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Abstract

Although French influence in English architecture can be traced to the Norman Conquest and is clearly evidenced in the late seventeenth-, early eighteenth-century work of Christopher Wren and other Baroque architects, such as Vanbrugh and Gibbs, a direct exchange of the two nations' ideas on architecture and decoration does not seem to have significantly occurred until shortly before the Revolution that annihilated France’s ancien régime and destroyed the royal patronage which had sustained the finest artists, architects and craftsmen to exist since the Italian Renaissance.

The examination concentrates on the last three phases of French influence in English architecture. It begins with what has been described as the final flowering of true taste in the first decades of the nineteenth century, transits the early and mid-Victorian debased revivals and completes its history in the years between the First and Second World Wars, when retrospective evocations accomplished a presentation worthy of their historical models. It parallels these with England's rise to and status as the greatest military and commercial power on Earth, cites many of the wealthiest and most influential people of the times - who naturally enough selected the costliest representative styles to mark their social and financial position - and traces the development of supportive crafts through one of the most remarkable periods of world history. The French, who from the late Renaissance, admit to very little outside influence in architecture and decoration, will be seen has having continuously benefited from English thought until the last decades of the nineteenth century, when Beaux-Arts architecture and design became what we think of in modern terms as the first great international style.

This dissertation is dedicated to Professor Derek Linstrum, who suggested its theme, and continuously counselled the writer throughout its entirety, including the three years after his retirement from the University of York, Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies.

...par loir très humble serviteur.
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Preface

In this review of what is essentially a French influence in nineteenth-century English domestic architecture and decoration, the writer will attempt to describe, largely through case study analysis, the development of this taste from the late Neo-Classical period (Regency/English Empire) until its most pervasive evidence approaching and spanning the short reign of Edward VII. Although many writers have made peripheral notations about the French retrospective appearing amongst a plethora of eclectic themes during this period, many do so disparagingly, as if the entire Victorian age were a tasteless rummaging of times past in an attempt to provide connotative sanctuary within the harsh realities of an emerging industrial world. And they are not altogether wrong in this attitude, if their view is prejudiciously retrospective itself. To say however that "the virtue went out of it and never came back" is to discount the great technological advances that occurred, specifically in regard to furniture and decoration - and the superb craftsmanship accompanying this progress - but also as concerns the art of building itself. Certainly these developed as the result of an unprecedented prosperity following the French wars, but also were due to a corresponding population explosion, and its demands for a greater good for the greater number (an eighteenth-century idea) overstepping aristocratic priorities, which hung on as it were until the Great Wars destroyed certainly the substance of mankind's gentler dream.

The study's goal as such is hopefully to extend the academic knowledge of its specific subject, and provide a supplementary perspective of historical persons and times. The writer has concentrated on those projects which he has identified as being central to the work (refer Contents), and in certain instances the architects, decorators and craftsmen who were positioned to carry them out. Thus, once having sketched a general chronology, the investigation became inductive rather than a process by which an evolution of taste were established with examples cited as evidence. In this way, discovery informed and consequentially lead the narrative; or, the history, with very little imposed direction, demanded that known facts and associative suppositions develop the outline. As a result - and with the practical concessions to time and space - much of what was researched, certainly pertaining to civic architecture, including clubs, theatres, and even ships and yachts, became peripheral if not redundant. Even within the specific parameter of domestic architecture and decoration, the writer has focused his research on interior architectural decoration, documenting a great number of instances, which certainly provide evidentiary support for a proliferation of French-inspired interiors in England during the latter half of the century. From the extensive Photographic
archive at the National Monuments Record alone, over three hundred and fifty were identified, which might have formed an accompanying gazetteer, but certainly would have proved a monotonous if not tedious exercise for both writer and reader, as likewise would have been an attempt to enumerate the several French-inspired edifices which proliferate just London's urban landscape. In deference to the reader, who may or may not be familiar with this theme and aspects of the enormous scope of French design influence in England (as well as throughout the western world), he will hopefully sympathize with the writer's quandary as to whom and what he might mention here as not being mentioned in the general text with regard to whom and what he is not mentioning at all. If a definition of "courage" is knowing one will fail before one begins, but begins anyway, the writer respectfully asks for the reader's forbearance in this brief, courageous attempt.

Certainly Robert Kerr's espousal of French Classicism as being the only reasonable course for English architecture found enthusiasts amongst the top ranks of late nineteenth-century professionals, amongst whom a Gallic response all but hallmarked their careers: This was especially true of the great theatre architects, Charles John (C.J.) Phipps (1835-97 - see pages 126 & 445), Thomas (1837-91) and his Paris-trained son, Frank Verity (1867-1937), Frank Matcham (1854-1920 - page 434) and Matcham protégés, Bertie Crewe and more importantly, William George (W.G.R.) Sprague (1865-1933), whose output of forty-two theatres includes one for Charles Wyndham (1899) in Charing Cross Road, where his preferred Louis XVI décor and satin or type-Aubisson tapestry-covered seating was housed under a ceiling derived from Boffrand's salon de la princesse de Soubise, with paintings appropriately reminiscent of Boucher.

The Great Hotels of the era just preceding and especially following the building of the London Ritz imbued the semantics of French design if not in substance certainly in spirit, as this format had come to be accepted (much as it is today) as the paragon of taste and luxury. One such to emerge was designed by the president of the Royal Institute of British Architects, Alfred Waterhouse, whose eight-story edifice for Frederick Gordon was crowned by a Mansard roof containing the two uppermost. With lavishly appointed interiors, The Hotel Metropole, Northumberland Avenue, opened in 1886, having three great dining rooms which could be combined to hold five hundred guests at one sitting. Also featured were a Louis Quinze Drawing Room, and a Sitting Room emulating Marie Antoinette's gilded Boudoir at Fontainebleau. A decade later, Perry & Reed's towering Hotel Cecil housed 800 bedrooms beneath its pavilion roofs, becoming the largest establishment of its type in Europe. With a cold, Versaillesque grandeur, all its great interior halls displayed an almost theatrical opulence, including an Empire Ladies' Drawing Room (later the 'Cleopatra Dining Room') which made very little concession to the
fairer sex. (With the great success of the Ritz, two similar, but enormous palm courts were added c.1914 by Edward Keynes Purchase (1862-1923) who had recently collaborated with Ritz architects, Mewès & Davis (page 441), on their Royal Automobile Club, Pall Mall.) Off Piccadilly, behind a faience façade, Henry Tanner (1876-1947), with W.J. Ancell and F.J. Wills, created the Regent Palace Hotel (1915), which greeted the visitor with an ornate, domed entrance hall, succeeded by a greater glazed dome (similar to that done six years earlier at their Strand Palace Hotel) crowning its Winter Garden. The hotel featured a Louis XVI restaurant having great sympathies - to its plafond vitré - with Mewès's turn-of-the-century Carlton Hotel Palm Court, which had caused a sensation in London society, as decoration responded more and more to feminine sensibilities. Not an exclusive precinct of the very grand, French nuance characterised even the smallest hotels with upmarket aspirations: Reed & MacDonald's Hans Crescent Hotel (1896 - Exhibit V) and the Norfolk Square Hotel (c.1897) by Treadwell & Martin, displayed crisp evocations of Louis XVI elegance. French chic also characterized hotels outside London, as it appeared for instance in Manchester, via the Mostley Hotel (1899) and in Liverpool's Hotel St. George (1902), Hotel Manhattan (1903) and the Adelphi Hotel (1914), designed by Frank Atkinson (architect of Waring & Gillow and, with American Daniel Burnham, co-designer of Selfrige's - both in Oxford Street - pages 407b & 452). The Adelphi was outfitted by (again) Waring and Gillow (page 451b), who had also done the Carlton, the Cecil, the Ritz and the Hans Crescent amongst a bewildering array of contracts extending their craftsmanship (often French-inspired) to practically every corner of the globe (Exhibit V).

Floating luxury hotels transformed a cross-Atlantic passage from one where Dickens described his accommodation as "an utterly impractical, thoroughly hopeless and profoundly preposterous box" to that which all but negated a journey was in progress. Immediately prior to World War I, the competitions for passenger traffic produced the gargantuan White Star Line trio, Olympic (launched-1910), Titanic (1911) and Britanic (1913) - all with French detailing and treilléged Café Parisians as a response to the luxury provided in Cunard's Lusitania (1906) and Mauritania (1907 - page 330), as well as Albert Ballin's (the Hamburg-Amerika Line's) Amerika (1906). Built by Harland & Wolff - who would produce the three great White Star liners - the Amerika was unlike every other ship of its day, in that it had been decorated throughout by a single architect - Charles Mewès - with his characteristic French panache. Notwithstanding the French Line's own offerings (figure 1040), Mewès would subsequently be commissioned to design the interiors of probably the three most luxuriously appointed ships of the era - not for English or French firms, but for Ballin and an enthusiastically competitive Kaiser Wilhelm, who christened in succession, the Imperator in 1912
and two years later, the _Vaterland_ and _Bismarck_. Concurrent with the outfitting of Ballin's giants, Arthur Davis was awarded the contract to design the interiors of Cunard's _Aquitania_ (figure 1041), with strict instructions to work separately from his French partner - a ridiculous arrangement which was doubtless circumvented, as Mewès was the firm's principal designer. All four of the German vessels offered the passenger an alternative to taking their meals in the ships' dining rooms, as the continuously innovative Ballin had surmised that an à la carte restaurant would be a great revenue producer. Emulating the great success of the Ritz/Mewès/Escoffier establishment in London's Carlton Hotel (page 446), the ships offered a 'Ritz-Carlton' version, more than justifying the great entrepreneur's expectations.

Hotels were not the only venues for luxury dining. If Paris were renowned for superb cuisine, it was paralleled in London with some of the most spectacularly appointed restaurants of any age. Pavillioned roofs crowned the Criterion Restaurant (with its adjoining theatre) on Piccadilly Circus. Built for Spiers & Pond by theatre architect Thomas Verity from 1871-73, its interiors were extensively decorated with ornamental tile-work in an effusive Second Empire style, distinguished by elaborate wrought iron detailing marking the Entrance Vestibule and a gilt mosaic ceiling above its Long Bar. For private functions, the restaurant offered a hybrid _Louis XV_ cum _XVI_ Dining Room, with silk damask framed in Rococo panelling. So popular was the establishment that it was extended to the east in 1878 and again to the south in 1885. In 1888-9, the restaurant bearing the name of two Swiss brothers, was also enlarged to face both Piccadilly Circus and Regent Street, facilitated by the 1877-86 formation of Shaftesbury Avenue. Doubling its size by architects Christopher & White, the Café Monico featured a barrel-vaulted "International Hall" looking like a Bavarian Baroque section of the Moscow subway - complete with supporting consoled atlantes and large tear-drop crystal chandeliers. The restaurant's more intimate "Renaissance Room" was enriched by a chorus of swathed females in relief, either floating on the ceiling amidst a whirl of drapery or punctuating its cove with epergnes and elaborate floral festoons, within a setting of sinuous art nouveau flowers and tendrils. Setting the decorative trend for many of the larger establishments and also the relatively tiny Hanover Restaurant, Mill Street (1900), where a bevy of painted fin-de-siècle, bare-breasted females amused the diners, the décor known to Max Beerbohm as "Lulu Quinze" characterized the greatest of them all: the Café Royal, Regent Street. For twenty-two years from 1863, the restaurant was continuously expanded by Archer & Green from its beginnings at a minute location on Glasshouse Street to what became the most palatial rendezvous of the West End.

