



THE
GEORGIAN
GROUP

Derek Linstrum, 'Robert Adam and James Wyatt', *Adam in Context*, Georgian Group Symposium, 1992, pp. 34-41

ROBERT ADAM AND JAMES WYATT

Derek Linstrum

Although we have often been told that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, not all creative artists subscribe to the idea. There was a noticeable asperity in the Adam brothers' words in the preface to their published *Works* of 1773 when they claimed: "We have not trod in the paths of others, nor derived aid from their labours . . . we have not only met with the approbation of our employers, but even with the imitation of other artists . . . We by no means presume to find fault with the compositions or to decry the labour of other authors, many of whom have much merit and deserve great praise." Then magnanimously, they avowed: "Our ambition is to share with others, not to appropriate to ourselves, the applause of the public [while staking their claim] we flatter ourselves we have been able to seize, with some degree of success, the beautiful spirit of antiquity; and to transfuse it with novelty and variety through all our numerous works."¹

We need not go along entirely with their claim of innovation, especially if we are partisan to Sir William Chambers' dismissal of their boast of "having first brought the true style of Decoration into England, and that all architects of the present day are only servile copiers of their excellence".² After all, other architects had studied in Italy.

Nevertheless, it is unquestionable that by the 1770s when they were writing there was a recognisable Adam style, displayed for all – architects, craftsmen and patrons – to see in the published *Works* and to make use of as best they could. It has been generally believed that the principal target of the brothers' accusation was the young James Wyatt who, only the previous year, had unveiled the wonders of the Pantheon in London to the quite extraordinary acclaim of a public that obviously valued novelty. But there were many who could be called imitators and there is no evidence that the Adams were singling out any one, although Robert's complaint to Lord Scarsdale that Samuel Wyatt, who had been employed as clerk of works at Kedleston, was getting too grand to speak to him,³ might be taken as an indication of a jealousy that extended to the whole Wyatt tribe.

"When he came from Italy he found the public taste corrupted by the Adams and he was obliged to comply with it."⁴ Farington's reported comment by James Wyatt, made in 1804 nearly 40 years after his return from Italy, is the only reference we have to his opinion about the Adam brothers, except for the arch-gossip's earlier account of Wyatt's telling him he had heard of "the reports which have reached the King's ears, propagated by [the Adams], of Wyatt's having recd. instructions from them & obtained drawings out of the collection". The diarist noted he was told "the whole [was] grossly unfounded",⁵ and surely Wyatt was not still brooding over what some see as an implied accusation in the preface to the 1773 *Works in Architecture* that he (though unnamed) had been guilty of plagiarism. There, at any rate, we have the remarkably brief documentation of the Wyatt/Adam relationship during the relatively short time their careers in England overlapped. Wyatt returned from Italy in 1768, 10 years after Robert Adam; and the latter's London practice was in decline during the late 1770s following the Adelphi fiasco.

There is a curious similarity about their biographies. Both were the son of a successful builder-architect; both had brothers who followed the same profession; both went to Italy in the company of a wealthy aristocrat although neither remained for long with his patron.

Adam's family acquaintances were probably, generally speaking, rather superior socially and intellectually to those of Wyatt; but the difference between them is that with Adam we have an abundance of documentation and a detailed account of his years in Italy, whereas we know virtually nothing about Wyatt's formative years. Six years in Italy when in one's teens would have been a remarkable experience in every sense, but what did it mean to the young man from the heart of England?

If we accept the cantankerous statement almost amounting to a self-indictment that "he was obliged to comply" with the vogue for the Adam style, we might interpret it as meaning he would have preferred to follow a Palladian line. Another tantalising report from Farington tells us Wyatt had a low opinion of Michelangelo and thought St Peter's "bad architecture" while conceding there was "good architecture at Venice by Palladio".⁶ This is not very revealing, even if it seems to suggest a preference for Palladian over Baroque or Mannerism. At that time the only surprise would have been if he had said the opposite, especially when we know who his mentor was.

