⁷⁸ Thus a pattern book was not only a visual lesson, but when copied, it inscribed the memory, resulting in the actual pattern book becoming part of a student's mental repository to be later called on as a basis for new designs. Figure 8 shows an example of Standard III, part of the course of instruction developed by the British government's Science and Art department in 1868. Note the similarity between this exercise and Cottingham's earlier text (Figure 2). It was by this period

that these images and other outline drawings had become part of an institutionalised design education system in which studying by copying had become the central system of instruction, drawing on this earlier relationship between the memory and invention.⁷⁹

Again, Flaxman himself is an excellent, though rather more sophisticated, example of the culmination of years of study and the process by which that study allowed a designer to generate original designs and patterns. Deanna Petherbridge (2003) has described Flaxman's graphic design practice as a system of building up many lines into a single, permanent line through a series of tones from light graphite to grey-black or brown ink.⁸⁰ A hint of this activity is visible in Figure 9, which is a pen and ink sketch of Hermes visiting Calypso, a drawing that was to become one of the scenes illustrated for the *Odyssey*. What is intriguing for this investigation is that Petherbridge understands this drawing practice not as "...mechanical redrawing of an existing contour, but... [as] a gestural stripping-away of unessentials; paring down to 'simplicity' and 'purity'".⁸¹ John Gould commented that in one piece of work, Flaxman had condensed "...into one comprehensive space all the knowledge which he had acquired during a long and laborious life".⁸² Given this description it is possible to appreciate the mental activity that appears to have been undertaken by the artist. Gould considered Flaxman's process as one in which he 'condensed' all of his knowledge. This suggests that Flaxman was, at the stage of composition, gathering all his useful examples from what Charles O'Brien would describe as his 'mental repository' or memory. Since it has been proposed previously that this mnemonic collection was inscribed through Flaxman's drawing practice, then it is possible to consider Petherbridge's description of the artist's process as a 'gestural stripping-away' more clearly in relation to this. Here it seems the physical act of calling on mnemonic models to aid with his composition could be seen visibly on the surface of the paper, whilst the refining of many marks into a single line would appear to be the graphic evidence for Flaxman's distillation of many forms into one underlying and perfect form.

The notion of many forms becoming one superior and ideal form was a highly Platonic tradition described by teachers like Henry Sass and the art historian Johann Wincklemann as the method by which the Greek artists themselves had composed and

created the ideal.⁸³ That Flaxman undertook this process seems to indicate that his practice was indeed based on Neoplatonism but the development of a repository from which to draw on, and from which to select and condense, was not in itself always the considered to be the result of Platonic practice. In the seventeenth-century in Britain, there had been a rival to Plato's concept of the ideal – this alternative theory had been developed by the philosopher John Locke. Platonism, or Neoplatonism as it had become, assumed that every individual could learn of the ideal moulds, by seeing and understanding a realm beyond the appearance of the mundane world.⁸⁴ This was because knowledge of the ideal was thought to already exist within every individual, though in most it lay dormant. Thomas Taylor who was the great Platonic figure of the late eighteenth-century in London favoured this idea as one in which every person contained "...the forms or moulds of Ideas, of the realities which the soul knew before its descent here below".⁸⁵

But this theory seemed to suggest to Locke that everyone had an innate understanding, which he opposed. Rather he suggested the mind was a blank canvas with no intrinsic connection to a knowledge of the world, and it was through hard work and effort that the individual became enlightened.⁸⁶ Thus, there existed opposing theories, though these relied on the same process by which knowledge was acquired. This was through the eye, while the information gleaned was simultaneously written in the mind.⁸⁷ Though Locke had developed his theories in the seventeenth-century, Charles O'Brien indicates that the debate was still very much ongoing at the end of the eighteenth-century. O'Brien commented that he did not know what the word 'original' in reference to design meant because "...the term [has]...no precise meaning, till it is agreed on all sides, how ideas are acquired, whether intuitively [Platonic] or by sensation [Lockean]".⁸⁷