* Both the _Brittanica_ and _Bismarck_ were being outfitted at the beginning of the First World War, and may not have been completed as planned.
The Café was founded by French immigrant, Daniel Nicolas Thèvenon (Anglice Daniel Nicols), and as the restaurant grew in both size and stature, he changed his name once more to Daniel de Nicols - French again. The china was (and is today) emblazoned with the establishment's logo, being a Napoleonic "N" (for Nicols), wreathed in Laurel and surmounted by an Imperial crown, which the proprietor had mistakenly thought was of English royalty. As nobody seemed to care about authenticity, the restaurant enjoyed the frequent patronage of Edward VII, as well as other kings and potentates, the great and famous in the realms of literature, art and finance, celebrities and the then leaders of London's Smart Set. In addition to its superb cuisine, the diners were treated to a veritable art gallery on the ceilings of several sumptuously decorated halls. Today the Café Royal boasts nine floors of suites for conferences and banqueting accessed by an elegant wrought-iron and marble staircase, but only the ground-floor Grill Room (Exhibit V, page 2) remains largely as it originally appeared. With the refacing of the Regent Street Quadrant, and Piccadilly Circus (1920s) both this restaurant and the Criterion underwent massive renovations, which, in the case of the Café Royal, forced its original owners into bankruptcy.

One may mourn the loss of Nash's brilliantly conceived Via Triumphalis connecting George IV's Carlton House with Regent's Park, where its stuccoed façades had provided an attractive variety of Palladian palaces, churches, chapels, etc., composed with great subtlety as the avenue transited its various turns. This comfortable scale had been shattered with Norman Shaw's theatrically Baroque Piccadilly Hotel (1905-8), leaving the scholastic Sir Reginald Blomfield (who would author in 1921, A History of French Architecture, 1661-1774) little choice but to follow suit. This he did skilfully with however monumental, quieter modulations than Shaw's flamboyant offering. Approaching Piccadilly Circus, his elevation appears more French as it culminates with the elegant - and very French - cupola-crowned Swan & Edgar department store - easily the finest building there. John James Joass (1868-1952) designed its interiors, but this architect had previously exercised his highly innovative talent on two commercial buildings which took French design dramatically into the twentieth century: Mappin & Webb's, Oxford Street (1906-8) and the St. James's Street Offices (1907-9), just down from the Ritz on Piccadilly, where one observes the hotel's Mansard roof restated in modern terms above façades which make no secret of their supporting steel structure.

In addition to Blomfield and Joass, there were many architects of professional stature whose French inclination resulted in superb additions to British architectural heritage. Of these one might cite the Examination Halls, Queen Square, by Andrew noble Prentice, whose practice also produced
Leopold Albu's residence in Hamilton Place (page 465a) and interiors for the Orient Line's ship, Orvieto; the Waldorf Hotel, Aldwych, by Alexander Marshall Mackenzie (1847-1933); the Post Office Parcels Office, Glasgow, by Sir Henry Tanner (1849-1935) and Cardiff City Hall by Edwin Alfred Rickards (1872-1920) - all of which appeared when Beaux-Arts design reigned supreme in the halcyon days before the World War I. But to begin this particular history, which certainly takes the reader into this era, one must return to Regent Street - particularly its original focus, Carlton House, and specifically its royal occupant, to lay the foundation for the last and most prolific flourish of French influence in the island to the north. Here the reader will discover what impressed the writer at the very start of his investigation: Although French influence in English architecture and decoration was certainly promulgated by this very ostentatious monarch-in-waiting, there was concurrently an acceptance of English thought in France which endured for nearly one hundred years.

Clarke Andreae
Part I

The Nobility
George The Fourth

George IV is the most enigmatic of the Hanoverian monarchs and certainly the only connoisseur and major patron of the arts to emerge from the line. Unlike his father, George III, and his brother, William IV, who succeeded him, George IV’s popularity with the people was ephemeral, and such is the contradiction that no one longed more for approval than he. This man was and is judged as a king largely upon the misdemeanours and calamities of his personal life. Rarely do historians look beyond a myriad of petty and politically-inspired condemnations to discover an individual of tremendous intellect and ability. George IV was not a “bad king”, but certainly one for whom the circumstances of his life and time did much to thwart what could have been one of the most splendid reigns in British history.

In spite of many contemporary and subsequent derogations of the man, there is no real support to suggest George IV was any more or less morally relaxed than were many of his contemporaries. As regent and king, he was as much in control as had been his father, and during his reign France was eclipsed by England as the dominant influence in

---

*Charles I would be the only other English sovereign for whom the distinction of connoisseur can be made. Although their political circumstances were hardly paralleled, Charles’s fateful egotism and its consequences were not points lost on George IV, once he himself became king.*
both the New and Old Worlds. In matters of State, George was a focused sovereign; who had a keen grasp of his role as an historical figure, and as an active participant in the day-to-day political tussle. He did, however have his own private agenda: In a broad view, this would focus on that which would maintain the position of the crown, and see to it that he would have plenty of money for his life style and building projects. This sensibility, in ordinary terms, is common to us all.

Against a growing cry for the Parliamentary reform that had been a popular theme since the days of the American and French Revolutions, George IV managed to create the royal buildings that rival their European counterparts, and today, quintessentialize the British Monarchy. They reestablish the grandeur of lost English palaces and often represent unparalleled schemes of decorative achievement.

a After his European campaigns against Napoleon, Wellington served from December, 1826, as Commander-in-Chief. Refusing to take part in the Canning Government, he resigned his post in April, 1827. (George IV retained the appointment in his own name, until his friend Arthur recovered his temper.) Following the death of Canning in August of the same year, and the fall of "Goody" Goderich's five-months' cabinet, Wellington served as Prime Minister from January 9, 1828 until November 20, 1830, when his opposition to the Whig Reform Bill caused his defeat. Momentarily unpopular, he was hooted by rioters to the degree he thought it wise to retro-fit the windows of the Waterloo Gallery, Apsley House with iron shutters.


b Windsor Castle (where on November 20th, 1992, fire swept through more than three acres of floor space destroying most of the spectacular interiors created for George IV by Sir Jeffry Wyatville), and Buckingham Palace. As prominent in the public eye, though no longer a royal establishment is the Marine Pavilion at Brighton. After the demolition of Carlton House and the sale of the Marine Pavilion, their exquisite furnishings were re-used, for reasons of "economy" in principally Windsor Castle and Buckingham Palace. Prince Albert and Queen Mary deserve much credit for their preservation. The Brighton Pavilion interiors as restored today represent the most complete expressions of George's taste open to the visitor. Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II has returned on loan, many embellishments which were removed by Victoria prior to the 1850 sale of the Royal Pavilion Estate to the City of Brighton. Peacocke, M.D. The Story of Buckingham Palace, The Royal Home through Seven Reigns, Oldhams Press Ltd. (London-1951); Ames, W., Prince Albert and Victorian Taste, The Viking Press (New York-1968); Rowse, A.L. Windsor Castle in the History of England, G.P. Putnam's Sons (New York-1974).

* It is worth mentioning that these buildings, which are in fact alterations and additions to existing structures (completely transforming them, however), were erected by a constitutional monarch dependent on and answerable to the government for his expenditures. Other comparable European structures were accomplished under monarchs who enjoyed absolute rule. We can be thankful the surviving buildings were largely complete during George IV's reign. After the Reform Bill, conceived during the reign of George III and finally passed under William IV, no succeeding monarch has enjoyed the dominion of George IV. Plumb, J.H., The First Four Georges, The Macmillan Co. (New York-1957)p.160.

c Examples of which would be Henry VIII's "Nonsuch", Whitehall (continued)
During his lifetime, they contained the finest collection of French decorative art assembled outside France. Viewed in chronological progression, they reflected in their ever increasing size and elaboration, George IV's ambition (as he transited from prince of Wales-to-regent-to-king) to create a personal document of his tenure as sovereign of the nation which had vanquished the Napoleonic menace and become the richest and most powerful in the world. No account this writer has found suggests that there is a corollary between events in the life of George IV and the development of his building schemes, and that will not be a purpose here. The isolation of his childhood mirrored by similar circumstances in his last years has a certain symmetry that is best left to psychologists. It is interesting to observe the most chaste statements of architecture and decoration occurring during the early years, and becoming almost Piranesian in scale as time went on. One can speculate if the string of public humiliations marking his personal life had had their effects in the ever increasing theatre of his architectural surroundings, and point to the paradox of one described as vulnerable to the extreme - this paralleled with a seemingly endless succession of self-indulgences not at all characteristic of a sensitive personality. What is extraordinary is that this king, socially sandwiched between the wealthier aristocracy who looked upon the royal family with disdain, and a resentful, envious (and over-taxed) middle class, outbuilt them all with an extravagance that would set if not exceed the English standard of luxury for at least the next two generations, but probably for all time.

To understand the built legacy, it is important not only to conceptualize the builder, but also the arena in which he played his game. His influence on the popularisation of French-inspired decoration in England, surpasses the efforts of the professionals within his employ, and places himself at the centre of a design ethic that would maintain a constant presence until the early decades of the twentieth century.

A full embrace of French aesthetic, which had a pervasive sway in Europe and a Western-oriented Russian Court, was an unlikely happenstance in the islands to the north. The political rivalry between France and England extended beyond power-gamesmanship to the arts. Yet the major architectural publications of the time, as well as a first-hand (continued) during the reign of the Stuarts, and Wren's French-inspired, but never-completed Winchester Palace. Winney, M., et al., Edwards R., Ramsey, L.G.G., The Connoisseur's Complete Period Guides, Bonanza Boos (New York-1968)p.284

This progression is paralleled by George's slow withdrawal from society, ending in a self-imposed isolation which he described as his reduction to the Deanery of Windsor (while the duke of Wellington ruled England and O'Connell ruled Ireland).Leslie, S., George The Fourth, Little, Brown, & Co. (Boston-1926) p.159
experience on the part of many aristocrats and artists on both sides of the Channel, would have significant and long-lasting effects in both societies. It is the exchange that the writer proposes to examine; and allowing a subjective starting point, the study begins with an overview of the Neo-Classical movements in England and France (arguably the last stylistic development that can be seen as generative for nearly a century and a half). From here, a cross-Channel exchange of architectural and decorative thinking will be demonstrated; which, as exemplified by many English cognoscenti, went well beyond an accumulation of French collectibles.