There is no evidence that Wyatt followed a systematic line in pursuit of knowledge in Italy; but none that he did not. We know he spent a considerable length of time in Venice because he showed Farington a painting he owned by the man he called his master, Antonio Visentini; but again all he said was that Visentini was a temperate man who once a week, on Sunday, drank a bottle of Burton ale procured for him by Consul Smith,⁷ for whom he had designed a small palace known as Terra Firma. In what sense had Visentini been Wyatt's master? He is remembered principally as one of the minor *vedutisti* who engraved Canaletto's views of Venice and made a series of architectural *capricci* in collaboration with Francesco Zuccarelli.⁸ One of these shows Antonio de Ponte's prison in Venice, which Wyatt was to use as a source for his library at Oriel College, Oxford, (1788) transplanted to a riverside landscape. In 1761, not long before Wyatt arrived in Venice, Visentini became *maestro di architettura* at the Accademia, and he employed a large number of assistants and pupils to make sets of measured drawings of Italian buildings for sale to English visitors.⁹ Very probably it was as a teacher of the technique of draughtsmanship that Visentini was Wyatt's master, and maybe this was why Wyatt was said to have caused much amazement and drawn a large number of spectators to watch him as he was slung horizontally upon a ladder without cradle or side-rail into the voids of the domes of St Peter's and the Pantheon so that he could measure and draw every detail.¹⁰

We also have another remarkable statement in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, to the effect that Wyatt's architectural paintings rivalled those of Panini – a considerable claim – and that as a result of the years in Italy he was equally talented in painting, architecture and music and was undecided which to take up as a career when he returned to England. But where is the evidence? It would be satisfying to be able to reveal that the well-known painting of his first great success, the Pantheon, is his work;¹¹ but it is generally accepted that William Hodges and Johann Zoffany were the artists. However, it is interesting that Wyatt was paid quite a considerable sum "for paintings and statues"¹² in addition to his 5% as architect. And yet, having noted this claim of outstanding architectural painting and assumed the young man had been trained by Visentini as a draughtsman, we find him speaking slightly of "execution in Architectural drawings"¹³ to Farington, adding that some of the greatest architects could not draw at all. Could he have been, tongue in cheek, denigrating the superb quality of the Adam office drawings? One never knows with this unpredictable man.

But let us consider Wyatt, aged around 20, after his arrival back in England around 1768. If indeed he was intending to design in a Palladian manner, it would not be surprising since Visentini had become more and more committed to an academic Classicism and was soon to publish an anti-Baroque tract in 1771.¹⁴ Wyatt would also have had first-hand knowl-

edge of Palladian villas, palaces and churches in Venice and the mainland, and more importantly he would have been familiar with the Palladian revival in the Veneto which was being followed enthusiastically by such architects as Giorgio Massari, Ottavio Calderari, Ottavio Bertotti-Scamozzi and Francesco-Maria Preti.¹⁵ Maybe these were the sort of buildings Wyatt would have preferred to design; but was he really prevented? Or was it just another of his often contradictory statements expressed after too much wine?

What did the young man, who probably felt very superior after six years in Italy, do when he returned? Probably he was working at first with various members of his extensive family in Staffordshire, but principally with Samuel, whom Adam had appointed as clerk of works at Kedleston in 1759. Samuel spent six years there, probably developing some of Adam's ideas for the building and its decoration, and he must have been very familiar with their style. It is difficult to imagine that James Wyatt was not interested in this great house, more or less on the family doorstep, and one might think it obvious that Kedleston, both in James Paine's original design and in Adam's reworking of it, was not without influence on the young man. His 1771 design for a house in Sussex seems to confirm this.¹⁶ Another local estate was Shugborough where James Stuart's triumphal arch and Tower of the Winds, only recently completed, could have evoked comparison with the monuments of Antiquity in Rome and even introduced him to the Greek style which was to be incorporated in later designs.¹⁷

Hitherto little has been known about anything of Wyatt's work earlier than the Pantheon, which launched him on his London-based career. There was a house in Hertfordshire, Gaddesden Place, which was conventionally Palladian in its detailing. That seems to date from 1768, and one would hardly call the decoration Adamatic (to use Soane's adjective), although the ceilings at Fawley Court at Henley-on-Thames are more in their style.

Much more interesting is Fawley Temple, which seems to have been designed in 1769 and completed by 1771. An elegantly bowed substructure is surmounted by a domed cupola, but it is the decoration inside that gives the building its special interest since its green walls are painted with black and terracotta panels derived from Greek vases, and with other decorative elements which, rudimentary though some are, can certainly be categorised as "Etruscan" and the forerunners of Wyatt's later decoration at Heaton and Heveningham, and presumably of Adam's at Derby House and Osterley.¹⁸ It seems as if the Adam's claim that they had "not been able to discover, either in researches into antiquity or in the works of modern artists, any idea of applying the [Etruscan] taste to the decoration of apartments"¹⁹ revealed inadequate research. But then why should the great Adam brothers have gone to look at a Thames-side temple at Henley, the work of a little-known young architect from the Midlands. They might have heard about it if Biagio Rebecca was the painter, as Edward Croft-Murray suggested.²⁰ But is it not just possible that Wyatt – the rival of Panini(?) – might have been the artist? However, that is idle speculation. Rebecca was certainly one of the painters employed at the Pantheon, along with Edward Crace, so let us look at this crucial building in the career of the Adams' principal rival.

