



THE
GEORGIAN
GROUP

Alistair Rowan, 'The Adam Brothers and Contemporary Office Practice', *Adam in Context*, Georgian Group Symposium, 1992, pp. 42-49

THE ADAM BROTHERS AND CONTEMPORARY OFFICE PRACTICE

Alistair Rowan

In this paper I have been given an uncongenial task as I have been asked to ignore one of my prime interests, the Adam brothers and their buildings, and to concentrate rather on their office practice and the back-room boys whom they employed. I cannot speak of other architects' offices and assistants, except in a general sense, as I have not the detailed knowledge, but it may be helpful, as a selective exercise, to focus on the brothers' assistants: the men who may, or may not, have had an impact on their practice. What is required, I suppose, is a kind of architectural historian's equivalent of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern so perhaps I should begin by saying "Brunias and Dewez are dead". We know really very little about the draughtsmen in the brothers' employment: back-room boys remain in the back room and British architectural history would care very little about the careers of Agostino Brunias or Laurent-Benoit Dewez were it not for the fact that they were for a number of years employed by Robert Adam and drawn into his team. So what can we say?

I believe the first point to make is that the Adam brothers' consistent practice of using specialists within what we would now call the design team is rooted in their experience as men of business and builders. Robert and James combined in a quite special way the advantages of travel and a good education with the practical experience of trade. Much has been made in recent writing of the double life which Bob and Jamie found it expedient to follow while in Rome: this can I think be over-emphasised for I do not believe that there was any very great mis-match between Robert Adam's interests as a builder and as an elegant architect. The one, in my view, informed the other, so much so that the brothers' attitude towards the assistants whom they employed may be seen as no more than a logical extension of their early appreciation of the role which expert craftsmen could play in the execution of their ideas. In this regard the making of designs was closely similar to the construction of buildings: both required skilled operatives in whom the Adams had confidence and who could execute the brothers' ideas to the highest standards.

The earliest evidence for the Adams' dependence on craftsmen of quality is supplied by their behaviour, when in 1748, after William Adam's death, John and Robert attempted to introduce a new lighter style to Scottish interior work and brought new craftsmen to Hopetoun House to fit out the state rooms there. Thus they sought out George Dawson, a Scottish lad who had served his apprenticeship with the Anglo-Danish stucco worker Charles Stanley in St John's, Westminster, and whom they encouraged to return to Scotland in 1750 to execute new Rococo decorations very much in the taste of Isaac Ware's Chesterfield House. In the same way John insisted on employing an expensive wright, John Paterson, for the joinery work of the new rooms and when Lord Hopetoun's factor, Alexander Williamson, disputed Paterson's charges, Adam defended them immediately with the following minute: "there is no doubt that the prices seem high and would really be so for any other work but as it is the very best kind that ever I saw there is no doing a thing in an extraordinary manner without the price adequate to the pains".¹ I think we might almost be justified in taking this as a maxim for the *modus operandi* of all the Adam brothers – "there is no doing a thing in an extraordinary manner without the price adequate to the pains".

While he was abroad Robert Adam operated in very much the same way: he realised that Clerisseau and Piranesi had much to teach him and so he was prepared to pay money for his education and to act as patron to both men. He knew he would require expert draughtsmen to develop both the Antique motifs and new ornaments of his designs and to operate as lieutenants in the impending Adam Revolution. To this end, just as John Adam had coaxed Dawson to return to Scotland for the work at Hopetoun, so Robert brought Brunias, the Roman, and Dewez, a draughtsman from Liege, with him when he returned to London in January 1758.²

There is one family letter, of February 1, 1758 written by James Adam from a cold London to his sister Nellie in Edinburgh which vividly records the first days of his brother's practice and the impact which Robert's cosmopolitan assistants had on the young Scot. "I am just now come home after having paid a good many visits along with Bob and I have parted with him as he had yet another to pay before he should end the Labours of the Day. I have sat this half hour warming myself by the fire and chatting French at a great rate with Messrs. Liegeois & Romaine." At this point Robert Adam evidently returned for the letter continues, in maceronic style, "*Nondum pace* [no peace yet] Bob and his Italian are quivering away at this *nondum pace* to such a degree that I can't write a word & dare say if you heard them you would still enjoy less repose than I do, till you had made yourself mistress of them, for even I am so fond of Bob's Italian airs that I am insensibly making the most absurd attempts upon them to the great amusement of the traveller who laughs me to scorn."³