Francophilia and the English gentry

Evidence of French architecture and interior decoration in England can be traced well back before this island nation "...crawled out of the boglands of underdevelopment...to coast freely over the plateau of the Age of Reason...". Certainly the fledgling institutions and industries that contributed to the industrial developments of George III.'s reign owe a debt to Louis XIV and one of the many blunders of his administration: the 1685 revocation of the Edict of Nantes. With this act, hundreds of Huguenots (including Daniel Marot - Louis's own God-son) fled religious persecution, to England, where their artistry and technical skills developed the velvet, silk and satin industries of Spitalfields; the glass works at Bristol and Stourbridge; paper-milling at Laverstoke; and the Irish linen industry. Textile drawings (c.1717-56) at the Victoria and Albert Museum bear many French names as well as English, and although most of the designs are undoubtedly from London, they point to direct contact with French sources long after the great seventeenth-century exodus.

However this indigenous French presence in England may have contributed to the quality of local manufactures, the cultural locus for English dilettantes remained to a great degree with the French Court. Toward the final decades of the eighteenth century, France was the centre of European taste - French was the language of diplomacy and French government-supported institutions continued to define and encourage a Western standard of craftsmanship and artistic finesse, that has never since been equalled.

Traditionally, the Grand Tour helped to enrich the cultural legacy of the English aristocracy, and it was an acknowledged necessity in a gentleman’s training in the arts and the art of living. It also served as a social trophy that stood for international exposure, whether there was a cultural enlightenment or not. The long French wars interrupted the traditional confluence of the English and French societies, that in the more erudite examples of Horace Walpole

* An excerpt from his August 31st, 1765 letter to George Montagu, anticipating his journey to Paris, reads: "... I know four or five very agreeable and sensible people there, as the Guerchys, (continued)
and the Earl of Chesterfield (a generation previous), had established friendships that ignored the political schisms. The end of a war, 1763, 1783, 1802, opened France's borders to admit a more friendly English invasion. Once again, old acquaintance was renewed in a bustle of social activity. The isolation and bitterness of conflict (if indeed they had occurred at all) were supplanted with a vigorous new spirit of camaraderie. 15

The Seven Years War (1756-1763) was fought between France and Great Britain over their rival concerns for the development of empire. Its conclusion resulted in a loss to France of its interests in India and Canada, reasserting Great Britain as the world's preeminent naval power and consolidating her own overseas dominion. 16

Beginning in 1776, the successful revolt of the English Colonies in America was directly supported by the French against Britain's interests. The loss of the Colonies was recognized with the Treaty of Paris in 1783, but the peace, established the previous year, had thrown open the continent, with France once again hosting the English nobility. 17 Versailles was the scene of extravagant fêtes, displaying the nation's manners, morals and politics to all the higher echelons of the civilized world. 18 Once again the English men of rank brought back the polish and vivacity of that society, but also its corruptness and dissipation. If London were becoming Paris in all but name, its darker side was also reflected in the gaming, horse-racing and infidelities which marked the era in every corner (except the coterie surrounding the Royal family). The period is also signalled by the emergence of women, the conception of whose inveterate grace, dignity and virtue was also in flux. Boldly copying their French counterparts, as instanced (continued) Madame de Mirépoix, Madame de Boufflers, and Lady Mary Chabot, these intimately; besides the Duc de Nivernois, and several others that have been here [England]. The Letters of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, Vol. III, (Lea and Blanchard, Philadelphia-1842) p. 417


b Encyclopædia Britannica, ed. 1942, p. 686 incorrectly reports the 1783 Treaty of Versailles

c Walpole writes to the earl of Stafford, 24 June 1783, "...Their angloomanie I hear has mounted - or descended - from our customs to our persons. English people are in fashion at Versailles." Lewis, W.S. ed., Horace Walpole's Correspondence, etc., Vol 35, Yale University Press (New Haven-1973) p. 369

d It should be noted that, as in England, the royal family in France conducted itself with great dignity. Campan, Mme J.L.H.G., Memoirs of Marie Antoinette Queen of France and Wife of Louis XVI (trans. Mémoires sur la Vie Privée de la Reine Marie Antoinette), P.F. Collier & Sons (New York-1910 passim.)
by the duchesses of Devonshire and Rutland, they began to take an active part in society and the affairs of public life.\(^9\) This had (Rutland et al) its architectural consequences.

The formal cessation of hostilities was swiftly followed by a reconciliation between France and England with the commercial treaty of 1786. France, Spain and Holland, allied with the Colonies, had temporarily threatened English shores, but the English were to control the very profitable West Indies, take Gibraltar, and reestablish their supremacy in the North Atlantic. The loss of the Colonies - and subsequently Britain's chief export market - had caused fears of industrial ruin. These soon evaporated during the first ten years of Pitt's administration, when goods shipped to an independent America greatly exceeded those of the last years under Colonial rule.\(^{10}\) For France, however, beneath all the glittery show of opulence, the financial burdens of the war had resulted in a bankruptcy that would lead to a demand for a convocation of a States-General as early as July 21, 1788. This signalled the French Revolution, which would pit England against France for nearly twenty-three years.\(^{11}\) It began in the same manner as the Frondes of 1648 and 1650.\(^{12}\) This time, however, it was the nobles and the magisterial aristocracy of the provinces who gave the signal for revolt. Philippe, duc d'Orléans, alias Philippe Égalité, a prince of the blood (and a close friend of the prince of Wales) was among those who voted for (and attended) the execution of his cousin, the king.\(^{13}\)

**Anglomania**\(^b\) and the French gentry

In matters architectural, British thought begins to be appreciated in France during the last half of the eighteenth century. Volumes I and II of Vitruvius Britannicus, published in the reign of George I, had simply the title-page printed in French alongside the English. Volume III, published early in the reign of George III offered concurrently the entire text in French.\(^{14}\) When Sir William Chambers published his Treatise of Civil Architecture in 1759,\(^{24}\) it

---

\(^{1}\) The actual dates are 6 November 1792 (France's invasion of Belgium and the occupation of Antwerp) until Waterloo, 18 June 1815. Encyclopædia Britannica Vol.9, (Chicago-1942) pp.640,645

became a standard work, which included his own studies along-
side works by Bernini, Peruzzi, Palladio, Vignola and Scamozzi. Here, although the subscription list included several names of the French nobility, Palladian/Baroque design principles were hardly new to them. France had had a first-hand experience, importing Italian Renaissance masters as early as the reign of Louis XI (1461-83). With the reign of Francis I (1515-47) it was apparent that the French architects and craftsmen had absorbed and adapted to their culture and climate the lessons of their masters and originated a mature expression of their own - now contributing substantially to European artistic development. The French interpretation of Classical architecture, whilst reaching its apogee with the Louis XIV style, followed from these times in an almost unbroken progression into the twentieth century. This it did with little direct influence from outside the country. But one importation, if in fact it can be called that, occurs in the late eighteenth century, and regardless of which country’s literature one consults (French sources are less enthusiastic), it is in Robert Adam’s and William Chambers’s Neo-Classical evocation of the Antick that this influence seems to be most apparent.

In matters social, an impression can be gained from Walpole’s 1762 letter to Horace Mann. Here he repeated a friend, George Selwyn: “our passion for everything French is nothing to their’s for everything English. There is a


One undeniable exception would be the influence of Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640). During the reign of Louis XIII, Rubens visited Paris (1622-6) to decorate the Luxembourg Palace, and consequentially gave great impetus to the Flemish Baroque in France. Here however, the excesses of the style, also apparent in Italy, were characteristically toned down to suit a more conservative national taste. Local restraint of the idiom is seen in England during the reign of the French and Italian decorative painters [i.e. Daniel Marot (1663-1752), Louis Laguerre (1663-1721), Antonio Verrio (c.1639-1707), Louis Chéron (at Boughton House, c.1680). It is also apparent in Rubens’ own work for Charles I (Inigo Jones’ Banqueting House ceiling, Whitehall - after which Norfolk House’s Music Room ceiling was patterned (fig. 48a). Completed in 1634, the ceiling shows a proliferation of heroic multitudes restrained within an emphatic Palladian framework.


Most historians name Robert Adam as the most obvious source; but as will be seen, Sir William Chambers, who had far stronger ties with the French, was with his publication of A Treatise on Civil Architecture, as significant a contributor to the Neo-Classical movement in France. Eriksen, in his book Early Neo-Classicism in France, refers to the English connection via Adam and Chambers. Citing John Harris, he lists Chambers’ cross-channel friends as including Barreau de Chefdeville, Soufflot, Mique, Antoine, Patte, Peyre, Jardin and “probably” Bélanger [most definitely Bélanger]. Eriksen, S., Early Neo-Classicism in France, Faber and Faber Ltd., (London-1974) p.141; Harris, J.P., Sir William Chambers, Knight of the Polar Star, A. Zwemmer Ltd. (London-1970) p.171.
book published, called the *Anglomanie*." Mann responded: "...I shall be curious to see the Anglomania, and expect to hear that the French are bursting themselves at all their meals with hot rolls and butter..." In 1776 he wrote: "Monsieur de Marchais [Baron], first valet-de-chambre to the King of France...has the anglomanie so strong, that he has not only read more English than French books, but if any valuable work appears in his own language, he waits to peruse it till it is translated into English..." It was much more than rolls and butter the French imported: In 1778, reflecting the craze for English gardens, the prince of Wales's friend, Orléans, then duc de Chartres, ordered a park in the English style on four hundred and seventy acres in the plain of Monceau. *La Folie de Chartres* included an obelisk, a pyramid, a pagoda, a ruined temple, a Gothic dungeon, a Swiss farm, a Dutch windmill, a river, islands, a waterfall, a blue and a yellow garden - all positioned so closely together that they resembled more an amusement park than the romantic English idyll. Orléans's competitive stance with the ruling branch of the House of Bourbon may have extended to horticultural endeavours, but a dabbling in this sphere was more likely yet another evidence of the eighteenth-century French passion for the *jardin anglais*. Parc Monceau follows one exquisitely created in the environs of the Petit Trianon by the duke's cousin-in-law, Marie Antoinette (r.1774-1793). Replacing the botanical garden of Louis XV, its design was proposed to the new queen in 1774. 