Externally, the facade to Oxford Street was unusual because of its two towers flanking a Classical frontispiece. Was this possibly a recollection of the Palladian remodelling of Villa Trissino at Rigo?²¹ Behind this narrow frontage a vestibule with screen colonnades and an apse led into a corridor with decorative plaster ceilings past card rooms into the great hall or rotunda. The generally accepted source of the plan is Santa Sophia at Constantinople, which was certainly a novel model and not altogether explicable since there is no reason to think Wyatt had been to Turkey. Had St Mark's aroused his interest in Byzantine architecture when he was in Venice? Was it not itself perhaps a source? The dome itself is obviously derived from the original at Rome, from which Wyatt had been slung in order to measure it, and the

canted corners seem to have been based on Bernini's treatment of the crossing piers in St Peter's, even if the young man did have a poor opinion of the Roman building. The main lines of the internal space were decorated with Classical detail, either in stucco by Joseph Rose or painted by Biagio Rebecca and Edward Crace.²² There were statues in the niches of the apse, and it is interesting that Fanny Burney's *Evelina* is made to reflect what was probably the author's own opinion, that although she was struck by the Pantheon's beauty, it had "more the appearance of a chapel, than of a place of diversion".²³

I feel the force of Miss Burney's comment very strongly, because earlier this month I was in Baltimore, Maryland, for the first time; and when I entered Latrobe's Roman Catholic cathedral I had a strange feeling of *déjà vu*. Here is the closest we can now come to Wyatt's Pantheon, even to a similar diameter of the rotunda and comparable spatial qualities. Latrobe, a pupil of Samuel Pepys Cockerell in the 1780s when the Pantheon was still a novelty, was, strangely enough, a family friend of the Burneys.²⁴

Why did the Pantheon provoke so much interest with 1,700 visitors on the opening day in 1772, and tales of streets jammed with traffic, offers from Russia, and much else? One obvious answer is the public nature of the building. This was not a private house which relatively few could see, but a place designed for entertainment – a winter Ranelagh, as Horace Walpole called it – and open to all (within reason).²⁵ We must remember too that this was the first dome constructed in London since that of St Paul's. It was also the first in England that was seriously based on the Rome Pantheon, with its nostalgic memories for those who had made the Grand Tour, and a substitute for those who had not seen it for themselves, although its 60ft diameter did not match up to the original, which is twice as large.

Walpole, of course, had seen the original; but, blasé though he usually was, this building amazed him and drew comparisons with "Balbek in all its glory . . . [and] Raphael's *loggias* in the Vatican". Later, he compared Wyatt's work with Adam's, being of the often-quoted opinion that Wyatt employed "the antique with more judgment".²⁶ In architectural form or decoration? He does not say; nor can one be quite sure what he means, although this seems to be a part of the general criticism of "lace and embroidery", "filigree" and "gingerbread and sippets of embroidery" which Walpole enjoyed levelling at Adam. There is plenty of evidence that during the 1770s fashionable taste was decreeing the Adams' work overdone, whereas Wyatt was very busy.

Howard Colvin lists almost 120 country houses, as well as town houses, 32 public buildings, and 23 cathedrals and churches, in which Wyatt was involved in some way, either as architect for a new building, or as remodeller or restorer.²⁷ Many of the domestic works can be said to have been more or less routine exercises in what we might not unfairly call a simplified Adamatic, such as various ceilings which incorporate more or less standard motifs, although we have to remember that Wyatt had seen and presumably recorded the same Antique sources as Adam had. Even so, one can often detect a bolder and simpler approach in their design, as in the Boudoir at Belton House of 1776 and a similar but unidentified design.²⁸ There was less use of filigree decoration, and so far as one can tell a more restrained use of colour. There are some hallmarks, for example the fan motif, of which Wyatt was fond. This could be used in various ways, fully opened or partially, upwards or downwards, in both Classical and Gothic interiors. There is some truth in the rather sycophantic pamphlet written by Robert Smirke senior, but published anonymously in 1779, which praises Wyatt at Adam's expense: "His ornaments are never of inelegant shapes, nor lavished with vulgar prodigality, nor too minute to be seen, nor so predominant as to engross our attention. We are never pained by lines violently contrasted, nor perplexed by a harsh opposition of glaring and discordant colours' etc."²⁹ As John Byrom wrote of two earlier 18th-century artists, Handel and Bononcini:

Strange! that such high dispute shou'd be
'Twixt Tweedledum and Tweedledee

The evident influence of Kedleston on Wyatt's early house designs has already been mentioned, and his first important house, Heaton Hall, which was possibly done in collaboration with his brother Samuel, illustrates this. It dates from 1772, the year of the Pantheon's opening. It is in effect James Paine's design for Kedleston,³⁰ which was quite well known, brought down to ground level, but Heaton also illustrates the change in relationship between a house and its surroundings. All signs of the *piano nobile*, which had gradually been losing its importance, have now gone and there is a direct sequence at ground level from the main rooms to colonnaded loggias and then directly into the garden. Heaton also shows Wyatt's strong inclination towards shallow Pantheon-like domes, and if we take away the wings we have what was to become a popular, much-imitated, villa design with a semi-circular or segmental central bow crowned by a shallow dome. Pilasters and half-columns are still there at Heaton to articulate the facades, although in later Wyatt designs these would be omitted so that, as Samuel Pepys Cockerell said in 1798, the "outside designs are blocks of stone".³¹ Heaton also illustrates how the Wyatts took advantage of new materials such as cast iron and Coade Stone, both to facilitate construction and to speed up building methods.

Inside, although as we have seen the elements in the decoration are similar to those used by Adam, there is a restraint in their use which was to increase over the decades until the familiar motifs virtually disappeared altogether. On the other hand there is the Cupola Room which was painted by Biagio Rebecca in a mixture of "Etruscan" and Renaissance grotesque decoration, possibly with memories of Stuart's Spencer House, possibly after Adam's design for a Painted Breakfast Room at Kedleston.³² The articulation of the room itself seems to owe something to Bramante's favourite triumphal arch motif that we can see in the Vatican and inside the tempietto of S. Pietro in Montorio, a Roman building with which Wyatt was doubtless familiar. At Heaton too, he seems to have been following to some extent the Adam practice of designing the furniture, often painted to form part of the decoration. How often he took on this responsibility is not clear since documentation of the likely houses is inconclusive, but the sale catalogue of Milton Abbey, for example, where he was working in the mid-1770s, contains several pieces which appear to have been architect designed to suit a decorative scheme.

Certainly, Wyatt designed furniture for the house which is the high point of his Classicism, Heveningham Hall.³³ His part seems to date from the early 1780s when he succeeded Sir Robert Taylor and made alterations to the interior as well as decorating the main rooms. There is an Etruscan Room, but it is not as assured as Adam's at Osterley which was almost certainly earlier in date. Certain elements introduced at Heaton recur, and once again Rebecca was employed to provide painted panels and, presumably, the arabesque *trompe l'oeil* decoration which harmonises with the plasterwork in the segmentally vaulted Saloon. In the library, the modelling of the walls with their repeated arch motif dominated over the delicate relief decoration, while both the arches and the portrait medallions seemed to be reflected subtly in the central medallion with its relief of Apollo and the Muses. Alas, that one has to use the past tense when referring to some of the detailing of this beautiful room, although restoration is slowly putting back the decoration characteristic of Wyatt's work in the 1780s. In the staircase hall too we see typical minimal decoration which became a Wyatt legacy to the next generation of the family.

But fortunately the great glory of Heveningham, the room which Christopher Hussey bracketed with Adam's Ante-room at Syon as "the finest . . . produced by English neo-Classicism", still exists, and almost certainly with its original painted decoration. This is Wyatt at his finest and most original; there could never be a charge of imitation here, but a bringing

together of elements from earlier designs, for instance the fluted fans which became almost Gothic fan-vaulting such as he was incorporating about the same time in Lee Priory. At Heveningham, see how the theme is taken up again in the alternative roses and half-roses in the vaulted ceiling. The whole room is a model of unity of design, the compartments in the scagliola floor related to those in the ceiling, the continuous bands of articulation formed by the pilasters, the ceiling ribs and the dark strips in the floor, and each item of furniture designed for an appointed place and painted to form a part of the whole. Each individual detail in this masterly design could be commented on for its contribution to the whole, and then there is the subtle colour scheme in many tones of green, interrupted only by the yellow scagliola pilasters.