Later the same year we find the younger brothers angling to get their eldest brother, Johnnie in Edinburgh to relinquish a young clerk, George Richardson, who had joined the brothers' Edinburgh office two years before, so that he could come down to London, train properly in Robert's office and then travel in Italy with James. "What strikes me is the loss you will be at for a draughtsman" wrote Robert on November 10, 1758. He knew how difficult it was to pick up one that knew anything in England or in Italy and besides he had a problem with one unsatisfactory Scottish boy, Jack Strachan, whom Adam explained had suffered from toothache, sweatings and feverish heats for more than three months, but who had never been a success. "Even when he was well", Robert wrote, "I did not find in him the least fire or ambition to become equal to his neighbours as he never touched a pen but in the drawing room where he was quite awkward and insufferably slow."⁴ Bob and Jamie agreed the best thing would be to send Strachan back to Scotland where he "could draw for Jonnie" and to get Richardson to London. At this stage, some 10 months into his London practice, Robert had it in mind to take an apprentice as he had the offer of one, though we do not know his name, and he was also anxious to procure the services of one Lillyman who would act as a draughtsman, measurer and estimator all in one. He had been badly served by "that idiot, young Mercer" who was confused in all he did and failed to turn up for meetings.

When James in his turn went to Italy, duly accompanied by George Richardson, he, like Robert, remained on the *qui vive* for good Continental assistants: "Let Bob know" he writes to Betty Adam on December 26, 1761 "that I picked up at Naples another youth for him. He promises very well if he holds on and has this great advantage that his great delight is architecture and he already draws it well."⁵ In a later letter of April 1762 we learn that Robert had tried his luck with another Scottish assistant J. Fordyce who this time turned out well. Jamie was pleased as he "always thought him a good open-hearted lad".⁶

Two letters – from Jamie to Jenny on November 20, 1762, and her reply – throw more light on the early office staff. "As both Bob and Willie are people of great affairs, I will trust you to return me the necessary answers. Amongst others I should be glad to know what Bruny's salary now is, (that is Agostino Brunias) & what he boards for in London, that is to say bed, board & washing – & also if he attends and keeps all feasts as he did in this country, or

how he manages that particular. What does Bob give to a common draughtsman, such as the stupid line drawer he had when I left London? . . . I should be glad to have from you a list of Bob's present set of Draughtsmen & their different provinces."⁷

To this intriguing letter Jenny replied on December 21, "Bruny's salary is about £60. He boards for something under £40. He seems to keep very much the same feast days with the Church of England for Bob very seldom misses him at any other time. There is no such thing as getting a tolerable draughtsman at under £40 salary. Bob says he wrote you himself", she adds "of the present state of his draughtsmen and their different employments".⁸ Sadly, Bob's letter, which promises considerable detail on the management of the office, has not survived.

Two months later on January 8, 1763, James is writing to Willie, "I see Bob approves of my three recruits, who I make no doubt will be very useful people. My Arabesque" – James here probably means Giuseppe Manocchi – "paints Oyl and quazza but I don't believe he has any practice in fresco, but he is very sharp and is a great mechanical man . . . Zucchi will either remain here or return to Venice as it promises best for himself, as I can by no means charge myself with him, further than doing him all the service I can, which he really deserves not only as an artist, but as a worthy honest lad, a most singular character in this degenerate country. Bob speaks as if I had a regiment of engravers. I have but one (Verronese) and he is charged with a wife and family and is very untransportable. Besides that this man is most usefully employed under Clerisseau and will probably rear us some young Elves".⁹

Antonio Zucchi was taken on by the brothers principally to forward Robert's great work of scholarship, *The Ruins of the Emperor Diocletian's Palace at Spalatro* for which he drew many of the plates in Italy. Despite what James says, however, he did travel to London and settled down as a specialist craftsman employed in the Adam office until the 1780s and specialising in the supply of small canvasses of neo-Classical subjects to be incorporated into the brothers' decorative schemes, a notable example of which occurs in the library at Kenwood.

We should note that all these assistants, in James's phrase the "young elves" are, and were to remain, paid employees, under contract to work for the brothers. With the exception perhaps of Jack Strachan, and the unidentified young man taken on in 1758 – perhaps Fordyce – the brothers did not have apprentices. They engaged good draughtsmen on a contract basis and paid them well. In return they were strict and, though the evidence is far from complete, appear not to have been very considerate employers. Perhaps this is a builder's or a business man's trait: a bargain is a bargain and, once struck, you stick to it.