Thus though Flaxman did himself use the metaphor conjoining the action of the eye, hand and mind together, it is not clear whether he saw the imprinting of the minds of the young students he was referring to at the time, as Platonic or simply Lockean.⁸⁸ From the visual evidence gathered so far, it is certainly tempting to understand his design practice as Platonic, but there is also some strong circumstantial evidence to support this association. Earlier in his career, Flaxman himself had invited the philosopher Thomas Taylor to speak on the subject of Platonism at his home. Taylor

was a man set to become known as ‘The Platonist’ in fashionable 1790s London and, some time between 1783-1785, he delivered twelve readings on Platonic Philosophy to the artistic and literary community in London with Flaxman’s support.⁸⁹ It is therefore very likely that Flaxman retained some bias towards the Platonic theory of the human mind. It is also possible that Cumberland interpreted Flaxman’s Homeric work as having those aspirations because, though Taylor is not remembered today, he was one of the major public figures at the time in which Cumberland was writing, and he was also secretary of the industry focussed Royal Society of Arts. Thus Taylor associates Platonism with industry and also with John Flaxman.

There is perhaps one further piece of evidence that can be drawn on to support the idea that Flaxman understood his work within a Platonic tradition. This is an object created by the artist between 1810 and 1821, entitled *The Shield of Achilles*, and produced by the firm Rundell and Bridge in a very limited edition.⁹⁰ The *Shield* was the three-dimensional manifestation of the same object carried by Thetis in Figure 1 and was a very famous passage in Homer’s *Iliad*, being described by Alexander Pope (one of the most successful translator’s of the poem), as providing a model of the ideal in art (Figure 10).⁹¹ In creating the work however, Flaxman did not use Pope’s translation, but rather, being able to read Greek, spent many years translating the scene in which the Shield is described in the original text of the *Iliad*.⁹² In itself, this laborious process signifies that Flaxman was anxious to understand the original meaning of Homer’s words, setting aside any other authors that may have clouded it. This practice indicates a continued interest in Platonism, because Taylor believed that Homer’s stories were allegories that, when profoundly interrogated, would reveal essential Platonic truths, a view the philosopher may have stated in Flaxman’s own house.⁹³ What is fascinating for us is that the process that the artist undertook to create the mould of the Shield, ready for the craftsmen of Rundell and Bridge, was documented by several authors and reveals the conjoining of philosophical inquiry into Platonism and the design process.

Flaxman followed Homer’s description of the *Shield* very closely resulting in a similarity between the construction and the literary formation of the Shield. The sculptor Joseph Nollekens noted that Flaxman modelled the Shield’s form firstly as ‘...the general design, without attending minutely to the respective parts’⁹⁴ – this

work was done roughly in clay and over a short period of time.⁹⁵ After this, Nollekens explained that Flaxman went on to mould the different scenes.⁹⁶ This series of activities exactly mirrors the literary description of the Shield, which is initially sketched by Homer in terms of its shape and the general impression of it, before the poet launches into a more detailed description of each scene at line 567.⁹⁷ At this point, Nollekens claims, Flaxman moved away from clay, and cast the material so that he was able to work on a plaster model when establishing the precise details of each scene.⁹⁸ This would have demanded that Flaxman concentrate on the underlying mechanics, one could say the grammar of the scene, by which to decide on the most important figures and actions to depict. This process would not only have been essential for compositional reasons, but it was also thought by Neoplatonists, like Thomas Taylor, to be a crucial undertaking when reading Homer. In practical terms this act of both inquiry and composition through excavation of the mechanics of the scene, was undertaken according to Nollekens by "...cutting away" and refining the plaster.¹⁰⁰ This was a physical process completely compatible with the literary and Neoplatonic demands of interpretation and extraction. But furthermore, if one returns to Petherbridge's description of Flaxman's drawing techniques, then it is apparent that the same activity of building up material and then subtracting from it, to reveal the essential forms was taking place, a similarity that I propose was not coincidental. Flaxman's practice in modelling *The Shield of Achilles*, a literary object known to a cultured audience as the ideal form of art itself, sheds light on his use of graphic line. The artist's line was not only indicative of the subtraction of material and of the action of himself as a superior artist, but was simultaneously a line that indicated his investigation, understanding and oneness with the realm of the Platonic ideal. Furthermore, in the publication of his Homeric illustrations, Flaxman was illuminating a path to design enlightenment, not simply to other artists but in a language understood and addressed to aspiring artisans.