Heveningham is certainly Wyatt's masterpiece, and in creating these superlative interiors he was casting off any question of imitative indebtedness to the Adams. But they were finished by 1784 and he was still in his 30s with another three decades of practice before him. In fact, the phase when, according to him, he had been "obliged to comply" with the fashion for Adamatic decoration was relatively short. He continued to work in a neo-Classical style when required, but his houses became increasingly austere externally and internally, as at Castle Coole in the 1790s, of which a French visitor commented "comfort has been almost entirely sacrificed to beauty". One might not agree, but one can see the precise, neat elegance that characterises such interiors. Charles Robert Cockerell was to describe such mid-career Wyatt houses, including Dodington, as "like a great box dropt upon the ground".³⁴

Dodington, his final design, seems to be looking in two directions. On one hand it appears to be reverting to Chambers' academic Classicism, reminding us that Wyatt told Farington there had been "no regular architecture since Sir William Chambers", in an apparent disparagement of Adam. The staircase hall at Dodington, for example, shows how far he had moved away from the Adamatic line. But on the other hand, this same house shows how Wyatt was modifying his Classical designs to accommodate up-to-date Picturesque theories. To one side of the house an impression of irregularity was given by attaching a domed church linked to it by a quadrant conservatory. The juxtaposition of the huge portico, more Greek than Roman in its proportions, and the curving glazed wall ending in the ecclesiastical terminal pavilion, is a striking and fluid composition. Inside the church he used giant Doric columns, another concession to changing taste,³⁵ although he had been interested in Greek architecture as early as the 1770s when he took over the Radcliffe Observatory at Oxford and provided a version of the Tower of the Winds, which could well have been suggested by acquaintance with Stuart's work at Shugborough, near Wyatt's early home.

Wyatt has been criticised for his eclecticism; but the ease with which he could turn his hand to different styles explains why he continued to retain his position as the unrivalled fashionable architect for such a long time despite a long list of clients who complained they were being neglected. They still came, and when he died in 1813 the Prince Regent, who seems to have waited a long time to employ him at Carlton House, lamented "he had just found a man to his mind, and was thus unhappily deprived of him".

The Adam brothers were, as we have heard, pioneers in creating a castellated or baronial style for the exteriors of picturesque compositions inspired by heroic landscapes; but there is no evidence that Wyatt's career as a Goth was inspired by their example. Both were working in a variety of semi-fortified style in the 1770s, and in this case Wyatt was developing his own methods, first in a hesitant manner in such designs as Sheffield Place, Sandleford Priory and Lee Priory. Nor were his castellated houses, Belvoir, Norris Castle and the extraordinary New Palace at Kew which had a life span of less than 20 years, like Adam's; they were more Picturesque in outline although often symmetrical in plan; but what they did was to establish Wyatt as an authority on Gothic architecture. His work on cathedrals, by no means

always as bad as his detractors proclaimed it, is outside the scope of this brief paper; but the picture would be hopelessly incomplete if one omitted reference to two designs of Wyatt's maturity which shows how much he had learned from his close association with most of the major English cathedrals – an experience that he skilfully incorporated in his own romantic compositions which exploited “the *Abbey Gothic*” and “the *House Gothic*” which led to “the date of Queen Elizabeth”, to use Repton's definitions.³⁶

Between 1796 and 1812 there was the scarcely credible Fonthill Abbey with its awesome staircase and great octagon, its treasure-filled galleries, and its challenge to the supremacy of Salisbury Cathedral's central tower. Here was the *Abbey-Gothic* in all its sublimity; and then in the slightly later Ashridge there is the *House-Gothic* with its echoes of Wollaton, its screened entrance hall leading to the dizzy height of the staircase-hall, and the convincingly detailed Gothic decorations and furnishing of the chapel which was completed by James's nephew Jeffry.³⁷ Here we are in a quite different world from those years when there was gossip about the Adam-Wyatt rivalry and opinions about which of the two was the more truly Antique. But by then Antiquity had acquired a respectable native connotation and was no longer simply that of the Classical world.