The *jardin anglais* is not derived from "Capability" Brown's sweeping panoramas. It is rather, the picturesque landscapes of Kent at Rousham, and Aislabie's Studley Royal that captured the French imagination. (ref. Endnote and Greeves, L., *Fountains Abbey & Studley Royal*, The National Trust, 1988, passim.) But one can look further to see that the English inspiration is derived from the Classically-inspired scenery of Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665) and Claude Le Lorrain (1600-82). Wilenski, R.H., *French Painting*, Hale, Cushman & Flint (Boston-1931)pp.58-75. The craze was also due to socioeconomic factors in France: There was no longer the wealth to maintain the traditionally elaborate formal garden (where even full-height hardwood trees might be manicured). Coincidentally, there was a growing aversion amongst the royal family and the nobility to Louis XIV-era pomp and ceremony. The new preference for life at its most simple and pastoral produced a number of retreats, including Marie Antoinette's Belvedere at Versailles, and the count d'Artois' Bagatelle in the Bois de Boulogne. Campan, Mme J.L.H.G., *Memoirs of Marie Antoinette Queen of France and Wife of Louis XVI* (trans. *Mémoires sur la Vie Privée de la Reine Marie Antoinette*), P.F. Collier & Sons (New York-1910) pp.150,179-80; Zerbe, J./ Connolly, C., *Les Pavillons, French Pavilions of the Eighteenth Century*, Macmillan (New York-1962)passim.
by the comte de Caraman, who had already created a similar one for himself. Its features, or *fabriques*, included a Temple of Love (1777-8), a Belvedere (1778-9), and the much-discussed *Hameau*, all by Richard Mique, with the now "designer of the King's gardens", Hubert Robert. 32

**A Frenchman's Influence on Robert Adam**

The man is Clérisseau (1721-1820), an influential French architect/artist, who has only recently been given his well deserved place in history with Thomas McCormick's *Charles Louis Clérisseau and the Genesis of Neo-Classicism* (1990). A major contributor to the development of the style in both England and France, Clérisseau's reputation was during his lifetime, based largely on his paintings of ancient Roman ruins. 3 Antonio Zucchi (1726-1795), who collaborated with him in Venice on Robert Adam's Ruins of the Palace of the Emperor Diocletian at Spalatro in Dalmatia (published in 1764) owed him a considerable debt for his own successful career in this genre. 33 However, it is not for his paintings or his work as an architect that earns Clérisseau his place in history - but rather for his rôle as draughtsman and maître to Robert and James Adam.

In the second (1755) of his four-year European tour, Robert Adam was introduced to Clérisseau by the sculptor, Joseph Wilton (1722-1803). The meeting took place in Florence at Wilton's residence - where Clérisseau was staying, intending to return home after a six-years' sojourn in Rome. 3 A Parisian and Adam's senior by seven years, he had been, at the age of twenty-four, the Académie Royale d'Architecture's oldest member to win the Prix de Rome. Working (1749-1753) under the sponsorship of the Academy at Palazzo Mancini, Clérisseau met early-on the great Italian *vedute* painter Giovanni Paolo Panini (1692-1765/68) and Giovanni Battista Piranesi (1720-88) who was to become his close friend during the nearly twenty years Clérisseau ultimately spent in Italy. Panini can be credited for the development of Clérisseau's already accomplished painterly technique; Piranesi, who is attributed a major rôle in the formation of Neo-Classicism throughout Europe, would have, with his penchant for detail often coupled with fantastical... On 2 September 1769, Clérisseau was the first architect to be accepted as a member of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture under the category, "painter of architecture". McCormick, Thomas J., *Charles-Louis Clérisseau and the Genesis of Neo-Classicism*, MIT Press (Cambridge/London-1990)p.145

imaginings, a pervasive influence.\textsuperscript{34}

When Cléricisseau met Adam, his art and technique were mature and at the level it would remain throughout his long career. Adam's, even with his family background in architecture and penchant for drawing, was embryonic - a fact he understood implicitly. Recognizing a pivotal career opportunity for precisely what it was, Adam spent the next three years in the company of the Frenchman, drawing the famous Roman monuments throughout Italy. Here he began to assemble a vast repertoire of Classical architectural details, which became the foundation for his long and highly successful practice. Cléricisseau instigated the Adam/Piranesi friendship, but the temperamental differences between these two men allowed little to be gained from it.\textsuperscript{4} The relationships are explained in Robert's letters to his brother James:

\textsuperscript{4} The context of this observation would deal with Piranesi's contribution to Adam's development during the latter's stay in Italy. The mutual respect these men had for each other is well documented to the extent that any good account of either will mention the other. In addition to his reinforcement of the Neo-Classical direction in Adam's expertise, an almost literal Piranesian aesthetic begins to show itself in the sinewy, linear quality of Adam's later works (later than the publication of Diverse Maniere...in 1769). Nowhere does Cléricisseau's technique in interior design (specifically groteschi) - which was well known to Adam - appear in any publication by Piranesi; nor does it appear in any works by Adam, who assuming he was familiar with the work of James (Athenian) Stuart at Spencer House (c.1759-65), may have felt it was old-fashioned. Cléricisseau's designs did however appeal to Bélanger as is evidenced by his decorations at Bagatelle (see pg. 30). In Diverse Maniere (d'adornare I cammini ed ogni altra Parte degli edifizi desunte dall'architettura Egizia, Etrusca e Greca, con un Ragionameo Apologetico in defesa dell'architettura Egizia, e Toscana; opera del cavaliere Giambattista Piranesi, architetto, (Parigi)) reprint, (Pirmin Didot brothers) Stampatori dell'instituto de Francia, Via Giocobbe, 24, (Rome-1836), Plate 877a illustrates a chimney-piece with overmantel, as having been executed in Rome under Piranesi's direction. He noted further that the overmantel is accomplished in metallo dorato, making it a precursor of Adam's exquisite Glass Drawing-Room for the duchess of Northumberland (c.1775 - fig.108, pg.86), now in the Victoria and Albert Museum. Oseley, G. & Reider, W., "The Glass Drawing Room from Northumberland (continued)
... Clerisseau preaches to me everyday to forbear inventing or composing either plans or Elevations [sic] till I have a greater fund. That is, till I have made more progress in seeing things and my head more filled with proper ornaments and my hand able to draw... 

... Without Clerisseau I should have spent several years without making the progress I have done in one fourth of the time. The reason is evident, the Italians have at present no manner of taste... Piranesi who may be said, alone to breathe the Antient Air, is of such disposition as bars all instruction, His ideas in locution so ill ranged, His expressions so furious and fantastical, that a Venetian hint is all can be got from him...

Adam feared Clérisseau would rival, by his presence alone, the impact he and his brother were eager to make on the English architectural world. They were also well aware William Chambers, having predated them in his association with the Frenchman (however small the benefit)* would be in a position to disclose the source of their new ethic. b

Paying him an annual salary of £100, Robert and James kept Clérisseau in Italy to assist them in the forthcoming publication of their joint (with Clérisseau) study of the ruins of Diocletian's Palace at Split (Spalato), and to continue to study and record decorative architectural details. In effect, the brothers paid him to stay out of England. Regarding the often intense rivalries that seem to be a


* Clérisseau met and was sponsored by William Chambers (1723-96), probably c.1752-3, during the latter's tour of Italy (1750-55). Lacking Adam's charisma, Chambers has been described as a proud, reserved, sensitive, and humourless man, who owed much to Clérisseau, but treated him badly. The Frenchman's influence on him can be detected in his sectional study of the unexecuted York House, Pall Mall, for the duke of York (1759). The drawing is one of the earliest in England to show, in section, a complete scheme for the interior decoration. It was rendered as a partial ruin, après Clérisseau. McCormick, T.J., Charles-Louis Clérisseau and the Genesis of Neo-Classicism, MIT Press (Cambridge/London-1990)p.19; Yarwood, D., Encyclopaedia of Architecture, B.T.Batsford Ltd. (London-1985)p.103; Lever, J., & Richardson, M., Great Drawings from the Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects, Trefoil Books (London-1983)p.56.

b Horace Walpole did that for them in his catalogue annotation for the 1772 exhibition of the Royal Academy (by then too late for any negative impact: "A Frenchman lately arrived, famous for the beauty and neatness of his drawings from the Antique. He was the master of Mr. Adam when at Rome." McCormick, Thomas J., Charles-Louis Clérisseau and the Genesis of Neo-Classicism, MIT Press (Cambridge/London-1990)p.157.
generic phenomenon amongst architects of any day, the Adam brothers’ isolation of Clérisseau is perhaps understandable. It should be observed however, the architectural profession was then as it is today, largely dependent upon social connections; and Clérisseau would have had only a marginal entry into the English sphere, if only for the fact that he was a foreigner with no reputation. Yet, in the 1760s, he was obscure in his own country as well. Clérisseau’s greatest talents and motivations were those of a teacher, draughtsman, painter and decorator; and the formal recognition he won during his long career was within these precincts - not as an architect of any great invention. His two great accomplishments in decoration were the "Ruin Room", (c. 1766) at the Convent of S. Trinità dei Monti, Rome, and the Salon for Laurent Grimod de la Reynièr in the hôtel of that name on the Champs-Elysées (figure 8). Executed by Etienne de la Vallée, later Lavallé-Poussin (c.1733-93), the decorations were done on canvas to Clérisseau’s designs and begun probably in mid-1779 - completed early the following year. Edward Croft-Murray describes these panels, which were imported and installed (c. 1850)" in the Drawing-Room of Ashburnham Place, Sussex and are now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, as being "...perhaps identical with the series...", also stating that this design was "...claimed to be the first of its kind in France, and thus launching what was to become the style Louis XVI".40

Clérisseau had done an earlier scheme for Grimod de la Reynière in his old mansion on rue Grange-Batelière. The decorations were applied to an existing space, and are mentioned in Janson’s edition of Winckelmann’s Lettres Familières (1781) and in Thiéry’s Guide des amateurs et des étrangers voyageurs à Paris (1787). Although Clérisseau made use of grotesques in the Pompeian or Antique style, descriptions of the scheme indicate it was very different from that of the newly-built Champs-Elysée hôtel. McCormick, Thomas J., Charles-Louis Clérisseau and the Genesis of Neo-Classicism, MIT Press (Cambridge/London-1990) pp.173-6

Uncharitable to Clérisseau as this observation may seem, James "Athenian" Stuart’s concept for the Painted Room at Spencer House, London (1759) employs a nearly identical scheme of scrolled pilasters alternating with larger panels of grotesques. Here as with the V&A grotesques from the Hôtel Grimod de la Reynière, the design concept follows closely that of Raphael and Giovanni da Udine in the Vatican Loggia and at the Villa Madama. Whether Clérisseau was aware of Stuart’s scheme or not is probably immaterial, but does account for the fact that as late as 1953 the V&A panels were ascribed to Stuart. Hussey, C., Country Life, Vol CXIII, April 30, 1953, p.1335; Speltz, A., Styles of Ornament, reprint of 1906 American publication, Regan Publ. (Chicago-1923)p.346,349; Becherucci, L., et al., The Complete Work of Raphael, Harrison House (New York-1969)pp.483-4

The Victoria and Albert Museum describes the canvas panels as c.1775, and painted by Clérisseau and Lavallée. Giving no references, but perhaps referring in part to the Almanach des Artistes, 1777, the Museum describes two contemporary accounts naming the artists of "le salon dans le style arabesque", calling it "Nouvellement décoré." Croft-Murray’s reservations are based erroneously on his belief that the originals were boiseries. McCormick describes an existing interior to which Clérisseau, with Jean-François-Pierre Peyron (1744-1814) applied an arabesque decoration (c.1773-4) for Grimod de la Reynière, in his house on the rue Grange-Batelière. This hôtel with its salon was still intact in 1805, eventually (continued)
“L’Étrusque” and “le style Louis XVI” are not interchangeable terms.