Conclusion

In this essay I have attempted to establish the idea that Flaxman's Homeric illustrations, which are often understood as an addition to his sculptural practice, are intimately linked to that work. Yet rather than studying the illustrations and their relationship to sculpture within a fine art arena, this paper has suggested that a contemporary perception of Flaxman's graphic work was that it was addressing a

manufacturing audience, an application that was particularly criticised by George Cumberland. The evidence for this has been discovered through the consideration of Cumberland's contemporary analysis of Flaxman's graphic line, which in its apparent lack of Classical accuracy, its sharpness and simplicity used the language of pattern books for industrial design. Furthermore, in the quality of this line, it has been suggested that rather than an addition to the pictorial surface, Flaxman's work indicated a potential 'cut line', one that could be used when creating a mould for casting. This 'cut line' has been shown not only to be associated with the line of original design intention from a superior designer, but because of this power, with the ability to literally cut and imprint the mind of the viewer of that illustration.

This idea has led on to an exploration of the artist's graphic technique in relation to art educational theories that derived from Platonism, where the concept of education, as an intimate relationship between the senses and the individual mind or soul, was used metaphorically and implicitly by art teachers. Following this tradition, Flaxman's own study has been explored to extract the process by which drawing was used as an analytical tool in order that a student could uncover the differences and relationships between forms, ultimately revealing through this labour, the originating forms or moulds from which the mundane world was thought to be cast. These were sought not only by fine artists but also by manufacturers who were determined to improve their designs for a rapidly expanding international market. As Barbara Whitney Keyser has noted, this Neoplatonic desire to discover the ultimate and most essential forms was central to a period in which artists and manufacturers alike were "...reconciling ancient wisdom with modern achievements".¹⁰² Flaxman's illustrations formed a crucial role in this reconciliation between old and new, as they provided not only a refreshingly primitive aesthetic for many artists, but also a model for excellence in industrial design, shared and understood by manufacturers and tradesmen alike.

References:

¹ Irwin 1979: 67.

² Cumberland 1796: 1.

³ The term Platonism refers to the ideas of Plato, Neoplatonism suggests the development of those ideas through the works of other theorists.

⁴ David Allen (1986) notes how during the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-centuries many scientific disciplines were similarly fragmenting and becoming more specialised (5).

⁵ Irwin 1979: 5. Flaxman was also trained more formally at the Royal Academy.