There are at least four instances of the brothers' treatment of assistants which illustrate this. During the summer of 1758, the earliest days in London, when Robert had already expended a great deal of capital on his own education, and was feeling the want of any real employment, he tried to procure the post of "architect to the kings palaces in Scotland" – "a place of £300 yearly without doing anything for it" which was not to be neglected. In an attempt to engage the Duke of Argyll on his behalf he had employed Brunias to paint a large landscape view of Inveraray Castle as a present for the Duke who liked it and gave Adam "£20 to give to my Italian." But, as Adam wrote to Jamie in August that year "I who am more needy than he, gave him £5.10.0 of it and with the rest paid £6 for the frame and £3 for the cloth, colours etc and 10 shillings for a frame to his small view of it, so that you see, I clear myself of all charges, which would have been very ridiculous for me to be at and retain £5 to myself and have the consolation to think my time has not been thrown away in vain."¹⁰

This is perhaps no more than a properly cautious distribution of limited funds by an employer at the start of his practice. James's inconsiderate treatment of his own assistant on the Grand Tour, George Richardson is harder to defend. Here the draughtsman's complaint

relates to the clothes which were supplied for him while in Italy and the restraints which James placed on his assistant's activities. This tale comes from a long and detailed Grand Tour letter which Richardson wrote to Archibald Shiells of Inverask in October 1762:

“When we first spoke about my last suit he proposed to give me a stuff of silk and cotton, but instead of that and without ever acquainting me of the change bought me a very coarse woollen stuff worn by the lowest tradesmen, which I took very ill and resolved that it should not pass without him having some sharp answers, be the consequence what it would. So I asked him if he had seen the stuff that was bought for my cloaths, he said yes, why did I ask. I told him I hardly believed he would propose to give me a silk and cotton stuff and to buy such a coarse stuff as had never been worn upon my back. He replied that a silken stuff would become dear. I told him I did not expect anything of silk but thought I might pretend to a coarse Camblet at least. He said as we were going to Greece that it was little matter how we went. I said that might be but I saw no reason why I should be obliged to go meanly in Rome where everyone goes remarkably genteel. Then he said that a suit might serve two summers and that at least if not this season, next summer we would be in Turkey, and that the more we all went like slovens it would be the better, to which I answered that he might have ordered the lining of my breeches a little finer without any risk of the Turks seeing them for they were fitter to make sacks of to hold corn than to be lining to my breeches and that I was sure they would prod me for many days before the hardness went off them . . . I know he intends to settle in London with his brother and I understand he proposes keeping me with him there but I have not this from his own mouth . . . At the same time I cannot entertain the smallest thoughts of doing without him or his brothers, well knowing my own incapacity, small fortune, want of books and little hopes of interest . . . I don't intend ever to make a longer agreement at a time than for one year . . .

During our stay abroad I have now got together several rough sketches of Antiquities which will be very useful for my own study, if I get them home concealed from Mr. Adam's sight, for I know if he were to see them, I would run a risk of his everlasting displeasure, though I do them in my ly hours and even when I should sleep. For I have seen examples of this, when one would do good for themselves they loose his favour, though it can by no means encroach upon any of his properties.”¹¹

James not infrequently appears in this ungenerous light. The brothers, especially at the start of their London practice, clearly aimed at imposing a cultural monopoly on English taste and would brook no competition from assistants who had trained with them and whom they paid. They were anxious to keep Clerisseau out of London at all costs and to control the specialist draughtsmen whom they brought from the continent. Giuseppe Manocchi, who was one of James's discoveries and who was to be their decorative and figurative specialist, felt he had been harshly treated when, after 10 years of service, he returned to Italy in 1773.¹²

The case of Joseph Bonomi also illustrates this point. Bonomi, who was destined to make a significant and distinctive contribution to British architecture, was no underprivileged Adam protégé, but an educated artist who had trained with Asprucci in Rome and who later studied with the Marchese Teodili. He worked under contract for James in Italy from 1763 before travelling to London to join the Adam firm by invitation in 1767. As an Adam employee with a retaining contract, he records that he was forbidden to work on his own account – in fact he had agreed not to do so in his contract – and that a penalty clause of