What Croft-Murray means by the style Louis XVI, is in fact known to the French as le style étrusque.* The elegant, refined white and gold, or pastel-painted boiseries of petits appartements are typical of the Louis XVI. The style historically precedes the étrusque, and with its general rectilinear design parameters, provides a natural framework for the more antique-inspired design.

Approaching the Revolution, both styles exist separately and also in combination - the Louis XVI dying temporarily with its namesake - the étrusque surviving to become the foundation for Napoleon’s style empire. Panelled apartments exemplified by Ange-Jacques Gabriel’sb Library for Louis XVI (Versailles (continued) being purchased by the government in 1812. The salon was drastically altered with a mezzanine floor (c.1821) when it became part of the Opéra. According to McCormick, the V&A date of 1775 is representative of the confusion surrounding the two interiors done by Clériseau for Grimon de la Reynière. Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington, Museum No. WC v 1957; McCormick, T.J., Charles-Louis Clériseau and the Genesis of Neo-Classicism, MIT Press (Cambridge/London-1990) pp.169-178.

a Verlet refers to the style étrusque as being derivative of the grec c.1760, and under Louis XVI was an interchangeable term with romain, égyptien, and also chinois or turc. The decorative motifs, which can be compared to a degree with Adam’s later work - exemplified by the Piranesi-influenced Etruscan Dressing Room at Osterley Park - are inspired by the Raphaellesque grotesque-work at the Vatican and Villa Madama, and Greek vase motifs. Verlet describes them as characterized by “Ornements Antiques, animaux, fleurs, trophées, rubans, arabesques; dans l'exécution, une finesse, une spontanéité jusque-là inconnues.” The Louis XVI style utilizes ancient motifs, but is much more associated with le goût Marie Antoinette, and is not as extreme a departure in presentation, from the Louis XV style. Exquisitely detailed, the latter style retains a gorgeousness that, in juxtaposition to earlier interiors at Versailles, causes no jolt to the senses. This would not be the case were any of these spaces à l’Étrusque. Verlet, Pierre ed., Styles, meubles, décors, du Moyen Age à nos jours, vol.II, Librairie Larousse (Paris-1972) pp.32-34,58,65,88,94-95. b Gabriel (1698-1782) succeeded his father, Jacques-Jules Gabriel (d.1742) as premier architecte to Louis XV. Three years later, he was
- 1774), Louis's Dressing Room (1788), and the Gilded Chamber of Marie Antoinette (1783) by Richard Miquee are archetypal of the white and gold Louis XVI. Marie-Antoinette's bedroom on the upper floor of the Petit Trianon (1762-4) demonstrates another exquisite example of these elegant, carved decorative details and frames - here painted white on a pale blue ground. They exemplify the design direction initiated by Madame de Pompadour (1721-1764), and reflect the Neo-Classical leanings of the new-generation (to Gabriel) artists whom she sent in 1748, to Rome with the marquise de Marigny. Her purpose, aside from promoting her brother to the post of Minister of Royal Works, was to allow these men a first-hand study of the ancient monuments. Upon their return, they were expected to initiate a new, noble style of royal building which avoided Rococo extravagances. The result combined a noble simplicity with a more delicate and contained, but still spontaneous Rococo decoration. The new artistic direction made its début with the Petit Trianon, Versailles, which was built for la Pompadour by Gabriel - but was enjoyed by her successors; as she died in 1764, the year of its completion. 4

Pompadour's New Style

The "new" style is in fact a further development in the well-established French academic tradition - compromising Rococo and the earlier Palladian traditions of Louis XIV. (continued) made inspecteur général des bâtiments royaux. Gabriel presided over the Académie Royale d'Architecture throughout his entire career. Tadgell, Christopher, Ange-Jacques Gabriel, A. Zwemmer Ltd. (London-1978)p.3

a Mique (1728-1794) was a pupil of Jacques-Francois Blondel, as were Peyre, de Wailly, Ledoux and Cherpitel. In 1776, he was appointed contrôleur général of the buildings and gardens of the queen, Marie Antoinette, and succeeded Gabriel according to Sturgis, upon the latter's death, in 1785 as premier architect to Louis XVI. Ward states that Gabriel resigned shortly after the death of Louis XV (1774) and was at that time succeeded by Mique. Tadgell gives the correct date as 21 March 1775. Mique was executed during the Terror. Sturgis, R. et al. Sturgis' Illustrated Dictionary of Architecture and Building, first ed. 1901-2, four vols. Vol II, Dover (New York-1989)p.912; Ward, W. H., The Architecture of the Renaissance in France, two vols., Vol.II, B.T. Batsford (London-1911)p.426; Tadgell, Christopher, Ange-Jacques Gabriel, A. Zwemmer Ltd. (London-1978)p.3.
b One need not go to Versailles. An exquisite white and gold petit appartement exists on the first floor of Waddesdon Manor, Aylesbury (provenance obscure) that is largely unknown to the public. I am grateful to Miss Rosamund Griffin and Mrs. Carolyn Taylor of Waddesdon for receiving me at a time when Waddesdon was undergoing extensive conservation operations (1992).
c Eriksen gives the completion date as either 1766 or 1767. The interior decorations, whilst designed or produced under the direction of Gabriel, were not completed until later. Eriksen, S., Early Neo-Classicism in France, Faber & Faber Ltd. (London-1974)p.62
d A controversy exists as to the sources influencing the design of the Petit Trianon, with some historians insinuating English (continued)
(continued) Palladianism provided the model. Others contradict this view, ignore it entirely, or simply state that if such an influence had indeed made its mark on arguably Gabriel's greatest masterpiece, at most, it was an indirect one. Lees-Milne is perhaps the most certain of the English influence, going so far as to assert that aside from his French academic background, Gabriel had been "...schooled with the styles of the English Palladians.", and suggests further that the Petit Trianon "...combined many ingredients of composition that are derived from out-worn English sources." He cites Easton Neston, Northamptonshire (1702 on) and Appuldurcombe House, Isle of Wight (from 1710) to illustrate his point. Lees-Milne further credits details, such as the aile-de-bœuf windows in the basement level as being in the "...rococo manner of James Gibbs..." and the staircase window openings after Ripley at Wolerton Hall (1736) (One could also speculate that the terrace balustrades here and in Gabriel's subsequent Grand projet (Gros Pavillon) for Fontainebleau might have been inspired by Sir William Chambers, who described them as "Tuscan" in his Treatise..., but in both these projects, the basement and ground floors adopt the rusticated Tuscan Order making a reflection of this in the balustrading most appropriate.) To suggest that Gabriel was looking to English sources and not to Palladio himself and other direct Classical references is perhaps extending the argument; and this is what Kaufmann infers. Citing Edmond Comte de Pélas Ange-Jacques Gabriel (Paris-1912) p.22, Kaufmann allows the Petit Trianon may have been inspired by David Leroy's Ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grâce, but refutes this directly in his praise for the architect as possessing great versatility in his advanced age, which allowed him to lead, rather than follow the new Neo-Classical trend in France. This view is repeated by Tadgell, who supports his arguments with scholarly documentation clearly showing Gabriel as being within the tradition of the French Academic approach to architecture. Tagell cites J.-P. Blondel (Gabriel's contemporary) and his estimation that Jules Hardouin Mansart and Philibert de l'Orme were much more appropriate sources than the English Palladians. Pevsner precedes Tadgell in this opinion and adds that the English Palladian influence comes to Versailles via Richard Mique with the Covent de la Reine (1770); the rotunda dedicated to Cupid (c.1777) - and, as will be seen, with Bélanger's Bagatelle. Watkin and Fiske Kimball avoid the controversy entirely.

Now simplified - avoiding their Baroque heaviness - lines lose their curvilinear exuberance to become straight and slender. Boiseries are constructed most often with narrower panels; mouldings are slimmer; and decorations as a result become elongated. Flat ceilings above the cornice, as at the Petit Trianon, were often with little or no decoration. (A complete break with the past could hardly be expected of the sixty-four-year-old Gabriel, who had trained under the tutelage of his father during the reign of Louis XIV, and as premier architecte du roi produced many of the great monuments of Louis XV's reign. What is remarkable about this most versatile architect is his ability not only to accept a new direction in architecture and decoration, but to lead the next generation of French designers in its development.)

Carved and gilded decorations, although the most common approach to formal interiors, could be of varied presentation in situations of a more intimate nature. The development of Vernis Martin allowed a colourful, often exotic addition or alternative to gilding, and can be seen in polychrome applications to the elaborately carved detail of dauphin's library, and the small reception room of the dauphine at Versailles (1755) - both on a field of white. Madame du Barry's bathing room (1772), installed at Versailles by Gabriel, also makes use of a green Vernis Martin decoration on a gold field, and here, still in a transitional style, the chamber is almost devoid of its rocaille elements in favour of the more restrained "Louis XVI" vernacular. Whilst illustrating the French love of colourful interiors, the limitation of Vernis Martin is its general application to sculptural elements. As panelings lose their Rococo profusions, more and more in favour of flatter surfaces, a more painterly

*a Gabriel was 66 years old when the Petit Trianon was completed. Lees-Milne describes him as "that great artist in the cosmopolitan hierarchy of all time," and puts his contribution to Neo-classicism as one rooted in the styles of his youth, being Mansard and de Cotte [i.e. Louis XIV style] and, curiously, the styles of the English Palladians. Ward and others are for the writer more dependable sources, describing the transition to the Louis XVI style as evidenced in a "taming" of Rococo motives in, for instance, the work of Constant d'Ivry's early work at the Palais Royal, and in the case of Gabriel, a resumption of the Louis XIV manner in a chastened, much more Classically correct expression. Lees-Milne, James, *The Age of Adam*, B.T. Batsford Ltd (London-1947) pp.161-2; Ward, W. H., *The Architecture of the Renaissance in France*, two vols., Vol.II, B.T. Batsford (London-1911) p.415; Kaufmann, E., *Architecture in the age of Reason*, Dover Publ. (New York-1955) p.136.

*b Pérouse de Montclos describes these apartments (c.1755) as containing one of the first applications of Vernis Martin, owing to the fact that it had "just been invented." *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states that at least three factories existed in Paris in 1748, a year before Guillaume Martin's death, and were classified as "Manufacture Nationale." Reference is also made to Voltaire's comedy, *Nadine*, produced in 1749, referring to the technique as "bonne et brillante, tous les panneaux par Martin sont vernis." A mid-century date for Vernis Martin as being at the height of its popularity is probably correct, with a decline in its usage by the 1780s. Ibid. previous note.
approach is adopted for their decoration. Embellishments such as trophies, grotesques and arabesques, vigorously rendered in the styles of Louis XIV and XV, become finer and more delicate in form, and much more subtle in coloration.