-
- ⁶ In the first Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures of 1835-6, thirty-four of the thirty-seven witnesses considered that British goods were inferior, particularly to those produced by the French (Webb 2003: 122-123).
- ⁷ Irwin 1991:220.
- ⁸ Irwin 1991: 229.
- ⁹ Any discussion of the origin of designs was avoided and instead the reader was lulled into thinking that the “beautiful designs” that were churned out at “the rate of a mile in the hour” were the result of the activities of the “four- or five- colour calico printing machines” (Ure 1967: 369).
- ¹⁰ Puetz 1999: 219.
- ¹¹ Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1836 session q. 214: 21.
- ¹² Puetz 1999: 219.
- ¹³ Gould 1834, pp. i-ii.
- ¹⁴ Brett 1995: 10.
- ¹⁵ Of the firm Brydes, Campbell and Harrison, 18 Philpot Lane, London.
- ¹⁶ Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1835 session, q. 459: 33.
- ¹⁷ Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1835 session, q. 459: 33.
- ¹⁸ Before the first British government sponsored School of Design, there was much debate on this matter. One calico printer from Manchester, Mr. Bucknell, wrote to the proposed school’s committee stating that it was absolutely essential that a good designer understand the processes involved in the different manufactures that were going to be designed for (British Library MS Add 31218 f. 4).
- ¹⁹ David Irwin (1979) point to several letters in which Flaxman discusses the designs he produced with Wedgwood in terms of the effects of firings on the ceramic (26).
- ²⁰ Irwin 1979: 26.
- ²¹ He also did illustrations during this period for Dante and the *Aeschylus* (Irwin 1979: 68-69).
- ²² Quoted in Turner 1998, vol. 11: 162. See also Irwin 1997: 299.
- ²³ Eisenman et al. 2001: 38.
- ²⁴ Cumberland 1796: 16.
- ²⁵ Henry Sass suggested that all towns should have casts of certain Greek statues in museums, claiming that a collection of these represented the “archetypes of art” (Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1836 session q. 230, p. 23). See also Irwin 1997: 28).
- ²⁶ Keyser 1998:128.
- ²⁷ Plato 1972: 274-278 (Book VI).
- ²⁸ Plato 1972: 275 (Book VI).
- ²⁹ Yates (1992) describes how a knowledge of the archetypes makes one’s mind ‘divine’ (161).
- ³⁰ Harper 1961: 4.
- ³¹ Bermingham 2000: 49.
- ³² Onions 1991:65-73.
- ³³ Onions 1991: 67-69.
- ³⁴ Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1835 session q. 105, p. 10.
- ³⁵ Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1835 session q. 853, p. 59.
- ³⁶ Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1835 session q. 158, p. 13.
- ³⁷ Lewis N. Cottingham was an architect and designer, he is also associated with the Gothic revival in Britain.
- ³⁸ Cottingham 1824, preface, pages not numbered.
- ³⁹ Stafford quoted in Petherbridge 2003: 9.
- ⁴⁰ Hope 1807: 5.
- ⁴¹ Hope 1807: 53.
- ⁴² Cumberland 1796: 2.
- ⁴³ Cumberland 1796: note on 21.
- ⁴⁴ Cumberland 1796: 25-26.
- ⁴⁵ Thomson 2004, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26977, accessed 5 April 2005.
- ⁴⁶ Wedgwood acquired the illustrations before their publication (Coltman 2001: 2-3), a fact that perhaps emphasised his greed to Cumberland.
- ⁴⁷ Irwin 1997: 218.
- ⁴⁸ Coltman 2001: 2-3.
- ⁴⁹ Wedgwood gave this vase to the British Museum, underlining his conviction of the work as equal to the works of antiquity (Irwin 1979: 22).
- ⁵⁰ Irwin 1979: 23-24.
- ⁵¹ Irwin 1997: 220-221.

-
- ⁵² Cumberland 1796: 9-10.
- ⁵³ Cumberland 1796: 16.
- ⁵⁴ Cumberland 1796: 18.
- ⁵⁵ Cumberland 1796: 37.
- ⁵⁶ Cumberland 1796: 24.
- ⁵⁷ Cumberland 1796: 22.
- ⁵⁸ Cumberland 1796: 19.
- ⁵⁹ Cumberland 1796: note on 21.
- ⁶⁰ Cumberland 1796: note on 21.
- ⁶¹ The material boasted that its durability meant that unlike materials such as Portland stone and marble, it could stand up to the challenge of the British climate and retain a "...sharpness" (Coade's Gallery Catalogue 1799: iii-iv).
- ⁶² Cumberland 1796: 16. See also note 48.
- ⁶³ Turner 1998, vol. 11: 163.
- ⁶⁴ Yates 1992: 19.
- ⁶⁵ O'Brien 1789: pages not numbered.
- ⁶⁶ Yates 1992: plate 6a and 6b (Johannes Romberch's *Congestroium Artificiose Memorie* 1533).
- ⁶⁷ Bermingham 2000: 49.
- ⁶⁸ Bermingham 2000: 49.
- ⁶⁹ Bermingham 2000: 37.
- ⁷⁰ Brett 1995: 11.
- ⁷¹ Ginzburg 1998: 35-36.
- ⁷² Ginzburg 1998: 34-36.
- ⁷³ Ginzburg 1998: 34.
- ⁷⁴ Gould 1834: 160.
- ⁷⁵ Yates 1992: 24.
- ⁷⁶ Melion & Kuchler 1991: 19.
- ⁷⁷ Yates 1992: 47-50.
- ⁷⁸ Cumberland 1796: 40.
- ⁷⁹ Sutton 1967: 107-131.
- ⁸⁰ Petherbridge 2003: 8.
- ⁸¹ Petherbridge 2003: 8.
- ⁸² Gould 1834: 160.
- ⁸³ Irwin 1997: 29. For Sass see Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1836 session q. 240, p. 24.
- ⁸⁴ Harper 1961: 69-70.
- ⁸⁵ Yates 1992: 17-18.
- ⁸⁶ Harper 1961: 3.
- ⁸⁷ Harper 1961: 67. See also O'Brien (1789) who, on the subject of invention notes, "...the term having no precise meaning, till it is agreed on all sides, how ideas are acquired, whether intuitively or by sensation", distinguishing between a Platonic approach and a Lockean one respectively (pages not numbered).
- ⁸⁷ O'Brien 1789: pages not numbered.
- ⁸⁸ Flaxman stated his aim was to "...imprint on the younger student a strong sense of excellence which may be transplanted into his own mind from such examples" (1838: 24-25).
- ⁸⁹ Axon 1890: 4-5.
- ⁹⁰ Irwin 1979: 194, 204.
- ⁹¹ Pope 1720: 1452-1454.
- ⁹² Irwin 1979: 196.
- ⁹³ Harper 1961: 196.
- ⁹⁴ Whitten 1920: 359.
- ⁹⁵ Cunningham 1833: 365.
- ⁹⁶ Whitten 1920: 359.
- ⁹⁷ Pope 1720: 1401-1402.
- ⁹⁸ Whitten 1920: 359.
- ¹⁰⁰ Whitten 1920: 359.
- ¹⁰² Keyser 1998: 128.