£200 insured his compliance in this respect. As Bonomi grew older – he was only 24 when he began to work for James Adam – this limitation, which even restricted the development of his own ideas for his own use, was something which he evidently resented.¹³

Our last instance of the Adams' unscrupulousness in relation to their work force comes from the extraordinary vignette of the brothers, absolutely stuck for cash in the recession of the 1770s and 1780s, and attempting to off-load a long-dated bond on Angelica Kaufmann through the agency of the faithful and long-serving Antonio Zucchi who had become her husband. On December 9, 1779, William writes to John in Edinburgh that "the only solid fund of which we have the smallest expectation is the annuity which I formerly mentioned to you we had offered to General Clerk, which we have some faint expectation of being bought by Angelica Kauffman which we have proposed to her through Zucchi". Early in the new year, however, William despairingly reports that "Angelica, who herself was very desirous of agreeing to the proposal of an annuity, cannot get her father to give his consent."¹⁴

That the foreign draughtsmen were important to the execution of the Adam style is demonstrated by a comparatively early letter from Robert to James on July 24, 1760, which possibly provided the incentive to seek out Manocchi: "I tremble for Brunias, for I do not think he has a constitution for this country . . . I therefore wish that you would cast about for some clever one in that way, or some boy with good disposition to ornaments and figures and keep him either at work with you or send him to England and I could put him under Brunny – as he complains much of his eyes and I find grudges much drawing of ornament so small that it blinds him, so that I am convinced he would do everything he could to learn one in order to relieve himself".¹⁵

It was no doubt these Italian draughtsmen who executed the finely coloured and detailed drawings which the Adams used to present their ideas, particularly for interior decoration, to major clients while "the stupid line drawer", of whom James wrote, and his successors may have been employed on office surveys, such as the firm's record of old Mamhead House near Exeter,¹⁶ (which is a workmanlike but inexpert set of drawings), to enlarge plans to a bigger scale and to make office copies of different schemes – often only completed in outline and in part – before the original drawings were sent out on site. The Adams do not appear ever to have used tracing paper, for which recipes existed since the mid century. All their copy drawings are pricked through, which was the normal 18th-century practice.

Quite a few of the drawings in the Soane Museum carry the encouraging pencil inscription "buono" which suggests that the Continental draughtsmen exercised an element of what we would now call "quality control" in the Grosvenor Street and Adelphi offices. A drawing from the very end of the Adams' practice for the castellated stable block at Mauldslee Castle in Lanarkshire, drawn partly in ink but with the central block unfinished and in pencil, carries an unusual inscription which records the writer's concern over the appearance of one element in the design: "This spire does not seem to be in the right proportion. I can find no scale, always put a scale to your drawings as I don't know anything so provoking as to be in want of one." This note, left for a new clerk, must have been written either by Adam himself or else by John Paterson who conducted the Adam Scottish office in Edinburgh during the last years of Robert's life.¹⁷ It speaks directly of the regular use of dividers in 18th-century architects' offices, and of the real inconvenience caused by a clerk who omitted the drawn scale.

We know from the dust marks on the back of parts of many drawings in the Soane Museum that while the brothers were in practice they kept the drawings for their various schemes in rolls often with inscriptions scrawled across the loose end of the back to identify the contents of each roll. Some inscriptions are in red ink, some in black and as several are duplicated it seems fair to assume that from time to time the clerks were set to work to tidy up

the drawing store. The back edge of some of the early drawings are deeply engrained with dirt, which is perhaps not surprising for rolls of paper, kept in open racks for more than 36 years.

The coverage of different schemes by the drawings in the Soane Museum is quite erratic and it seems fair to assume that after both brothers' deaths a good many individual sheets and even rolls of their drawings disappeared. Peggy Adam in London and Mary Drysdale, Robert's widowed sister who was responsible for the office in Edinburgh, have both left letters which reflect their concern for their brothers' designs. "You and Mrs Drysdale have both been wishing us to come down with Bob if he goes [to Edinburgh] this summer", Peggy writes to Susan Clerk in the spring of 1789. "We all swear to stay and we think there are insurmountable objections arising from the insupportable depravity of the servants of this place and the things that are left in this house are not like what other people leave behind them because the books and drawings are like stock in trade and are at the same time very perishable."¹⁸ In Edinburgh Mrs Drysdale was no less concerned to protect the Adams' drawings. She did not trust the Scottish staff and had a particular aversion for John Paterson, against whom Robert had begun legal proceedings which were dropped only on account of Adam's death in 1792. On December 19, 1796, two years after James's death, she wrote to Peggy Adam from Edinburgh to explain why she had sent drawings from the Scottish office to London: evidently this large collection of rolls of loose drawings had not been entirely welcome.