There is a traditional confusion regarding the terms arabesque and grotesque, with many sources insinuating that the terms are interchangeable. They refer, in fact, to two very separate designs. **Arabesque** refers to stylised interlaced foliage motifs, having their origins in patterns of Near Eastern design. A major element in European ornament from the mid 16th century until the early 17th century, arabesques are characterized by a profusion of these densely intertwining foliate patterns, which were largely derived from damascened and engraved metalwork produced in Mesopotamia, Persia and Syria. Coming to Europe probably via Venice, where much of these designs were produced toward the end of the 15th century. They became a major element in European ornament from the mid-16th century to the early 17th century and characterize the work most associated with Jean Bérain (1637-1711) (and his son, Jean II (1676-1726)) the architect and ornamental designer who was one of the creators of the Louis XIV style. The influence of his designs is most commonly seen in the brass and tortoise shell veneers associated with the furniture of André-Charles Boulle (1642-1732). Architecturally, the arabesque as developed by Bérain, became a foundation motif of the Rococo. Superb examples of the style (together with grotesque-work) were completed at the Hôtel de Maillé (1687-8) by Bérain, and in England are evidenced in the painted **singers** at Belvedere, Kent, by Andien de Clermont (fl. from 1716/7-1783 (figs.67-8)) Fleming, John & Honour, Hugh, The Penguin Dictionary of Decorative Arts, Viking (New York-1989) pp.84,114; Lewis, P. & Darley, G., Dictionary of Ornament, Macmillan (London-1986) pp.35-6; Blunt, A., ed., Baroque and Rococo Architecture and Decoration, Wordsworth Editions (Hertfordshire-1998) p.136; Kimball, Fiske, The Creation of the Rococo Decorative Style, Dover (New York-1980) p.51, n.153.

**Grotesque** is a term given to the painted and low-relief plaster Roman decorations, discovered (1488) in the subterranean ruins of Nero’s Domus Aurea on the Esquiline Hill. The ruins were known to the Italians as ‘Grotte’; and it is from the location in which the designs were found that they take their name. Webster’s Dictionary, in its first definition, supports the ancient source of these decorations, further describing them as characterised by “…fanciful or fantastic representations of human and animal forms often combined with each other and interwoven with representations of foliage, flowers, fruit, wreaths, or other similar figures into a bizarre hybrid composite that is aesthetically satisfying but may use distortion or exaggeration of the natural or the expected to the point of comic absurdity...” Many early Renaissance artists (e.g. Lippi, Signorelli, Pinturicchio, Perugino (Raphael’s master)) employed various motifs from these newly-discovered designs, but it was not until roughly thirty years later that they achieved popularity, when Raphael (assisted by Giovanni da Udine) employed them in their entirety throughout the Vatican Logge (1518-9). Furthering the dictionary definition, (continued)
Bagatelle - an amalgam of Louis XVI Style, le style étrusque and English Neo-Classicism

Bagatelle and the Clérissetteau connection.

Fifteen years after Gabriel's Petit Trianon, Bagatelle's design furthered the Neo-Classical transition initiated by Pompadour. The pavilion was the brain-child of the comte d'Artois; who in 1777, wagered his sister-in-law, Marie-Antoinette, it could be built during the Court's three-month's autumn visit to Fontainebleau. Within forty-eight hours, plans had been drawn up by the count's architect, François-Joseph Bélanger (1744-1818), and approved. The project employed upwards of nine hundred men and, with materials diverted from other works in progress, was completed in sixty-four days. As the interior decoration required another two years to complete, the pavilion must have been somewhat sparse when Artois made good his bet. Elements of Bagatelle's decoration signal the emergence of the Antique, or so-called style étrusque;

(continued) the ancient grotesque is a tall, narrow, and axially symmetric composition which has as an essential feature the employment of tablets or medallions filled with painted scenes or cameos. These are arranged vertically with each tablet, etc., forming the focal point of a design group - the entire assemblage being composed of several motifs, often unrelated to each other - not unlike a Classical version of the North American Indian totem pole. When painted, these tablets, etc. feature scenes often done in grisaille, imitating their sculptural equivalents. The confusion surrounding the two terms, arabesque and grotesque is largely due perhaps to the inventiveness in which the French designed them in combination after c.1530. In typical examples, works of Bérain and others employ a profusion of vegetal forms, not characteristic of ancient designs, which typically feature human or animal figures, most often not fantasized, but added primarily as miniature ennoblements (and in certain instances, comedies) to the composition. Here as often as not, the French designs focus on a single design group from the larger composition. This approach gives the work greater width than is characteristic of a more faithfully rendered ancient grotesque. The work of the Huguenot, Daniel Marot (1663-1752) contains much arabesque/grotesque design, exemplified by the panels (probably painted jointly) by Jacques Rousseau, Charles de Lafosse, J.-B. Monnoyer and Jacques Parmentier for the 1st Duke of Montagu c.1691. Some of Marot's designs for panels, now at Boughton House, Kettering, are preserved at the Victoria & Albert Museum. Gove, P.B. ed., Webster's Third New International Dictionary... Unabridged, G. & C. Merriam Co. (Springfield, Mass.-1963); Fleming, John & Honour, Hugh, The Penguin Dictionary of Decorative Arts, Viking (New York-1989) pp.370-1; Victoria and Albert Museum Drawings Collection 8480.6 & 7; I am grateful to Gareth Fitzpatrick, Director of The Living Landscape Trust, for guiding me through Boughton House and allowing me to see the original Marot panels.
and here there is an interesting "first" claimed by its fashionable architect, for himself and the decorator (and Bélanger's brother-in-law), Jean-Démochène Dugourc (1749-1829). Bélanger announced the two as having introduced the étrusque, via Bagatelle, to France, and this distinction was reiterated by Dugourc in his autobiography of 1787. Bélanger is referring specifically to the grotesque wall-decorations which set the theme of Bagatelle's Salon. These were in fact preceded by Clériseau's highly praised decorations for the salon of the Parisian hôtel Grimod de la Reynière. Grotesques that pre-date Clériseau's can be seen in Pierre-Noël Rousset's proposal (via Cherpitel (c.1765) for the hôtel d'Uzès and in those by Gabriel for the bibliothèque (1769) of Madame Sophie at Versailles. These were unexecuted, but still it can be seen, that the introduction of the étrusque was not due to nescience within the architectural community, but more a matter of a client's willingness to accept the style.

Bélanger's debt to Clériseau is clear. Bagatelle's decorations were completed in 1779, two years after hôtel Grimod de la Reynière's Salon was given a three-page
commendatory critique in the Almarch des Artistes. But Belanger's direct association with Clerisseau begins c.1769, when both men (with Clerisseau's pupil, Lhuillier (d.1793) worked together on the pavillon de bains, hotel de Brancas, Paris. Allan Braham indicates that grotesque decoration was presumably applied to the bathing chamber of the Pavilion, adding "no visual record is known", and that the work was executed by Lhuillier under Clerisseau's direction. Lhuillier is the artist who subsequently sculpted the grotesque-work at Bagatelle, where Dugourc painted only the small basso-relievo plaques and cameos. How is it that the 'fashionable' twenty-five-year-old Belanger would have been aware, so early in his career, of this avant-garde, but largely unknown architect and his pupil? The association would seem to indicate a recommendation of Clerisseau, carrying the authority of an earlier collaborator (one with an impressive practice - which, as it happened, was in no small way based on the Frenchman's input). There is only one man who could have given such a recommendation - Robert Adam - in whose interest it may also

The Almanachs are essentially a listing of all the prominent artists in France at the time of publication. The lists appear by category with artists names initially in order of rank - the architectural section beginning with the Architecte du Roi. Belanger would most certainly have been aware of Clerisseau's project for Grimod de la Reyniere, if for no other reason than his own name appeared high in the order as "Inspecteur de la Chambre Plaisirs, Dessinateur de la Chambre a du Cabinet des Princes Freres du Roi..." As no reviews of any kind appeared in the 1776 edition, the commendation of Clerisseau's salon is unique. It is highlighted with the statement, "L'ensemble de cette superbe piece nous prove qu'en puisant dans les maximes des Anciens, il est tres facile d'y trouver un genre qui nous convienne parfaitement, quoique tres different de celui qui nous avons adopte". Plates of Clerisseau's designs were not published; and because of this, some historians have been confused as to their dating vis-à-vis the V&A panels of 1779-80 described above. There never were two sets of panels. Le Brun, Jean-Baptiste-Pierre, Almanach historique et raisoné des architectes, peintres, sculpteurs, graveurs et cisseleurs, année 1777, Minkoff reprint (Geneva-1972) pp.41, 84-6.

have been to help Clérisseau (now that he was no longer in Italy) to establish himself still away from England.

Bagatelle and the English Neo-Classicists

Bélanger was in England two years (1767-8) before he began work at the pavillon de bains. Here, he could observe, in some of Adam's major works - solid evidence of this 'new' aesthetic. Kedleston Hall (1758-68) was nearly finished; Shardeloes (1759-61), Syon House (1762), Osterley House (1761 onwards), Harewood (Music Room - 1765), Bowood (Drawing-Room), Lansdowne House (Ante-Room, Drawing-Room - 1765-8) were already there and could have provided considerable insight into Adam's extensive design vocabulary. Now in the library of the old Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Bélanger's carnet de voyage en Angleterre contains 152 pages of "thumb-nail" sketches - mainly of buildings he visited during his stay there. It also contains one he could not have possibly seen: Clermont (Claremont) for Lord Clive. Bélanger's sketch of Clermont illustrates a hexastyle Palladian Mansion of eleven bays, set on a storey-high podium. This sketch is too early to be a version of Brown & Holland's building, which was not begun until late 1770. In fact Holland had not yet entered into partnership with Capability Brown until the following year. Could this be the unsuccessful Chambers design, commissioned by Lord Clive in 1768? If this is so, Bélanger could have viewed it only at Chambers's office, where he would have seen a great deal more. Is it possible that Chambers would have introduced his young colleague to Robert Adam? Perhaps - but a more likely introduction would have come from Adam's then patron, Lord Shelburne, whose London house ("Maison Lansdown" - not the Lansdowne House of Berkeley Square) and country property,

a Braham states that Bélanger's sketchbook is practically the only surviving visual record of "visit of a French architect to England in the later eighteenth century". Braham, Allan, The Architecture of the French Enlightenment, University of California Press (Berkeley/Los Angeles-1980)p.222

Bowood, Bélanger also visited. Bélanger was one of a string of architects to receive a commission (his being c.1778) to decorate the Gallery at Shelburne's new London hôtel.


11 - Bélanger Lansdowne House Gallery, Transverse Section (1779) Soane Museum, no. 68/5/5.

12 - Bélanger Lansdowne House Gallery, Transverse Section (1779) Soane Museum, no. 68/5/6.