Although Robert Adam and James Wyatt were separated by only 18 years in age, Wyatt seems to belong more to the 19th century, of which he was to know 13 years before meeting his death in a carriage accident in 1813, whereas all the Adam brothers died before the end of the 18th century to which they belong. If there was serious rivalry between them, it was short lived. Each made a great contribution to our architecture, and in death their dust was mingled in Westminster Abbey. And on a note of requiem we might recall that Wyatt's complaint that the public taste had been corrupted by the Adams was echoed 40 years later by Beckford's cursing “a plague of Wyattiana. That infamous style will corrupt all England. *Libera me, Domine, di questa morte aeterna.*”³⁸

NOTES

1. R. and J. Adam, *Works in Architecture*, London, 1773.
2. Chambers to Lord Grantham. BM Add.MS.41134,34; quoted in J. Harris, *Sir William Chambers*, London, 1970, 70.
3. Adam to Lord Scarsdale, December 7 and 27, 1769, Curzon MSS; quoted in J. M. Robinson, *The Wyatts: An Architectural Dynasty*, Oxford, 1979, 59.
4. J. Farington, Diary (typescript in the British Library Print Room), p.2498, January 8, 1804.
5. *Ibid.*, p.10, January 19, 1794.
6. *Ibid.*, p.1122, November 7, 1797.
7. *Ibid.*, p.1281, July 28, 1798; Smith's residence is now Palazzo Mangili-Valmarana, see E. Bassi, *Architettura del sei e settecento a Venezia*, Naples 1962, 254.
8. D. Succi, (ed.), *Capricci Veneziani del settecento*, Gorizia, 1988, 223ff.
9. S. Lang, “Visentini Drawings”, *Architectural Review* CXIII, 1953, 192ff; J. McAndrew, *Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects: Antonio Visentini*, Farnborough, 1974, 7ff.
10. *Gentleman's Magazine* 1813, II, 296f.
11. The painting is in the collection of Leeds City Art Gallery at Temple Newsam House; see W. Wells, “The Pantheon, Oxford Road”, *Leeds Arts Calendar* V, 1952, no. 17, 11ff.
12. *Survey of London: St. James and Westminster*, Part II, London, 1963, 273.
13. Farington, *op.cit.*, 858, December 12, 1796.
14. A. Visentini, *Osservazioni che servono di continuazione al trattato di Teofilo Gallaccini*, Venice, 1771 (1970 reprint).
15. See references to these architects in Bassi, *op.cit.*, and F. Barbieri, *Illuminati e neoclassici a Vicenza*, Vicenza, 1972.

16. D. Linstrum, *Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects: The Wyatt Family*, Farnborough, 1974, 40.
17. See D. Buttle, "James Wyatt and the Early Greek Revival", *Studies in Architectural History* (Singleton, W. A. ed.), London, 1956, II, 70ff.
18. E. Harris and J. M. Robinson. "New Light on Wyatt at Fawley", *Architectural History* 27, 1984, 263ff; J. M. Robinson, "Temple of Delight", *Country Life* July 4, 1991.
19. See J. and A. Rykwert, *Robert and James Adam*, New York, 1985, 132f.
20. R. Croft-Murray, *Decorative Painting in England 1537-1837*, London, 1970, II, 261.
21. R. Cevese, *Ville della Provincia di Vicenza*, Milan, 1971, I, 72ff.
22. *Survey of London, op. cit.*, 271.
23. F. Burney, *Evelina*, London, 1932, 119.
24. See T. Hamlin, *Benjamin Henry Latrobe*, New York, 1955, 248ff; M. Lane, *Architecture of the Old South: Maryland*, New York, 1991, 116ff.
25. P. Cunningham, (ed.), *Letters of Horace Walpole*, Edinburgh, 1906, V, 235. Walpole to Rev. William Mason, May 6, 1770.
26. *Ibid.*, V, 489, Walpole to Mason, July 29, 1773.
27. H. M. Colvin, *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600-1840*, London, 1978, 940ff.
28. J. Harris, *A Catalogue of British Drawings . . . in American Collections*, Upper Saddle River, 1971.
29. See J. Lees-Milne, *The Age of Adam*, London, 1957, 153.
30. See P. Leach, *James Paine*, London, 1988, 89ff.
31. Farington, *op. cit.*, p.1352, November 10, 1798.
32. L. Harris, *Robert Adam and Kedleston*, London, 1987, pls. 41-42.
33. C. Hussey, *English Country Houses, Mid-Georgian 1760-1800*, London, 1956, 165ff.
34. J. Harris, "C. R. Cockerell's 'Ichnographica Domestica'", *Architectural History* XIV, 1971, 11.
35. See Buttle, *op. cit.*
36. Repton's Red Book for Panshanger, 1800; see D. Linstrum, *Sir Jeffry Wyattville, Architect to the King*, Oxford, 1972, 53.
37. *Ibid.*, 97ff.
38. B. Alexander, *Life at Fonthill 1807-1822*, London, 1957, 157.