"I was sorry when Mr. & Mrs. Clerk told me that you was mad at the Box with the drawings being sent from there. You had never said anything positively against it and I did not consider them at all safe in this place. There was not a single place in the world either in the box or out of it without running the risk of being destroyed by damp and I was quite unhappy at their being at the mercy of anybody that chused to go into Cairncrosses house when he was out of it and break open the box and take out any drawings they pleased. I always had a dread of that fellow Paterson playing some mischief and was glad when I got them away."¹⁹

Both letters articulate strongly the notion that designs have value in themselves and that ideas like objects should be protected against theft. This must represent Robert and James's own views.

From 1764 when William Adam and Company was founded, a firm which rapidly became the largest building contractor in Britain, employing between 2,000 and 3,000 men at any one time, the flux of draughtsmen and clerks between the brothers' drawing office as architects and the building company can only be imagined. Like any large practice in the present century draughtsmen must have been taken on and paid off according to the pressure of work in the office. The names of some have accidentally come down to us, John Robertson, Clerkson and Fordyce. John Raffield, who first entered the Adams' entourage while working for James Nisbet at Ford Castle in Northumberland, is a figure of whom it would be interesting to know more. He appears to have acted as something like a business manager for Robert and James from the late 1770s at least until 1788 when he was in charge of all the negotiations in relation to Lord Delaval's house in Hanover Square and at Milburn Place in Surrey.²⁰ He may have remained with the brothers until James's death in 1794. By 1797 Raffield was established as an architect in private practice, exhibiting at the Royal Academy and specialising in the design of bridges and minor Classical villas. His Chain Gate at Easton Neston, Northamptonshire, is clearly derived from the Adam gateway to Syon.²¹

Besides Raffield there were inevitably some other men who stayed with the Adams long enough to become valued executants of their manner and to absorb a good deal of their

style. The sheer bulk of the brothers' production seems to suggest, however, that, as seems to be the case with Raffield, the stylistic traffic was, for the most part, one way. William Thomas, the architect in 1789 of Sir Richard Arkwright's Willersley Castle in Derbyshire provides the sole example of an English assistant who adopted the idiom of Robert's castle style and whose *Original Designs in Architecture* of 1783 catch much of the essence of the villas designed by the brothers in the late 1770s and early 80s. Whether he also contributed to that style with its preference for pure geometry and the lucid articulation of small elements can not be determined. Robert Adam appears as one of the subscribers to Thomas's book which may indicate a recognition by the brothers of a contribution which went beyond that of a mere draughtsman.

We should also note that George Richardson, after 18 years with "those eminent masters, Messrs Adam of the Adelphi" produced in his *Book of Ceilings* of 1774 clear evidence of the benefits of a close association with the Adam style, which continued in his *New Collection of Chimneypieces* of 1782 and the *New Designs in Architecture* of 1792. Richardson is one employee who seems in the end to have won approval from the brothers for a degree of artistic independence. Perhaps they saw him as less of a threat though, if they did so, the fact that Richardson's ceiling design was to be chosen for the hall at Kedleston must have been a particularly galling occurrence.²² While he was their pupil Richardson obtained a premium for an architectural design from the Society of Arts in 1765. He also competed in 1769 for the design of the Dublin Royal Exchange and exhibited regularly at the Society of Artists from 1776, while acting as their "draughtsman and designer" which is his own description of his job.

We might wonder also whether James Playfair whose penchant for Italianate roofs formed as shallow slate pyramids, demonstrated in his schemes for Townley Hall, Co. Louth in Ireland, for Ardkinglass in Argyll and at Cairness in Aberdeenshire also worked with the Adams and perhaps contributed to the spare astylar idiom of Robert's late villa schemes, most notable in country house designed for Sir Samuel Hannay at Kirkdale in Galloway in 1788. Men like Bonomi, Thomas and Playfair are the only architects of stature in England, with perhaps the modest George Richardson whose books did much to disseminate the brothers' decorative style, to emerge as independent personalities from the anonymity of the Adam office.