The designs illustrated here were not accepted; nor were those of Clérisseau submitted four years earlier; nor were those of Francesco Panini (son of Giovanni Paolo

* Annie Jacques and Jean-Pierre Mouilleseaux in their contribution to La Folie D'Artois, assert that Shelburne is responsible for inviting him to England in the first place. They also mention a meeting with William Chambers, who "d'ont il mesura l'originalité des plans de maisons." Jacques/Mouilleseaux, La Folie D'Artois, "La Folie D'Artois", Antiquaires à Paris, ed. (Paris-1988)p.29
Panini), submitted three years before that. Yet the split between the now Marquis of Lansdowne and Adam did not occur until the controversy over Adam's Adelphi project in 1771, and therefore the introduction from Lansdowne is most likely. In any event, Bélanger's sketchbook clearly demonstrates he had not only visited Kedleston Manor, but had been allowed to view its interior. Indeed, his sketchbook contains more information about Kedleston than any other building he visited during his English stay. It includes a plan of the interior and also its elevations - specifically the Saloon. The invitation to Kedleston could have come only from Adam. And who was Adam's principal Frenchman? Clérisset - with whom Bélanger worked directly after his return from England. Also at Kedleston was another Englishman, with whom Bélanger would have spent some valuable time: its then clerk of works, Samuel Wyatt II. History has perhaps not given proper recognition to this excellent architect, who was to become overshadowed by his famous younger brother James. However, it was Samuel, with his association with Matthew Boulton and perhaps to a minor degree, Bélanger, who would become the most French-influenced architect in this generation of Wyatts. Trinity House, Tower Hill, London, and Doddington Hall, Cheshire, both feature architectural and decorative elements in a distinctly French manner.

George Dance also submitted a "library" scheme in 1788. Lansdowne House, Berkeley Square, was done for the Earl of Bute by Robert Adam, who had also done the definitive work at Bute's country estate, Luton Hoo. The Berkeley Square mansion was essentially complete, except for the Gallery (originally to be a library) when Lord Shelburne, now the Marquis of Lansdowne took ownership in the late 1760s. The gallery remained a shell until 1816-9 when it was finally completed by Sir Robert Smirke, one of the dullest English architects ever to gain prominence in the profession. All of the rejected schemes of Adam, Panini, Clérisset, Bélanger, and Dance were far more beautiful and inventive than the pedantic "British Museum" interior that eventuated. McCormick, T.J., Charles-Louis Clérisset and the Genesis of Neo-Classicism, MIT Press (Cambridge/London-1990) pp.151-3; Summerson, J., Georgian London, Barrie & Jenkins (London-1978 ed.)p.143; Watkin, D./ Middleton, R., Neoclassical and the 19th Century Architecture, vol.1, Rizzoli (New York-1980)p.143; Lejeune, A./ Lewis, M., The Gentlemen's Clubs of London, Bracken Books (London-1984 ed.)p.145, face-pg. 145; Morley, J., Regency Design 1790-1840, A. Zwemmer Ltd. (London-1993) pp.235, plt.174,287.

In 1860, Wyatt was twenty-three when he became clerk of works at Kedleston Hall, the point at which Adam was given sole direction of the house. For eight years, Wyatt remained on site, essentially as the go-between Adam and his architecturally well-informed patron, Lord Scarsdale. Much of his formative training was done at this time, designing various projects there in his own right. Wyatt would have still been on site for Bélanger's visit in 1768. In 1776, Matthew Boulton, the famous metallist (and mechanical painter), returned from Paris. He retained an enthusiasm for French architectural and decorative design throughout his career, and because of his intimacy with many of the Wyatt family, doubtless passed this interest on to them. Between 1759 and 1766, Wyatt directed the building of Boulton's Soho Manufactory, and later built Heathfield Hall, near Birmingham, for Boulton's equally famous partner, James Watt. Delieb, R., & Roberts, M., Matthew Boulton, Master Silversmith, (continued)
It may be worthwhile to observe a specific design detail from Adam's repertoire that Bélanger doubtlessly saw whilst in England: Adam's approach to the grotesque. Present in all the projects listed above were his own idiomatic, Palladian - transitional interpretations of this Antique decoration. Executed in plaster, they were, at this stage in Adam's career, vigorous and highly sculptural in character. They contained the panels and cameos derived from the grotte, with profuse Classicized arabesque elements being largely white on a monochrome field.\(^5\)

Given the French preference for carved wood versus plaster wall decorations, it is interesting to observe the latter being the form at Bagatelle (and probably at the hôtel de Brancas). Given also the short building schedule, plaster decorations would have produced much quicker results than would have been the case with boiseries.

Bagatelle offers some interesting play with English Neo-Classicism; and although it may be coincidental, there is enough evidence of a direct


\(^a\) It would seem an obvious observation, but one historians disregard more often than not. Interior decoration, as well as architecture, often must take into consideration what has gone on before, and that a startling jump into a new style is often too daring and/or impractical for the patron. Adam replaced, for instance, the Palladian architect James Paine at both Kedleston and Nostell Priory, after the architectural concept was well in evidence. Eriksen makes this observation as regards the general development of French furniture, when he points out that Louis XV, in spite of the Neo-Classical movement initiated during his reign, demanded cabriole-leg furniture for his own use. Eriksen gives excellent examples in his plates showing the transition of Rococo furniture into the new aesthetic. Here he illustrates, in the instance of arm-chair design, the flowing curves were augmented with classical details, and whilst retaining the cabriole leg, become much more static, or "imperial" in aspect. Remembering that Versailles contains all three "Louis" styles, it is not surprising to see Bélanger's design for the jewel cabinet of Marie Antoinette evoking the general structure and design used for this furniture type during the reign of Louis XIV. Eriksen, S., **Early Neo-Classicism in France**, Faber and Faber Ltd. (London-1974) plts. 111, 122, 143, 161 ,448; Verlet, P., ed., **Styles, meubles, décors, du Moyen Age à nos jours**, Librairie Larousse (Paris-1972) pg.235, fig.4; Maillard, É., **Old French Furniture and its Surroundings**, Charles Scribner's Sons (New York-1925)pl.III; Jackson-Stops, G., **Nostell Priory, House guide, The National Trust (Hampshire-1988)**p.5; Antram, N./ Jackson-Stops, G., **Kedleston Hall, House Guide, The National Trust (Hampshire-1988)**p.7.
influence to provoke comparisons. Remembering that Bélanger produced his drawings in two days, one may recall "Chance favours the man who is prepared", and believe that the design must have been at least superficially in Bélanger's head (or within his grasp) before Artois announced the commission. Chambers's *A Treatise on Civil Architecture* was published in 1759, and was internationally known. *Treatise* is largely devoted to Palladian principles of decoration, which are presented in a universal, Classical context. It contains as well, a wealth of design and detail which illustrates Italian Renaissance and ancient precedents. Bélanger was within the established architectural tradition, as opposed to avant garde (Clériseau, Ledoux, de Wailly, Rousseau, etc.), and highly placed within the main stream of accepted French design, i.e. "Gabriel-transitional". Chambers is also a transitional architect, whose study with Jacques-François Blondel, the great academician, not only produced the Francophile sympathies evident in Chambers's greatest work, Somerset House, but very likely influenced the highly scholastic format of *Treatise*. The respect Bélanger felt toward Chambers is documented (see page 20, footnote b).

"Transitional" is used in this sense as "within the traditional development of". Bélanger was a product of the Royal academies, which were in effect in France from the days of Richelieu. What was known as the Académie Royal d'Architecture dates from 1671, during the reign of Louis XIV. Here a student or élève received his instruction, not at the Academy, but in the atelier of a master (a tradition which lasted until the final days of the Academy's successor, the École des Beaux Arts). At the academy, his instruction came mostly in the form of lectures. Notwithstanding, its purpose as a glorification of the king or state (which were interchangeable), instruction concentrated on the search for universal principles in architecture - which had their foundation in classical examples, but not without a great regard for how these had been formulated over the centuries into a distinctly French tradition. In this way, the great names of Vitruvius, Serlio, Alberti, Palladio, were augmented by those of Lescot, de l'Orme, Mansart, Perrault, and Blondel. After a three-year stint in Rome under the auspices of the French Academy, a student was eligible to receive the great prize for excellence. This honour attained, there was the further possibility of election to the Academy itself. Thus a system was established that not only promoted a direction towards specific ideals in the development of architecture and decoration, but also the avenue by which professional recognition was attained. The system, supported by an absolute government, can hardly have been designed to embrace radicalism; and so in this sense, "transitional" is the norm, even in the promotion of "new" ideas. Chafee, R., *The Architecture of the École des Beaux Arts*, Drexler, A., Seeker & Warburg (London-1984)pp.61-5; Ward, W.H., *The Architecture of the Renaissance in France Vol.II*, Batsford (London-1911)p.272; Kimball, F., & Edgell, G.H., *A History of Architecture*, Harper & Brothers (New York-1946)pp.428-32.

and some of the architectural and decorative aspects of Bagatelle are, without a stretch, evocative of those illustrated in Chambers's work. In fact, the garden front of the casino, could easily have come from Treatise.**

**See also Addendum A, page 607**

The Entrance Façade could also have developed from an as yet unidentified English source. On page 88 of Bélanger's Carnet appears what he has described as a little Neo-Classical Pavilion. The writer offers a simple copy of that sketch and the corresponding Bagatelle façade.

The circular Salon features at least two decorative details: those of the spandrels and of the dome itself, which are remarkably similar to illustrations found side-by-side on face-page 84 of Treatise (following page). Chambers' illustrations here, do not represent entirely his own work; but are an annotated recueil of Classical details he judged as architecturally appropriate. Of more importance - looking back at Walpole's remarks on Anglomania - English publications were obviously having their effect in France, not only from a literary standpoint, but also from that of architectural design. As seen in the case of Bélanger, the connection was tangible.