Bibliography

- ALBERTI, L. B. (1966) *On Painting*. Trans. with introduction and notes by SPENCER, J. R. London: Yale University Press.
- ALLEN, D. E. (1986) *The Botanists: a history of the Botanical Society of the British Isles through a hundred and fifty years*. Winchester: St. Paul's Biographies.
- ALPERS, S. L. (1960) "Ekphrasis and Aesthetic Attitudes in Vasari's Lives". *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*. Vol. 23, pp. 190-215.
- AXON, W. E. A. (1890) *Thomas Taylor, the Platonist: a biographical sketch* [reprinted from 'The Library', July & August]. London: For Private Circulation.
- _____ (1639) *Sylva Sylvarum or A Naturall History in Ten Centuries, published after the author's death by William Rawley*. London: W. Lee.
- _____ (1835) *History of the Cotton Manufacture in Great Britain*. London: H. Fisher, R. Fisher and P. Jackson.
- BERMINGHAM, A. (2000) *Learning to Draw: studies in the cultural history of a polite and useful art*. New Haven/London: Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art/Yale University Press.
- BRETT, D. (1995) "Drawing and the Ideology of Industrialization" in DOORDAN, D. P. (ed.) *Design History – An Anthology*. London/Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- BURNET, R. (1826) *A Word to the Members of the Mechanics' Institute*. Devonport: J. Johns.
- COADE, E. (?) (1799) *Coade's Gallery or Exhibition in Artificial Stone, Westminster Bridge Road*. Lambeth: S. Tibson.
- COLTMAN, V. (2001) "Sir William Hamilton's Vase Publications (1766-1776): a case study in the reproduction and dissemination of antiquity." *Journal of Design History* vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-16.
- CUMBERLAND, G. (1796) *Thoughts on Outline, Sculpture, and the System that Guided the Ancient Artists in Composing their Figures and Groupes...* London: W. Wilson.
- CUNNINGHAM, A. (1830) *The Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*. Vol. III, London: John Murray.
- DOREY, H. (2003) "Flaxman and Soane" in BINDMAN, D. (ed.) *John Flaxman 1755-1826: Master of the Purist Line*. London: Sir John Soane's Museum & UCL.
- EISENMAN, S. F. et al. (eds.) (2001) *Nineteenth-Century Art: a critical history*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- FLAXMAN, J. (1838) *Lectures on Sculpture, as delivered before the president and members of the Royal Academy*. 2nd ed. London: Henry G. Bohm.