In Scotland, where so much of Robert's late work is located, the Adam practice in Edinburgh bred up a minor tribe of imitators and copyists: these were John Paterson, the chief clerk with whom Robert quarrelled in the last year of his life and who imitated the Adam Classical and castle styles with verve and subtle variety; Richard Crichton, the son of a builder at the university and a young draughtsman, taken on by Paterson, who particularly copied the castle style and Robert Reid who made of the solemn architecture of Edinburgh university a storehouse for his own designs. Robert Burn, the father of the more famous William Burn, and David Hamilton of Glasgow are two further Scottish architects much influenced by the example of Adam office who may perhaps have been drawn into the Scottish net. Burn is indeed an interesting case: his castle style, best known in the battlemented telescope erected on the Calton Hill in Edinburgh as a monument to Nelson, comes directly out of Robert's own castle idiom, and it has always seemed to me to be significant that his son William, the major country house architect in Britain in the 1830s and 1840s should guard the drawings of his office, the detail of his planning and the know-how of his firm with all the rigour that had characterised the Adams' own procedures.

Yet the offices in London and Edinburgh can never have been the only schools for the Adam style. Their own buildings proclaimed their manner strongly and provided a public pattern that could neither be kept secret nor ignored. Here the fine line which divided the

profession and the building trade in 18th-century Britain must further confuse our topic, for Samuel Wyatt is clearly an important agent in the dissemination of the Adam manner and his contact with their style came not through exposure to the think-tank of the office full of Italian chatter but through the superintendence of what was undoubtedly their most sophisticated early work at Kedleston. As a final footnote we may record close Scottish parallels to Wyatt's role in England in the careers of James Nisbet, who executed the works at Wedderburn Castle, and of Hugh Cairncross, an able designer in his own right, whom the brothers sent up from London in 1777 as clerk of works at Culzean and who remained to practice as an Adamesque architect in Scotland.

NOTES

1. A. Rowan, "The Building of Hopetoun", John Newman (ed.), *Design and Practice in British Architecture, Architectural History* 27, 1984, 197.
2. A very full account of both the Adam brothers' years in Italy is given in John Fleming, *Robert Adam and his circle in Edinburgh and Rome*, London, 1962.
3. Two extensive collections of letters between various members of the Adam family are deposited in the Scottish Record Office in Edinburgh: letters in the Clerk of Penicuik collection are in Register House, Princes Street, (G.D. 18) and from the Blair Adam collection in West Register House, Charlotte Square (TD 77). The letter cited here is S.R.O., G.D. 18, 4847.
4. G.D. 18, 4853.
5. G.D. 18, 4919.
6. G.D. 18, 4932.
7. G.D. 18, 4947.
8. G.D. 18, 4950.
9. G.D. 18, 4955.
10. The story of Adam's attempt to secure this post is told in two letters from Robert to James written in August 1758, G.D. 18, 4850 & 4851.
11. National Library of Scotland, MS 3812.
12. H. M. Colvin, *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600–1840*, London, 1978, see Robert Adam.
13. For Bonomi see Peter Meadows, *Joseph Bonomi, Architect 1739–1808*, London, 1988, 4–5, which reproduces Bonomi's account, written in 1800, of his time as a retained draughtsman working for the Adam brothers.
14. The financial difficulties of the brothers in London and the affairs of their building firm, William Adam & Company, are recorded in an extensive series of papers from Blair Adam. This particular story is reported in Blair Adam MS 4/1/letters no. 2 & 3.
15. G.D. 18, 4866.
16. For this see Alistair Rowan, *Robert Adam, Catalogue of Architectural Drawings in the Victoria and Albert Museum*, London, 1988, 86.
17. Sir John Soane's Museum, Adam Drawings, Vol. 29, f.15.
18. G.D. 18, 4961/15.
19. G.D. 18, 5549/19. Quoted in A. Rowan, *Designs for Castles and Country Villas by Robert and James Adam*. Oxford & New York, 1985, 11, which also discusses the working of the brothers' offices and the collection of their drawings.
20. Papers relating to Adam's work for Sir John Hussey Delaval in the city of London and at Milburn are in the Northumberland Record Office, 2 DE/23/1, 2 & 3.
21. Colvin, 1978, see Raffield.
22. Richardson's drawings are reproduced in Leslie Harris, *Robert Adam & Kedleston. The making of a Neo-classical masterpiece*. London, 1987, 45 & 46.