-
- GINZBURG, C. (1998) 'Style as Inclusion, Style as Exclusion' in JONES, C. A. & GALISON, P. (eds.) *Picturing Science, Producing Art*. London/New York: Routledge.
- GOULD, J. (1834) *Biographical Sketches of Eminent Artists: comprising painters, sculptors, engravers and architects*. London: Effingham Wilson.
- HARPER (1961) *The Neoplatonism of William Blake*. Chapel Hill/London: The University of North Carolina Press/Oxford University Press.
- HOPE, T. (1807) *Household Furniture and Interior Design, executed from designs by Thomas Hope*. London: Hirst, Rees and Orme.
- IRWIN, D. (1991) 'Art Versus Design: The Debate 1760-1860'. *Journal of Design History* Vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 219-232.
- _____ (1997) *Neoclassicism*. London: Phaidon.
- _____ (1979) *John Flaxman 1755-1826: sculptor illustrator designer*. London: Studio Vista/Christie's.
- MARCHAND, E. (2003) "The Flaxman Gallery at UCL and its History" in BINDMAN, D. (ed.) *John Flaxman 1755-1826: Master of the Purist Line*. London: Sir John Soane's Museum & UCL.
- MELION, W. (1991) & KÜCHLER, S. 'Introduction' in MELION, W. & KÜCHLER, S. (eds.) *Images of Memory: On Remembering and Representation*. Washington/London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- O'BRIEN, C. (1789) *The Callico Printers' Assistant; from the first operation of designing pattern, to the delivering of work for sale...* Vol. 1. London: Charles O'Brien.
- ONIANS, J. (1991) "Idea and Product: Potter and Philosopher in Classical Athens". *Journal of Design History*. Vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 65-73.
- PEACHAM, H. (1634) *The Compleat Gentleman*. 2nd impression. London: Francis Constable.
- PETHERBRIDGE, D. (2003) "Constructing the Language of Line" in BINDMAN, D. (ed.) *John Flaxman 1755-1826: Master of the Purist Line*. London: Sir John Soane's Museum & UCL.
- PLATO (1972) *The Republic*. Translated and introduced by H. D. P. Lee. Middlesex/Maryland/Victoria, Australia: Penguin Books.
- POPE, A. (1720) *The Iliad of Homer*. London: W. Bowyer for Bernod Lintot.
- PUETZ, A. (1999) "Design Instruction for Artisans in eighteenth-century Britain". *Journal of Design History* vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 217-240.
- SUTTON, G. (1967) *Artisan or Artist? A history of the teaching of art and crafts in English schools*. Oxford/London: Pergamon Press.

-
- THOMSON, D. (2004) "Tassie, James (1735-1799)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26977, accessed 5 April 2005].
- TRUEMAN, H. (1913) *A History of the Royal Society of Arts*. London: John Murray.
- TURNER, J. (ed.) (1998) *The Dictionary of Art* Vol. 11. London/New York: Grove/Macmillan.
- WEBB, J. (2003) 'The 1835-6 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures: Anatomy, Benthamism and Design'. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Wolverhampton.
- WHITTEN, W. (ed.) (1920) *Nollekens and His Times*. London/New York: John Lane.
- URE, A. (1967) *The Philosophy of Manufactures or an exposition of the scientific, moral, and commercial economy of the factory system of Great Britain*. (reprint of 1835 edition). London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.
- YATES, F. (1992) *The Art of Memory*. London: Pimlico.

Government Papers and Archive Documents

- (1836) *Report from the Select Committee on Arts and their Connexion with Manufactures, with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index*.
- (1968) *British Parliamentary Papers: Arts and Manufactures 1835 (598) Vol. V. and 1836 (568) Vol. IX*. Shannon: Irish University Press.
- (c. 1846) 'Prospectus of Freebairn's engravings of the *Shield of Achilles*'. Messrs. Rundell, Bridge and Co. British Library MS. Add. 39791 f. 90.
- Mr. Bucknell's Letter British Library MS Add. 31218, f. 4.