The fourth volume of Vitruvius Britannicus (1767) was published on the eve of Bélanger's return to France.
forty-five through fifty-one display Kedleston in all its glory - with the last being the powerful section through the Entrance, Marble Hall and Saloon. Miniaturised surely, yet how similar in arrangement appears a like...
section of Bagatelle. It is perhaps belabouring the point, but may be briefly worth while to observe at least two new hôtels, built in Paris after the appearance of Vitruvius Britannicus IV, and comparing their sections with the little English-inspired casino in the Bois de Boulogne: Appearing first is Claude-Nicolas Ledoux’s Hôtel Thélusson (c.1782) followed by the Hôtel de Salm (c.1785) of Pierre Rousseau. Although Michel Gallet demonstrates (within this context) that round rooms in France were not a belated echo of English examples, and that the

It would be fair to say that the same section through Chambers’ casino, would have produced a similar result. Please note that this engraving of Bagatelle appeared in Recueil d’architecture Civile, Krafft, 1812. It shows the dome heightened, and decorated at great variance to the original. There were no alterations to Bagatelle until c.1855, twenty years after King Louis-Philippe (Artois) sold the estate to the Marquis of Hertford. At this time a false parapet above the entrance door was added, the cupola enlarged, being encased in a bigger drum, and the ceilings on the first floor were raised, doing away with the attic floor. Jacques/Mouilleseaux state that the artist Dusseaux did much of the decorative painting, “...y figura, notamment, des têtes de bœufs à la base de la lanterne, desoiseaux et des fleurs dans les caissons de la coupole (aujourd’hui refait)...” - indicating that the internal dome design has never changed. This would make Kraft’s interpretive engraving somewhat of a prediction. Scott, B., Country Life Vol.CLXXXV, No.20, 16 May 1991, p.143; Jacques/ Mouilleseaux, La Folie d’Artois, Antiquaires à Paris ed., (Paris-1988) p.41
exterior expression of these spaces was more a factor of the study of ancient models, the sections of these two examples not only display the Kedleston format, but to a major degree, its decorative elements as well. Thus it is the writer's opinion, that considering the paucity of contradictory documentation, and the chronology in which these domestic works appeared, Adam and the English Neo-Classicists could very well indeed have contributed to the sudden blossoming of this now pure aesthetic in pre-revolutionary France. It is also not unreasonable to suggest, as an extension of this, it was perhaps as much within English decorative forms, that the Empire Style of Percier and Fontaine found some encouragement. Whatever the arguments made about the "first-in-France" aspect of Bagatelle's grotesques, there can be no doubt that following their appearance here, they reappeared again and again in French interior decoration well into the nineteenth century.

Bagatelle would seem however, to be a singular incident to Bélanger's taste. Referring again to his Lansdowne House offering, one can see, that given a commission of substance, he reverted however wonderfully, to the opulence that was to him, de rigueur.

Bagatelle and le style étrusque

Bagatelle's Salon is a rotunda, with eight arches supporting the dome. Three contain doors leading to the garden, four, to the interior apartments and service corridors - with the eighth framing the fireplace. The concave walls between the arches support the grotesque panels à l'étrusque. There are two alternating panel designs, differing only slightly in detail - clearly after the antique reproductions of Raphael. Both are supported by angels, or Jeunes ados-cents, representing "Harmony" and "The World". Echoing this theme, and of

---

Not with civic (or secular) architecture however. Braham illustrates Louis-François Trouard's church of St. Symphorien, Montreuil, Versailles, (1764) as being "the earliest and the most austere of the basilican churches of the 1760s in the neighbourhood of Paris". Braham, A., pg.127. By the 1770s, the architectural focus of both England and France was largely concentrated on the monuments of ancient Rome. The model for all of these coffered domes is certainly the Pantheon, for which James Wyatt's 1772 galleried assembly hall was named. It is the writer's opinion that as these domes were actually being built in England, their subsequent re-creation in France is as much an English influence as it might have been a purely Roman retrospective.

As a technical note, the curved surface of the interior walls would favour the use of plaster vs. wood, not only because of the short building schedule, but also in consideration of the difficulties inherent in producing correspondingly curved boisseries. Although (continued)
the same scale, angelic heralds occupy the spandrels. But charming as these figures are, the decorative theme is dominated by the grotesques, which feature oblong plaques, circular medallions, and in the case of one design (to the right as illustrated), a pelta. Displaying the same arrangement is Clérissette’s drawing of ten years earlier, which was in his possession at the time of his association with Bélanger.

Bagatelle and the style Louis XVI

At Bagatelle - the “new” antique elements aside - one also observes exquisite painted decorations that are typical of the period. In the Salon, arabesques embellishing the oak panels of the arch returns are of particular interest, as are those painted in the manner of Watteau, on the (continued) the subject here is the French and English interaction, Bagatelle, as far as its plan is concerned, has astonishingly similar reproductions in post-colonial America, as exemplified in Pharoux’ Van Rensselaer House, c. 1806, on the Hudson. Kennedy, R.G., Orders from France, Alfred A. Knopf (New York-1989)p.71.

The Pelta ornament is of classical origin, representing a shield. It was a popular Neo-Classical frieze and wall decoration. Robert Adam’s fanciful arabesque/grotesques at Osterley (fig. 13) for instance, employ two such forms. The Pelta has perhaps found its most conspicuous English application as the overdoor-ornament to the entrance of the 1908-11 Royal Automobile Club, London (pg.463, fig.1083). This building is by the late nineteenth-, early twentieth-century Anglo-French team of Mewès and Davis. Lewis, P., & Darley, G., Dictionary of Ornament, Macmillan (London-1986) p.231; Grey, A.S., Edwardian Architecture, Duckworth (London-1985)p.159.
29 - M. Dusseaux Bagatelle, Boudoir Rose, detail, Clarke, fig. 26, pg. 138.

30 - Dusseaux Versailles, second cabinet du Turc, Clarke, fig. 7, pg. 90.

31 - Delabrière Bagatelle, Salon, arch return panel detail, writer’s photo.
door panels of the Boudoir Rose. The latter are the work of
the decorative painter Dusseaux, who was also employed at
Versailles with the second Cabinet Turc for Artois (figures
29 & 30, previous page). The panels of the Salon's arch
returns (figure 31, previous page) are not attributed as of
this writing, but might be those of Alexandre-Louis
Delabrière, whom Henry Holland employed to do decorative
work at Carlton House. Unlike Dusseaux, Delabrière is given
no specific credit for his efforts at Bagatelle, which would
indicate that he was officially considered below first-rank
artists. The name Delabrière (or de Labrière) does not, for
instance, appear anywhere in the Almanachs of either 1776 or
1777, but that should not be a matter of great concern. His
presence at Bagatelle would qualify him as an artist of
standing, regardless of the official hierarchy. The
pavilion's decorative painting speaks for itself of an
artistic level that can be seen as a bench mark for all such
work done during the Neo-Classical period in France.

The style in this case is yet another variation of Louis
XVI style - this one named for Marie-Antoinette. There are
historians who would associate the style étrusque and all
its diversified forms with the French queen, and supporting
this view, point to the boudoir (c.1787) at Fontainebleau
(figure 43). While this gorgeous interior, seen as a high
point of the étrusque, certainly indicates her belated
acceptance of the aesthetic, the queen preferred pastoral
motifs and fragile arrangements of flowers, painted in natural
colourings. These were often embellished with groupings of
musical instruments or agricultural implements. Such a
scheme can be seen in Mique's Belvédère (1778-9), Petit
Trianon, Versailles, and in a virtuosic tour de force, by way
of the Sérillily Cabinet, now in the Victoria and Albert

Colvin states that Alexandre-Louis de Labrière came to England as a
refugee of the revolution, and that either he or his relative, Jean-Jacques
de Labrière was Controleur des bâtiments du roi at Fontainebleau in 1772
and at Meudon in 1778. As he was architect to both the comte d'Artois and
Madame Elizabeth, this would account for his presence at Bagatelle. Croft-
Murray lists him as "Louis-André(?)" Delabrière. Stroud makes no distinction
whateover between Louis-André and Alexandre-Louis, which is probably
correct. Given the English penchant for misspelling workman's names
(eespecially foreigners) on house accounts, etc., all the variations probably
point to one man. (see also footnote a, pg.78) Colvin, H., A Biographical
Croft-Murray, E., Decorative Painting in England 1537-1837, Vol.Two,
Country Life Books (Middlesex-1970)pp.197-8; Stroud, D., Henry Holland,

The cabinet is thought to have been designed by C.N. Ledoux (1736-
1806) and decorated by Jean Simon Rousseau de la Rottière (b.1747), whose
original design survives. Rousseau was probably assisted by his father
Jules-Antoine Rousseau (1710-1782) and his brother Jules-Hugues Rousseau
(1743-1806). The Rousseau brothers are also credited with the
Fontainebleau boudoir decorations. V&A Museum guide, Scala/V&A (London-
1991)p.62; V&A Museum exhibit No. 1736-1869; Dilke, Lady E., French Furniture
and Decoration in the XVIIIth Century, George Bell & Sons (London-
1901)pp.55-60.
Museum, London. The Sérilly Cabinet (c.1780)* predates the Fontainebleu boudoir by nearly a decade and heralds this project in much of its detailing.

More to the theme of this study, the cabinet decorations combine the formality of the grotesque panels (à la Bagatelle) with a seemingly unrehearsed playfulness of painterly detail. From an artistic standpoint, great liberties are taken here, and few examples of this spontaneous approach to a stately theme can be equalled even in France. The brush-work is easy, and without the crispness one usually associates with decorative painting. A Classical, carved guilloche is entwined with painted garlands of flowers, in the form of an alternating guilloche. Such particulars bring a freshness and intimacy, that seem as tangible today as they would have been over two hundred years ago.

**English Neo-Classicism in England - but with a French Translation**

One cannot expect quite the same approach from Delabrière in his work for most English patrons, who would have termed this delicacy “effeminate” - and so would the French for that matter - but with a great difference in

* Anne Marie Louise Thomas de Pange de Domangeville, Marquise de Sérilly (whose 1782 bust by Houdon is in the Wallace Collection, Hertford House) was a favourite lady-of-honour to Marie-Antoinette. Her husband was one of the trésoriers-payeurs de l’armée under Louis XVI. The cabinet was purchased on behalf of the South Kensington Museum for 50,000 Fr. by Sir Matthew Digby Wyatt in 1869. Writer’s visits to Hertford House; Dilke, Lady Emilia F.S., *French Furniture and Decoration in the XVIIIth Century*, George Bell & Sons (London-1901)pp.55-71; Notes provided by the V&A, Mus. No. 1736-1869.
decorative philosophy. In contrast to Coke’s “For a man’s house is his castle, et domus sua cuique tutissimum refugium”, this sentiment appeared in the Parisian Revu des Arts Decoratifs of 1896:

L’art décoratif s’exerce dans nos maisons et sur nos personnes... Et tout cela, l’influence des femmes est souveraine, ou doit être. Tandis que, par la force de la nature et de la loi sociale, l’homme le plus s’édentaire vit beaucoup ou dehors, en revanche, et pour les mêmes raisons, la femme la plus répandue reste bien d’avantage chez elle. Aussi, l’arrangement du home dépend-il de son action; il est ce qu’elle le fait, agréable ou maussade, élegant ou vulgaire. Salon, salle à manger, chambre à coucher, de la pièce la plus fermée à la plus ouverte, tout porte sa marque. Un intérieur peut ne rien apprendre sur l’homme qui l’habite; il révèle toujours la caractère et les goûts de la femme qui l’a combiné. Toute un partie de l’art décoratif est essentiellement féminin... 


Delabrière’s work under George Steuart (1780s) at Attingham reaches an apogée of this genre certainly in England. Figure 34 illustrates, in addition to the beautiful cameo
and its framing decorations, the termination detail of paired acanthus scrolls. In contrast to Antonio Zucci's comparatively chiseled bookcase decoration (1776) for Lady Wynn, Delabrière's detailing (seen in its entirety in Figure 35) is executed with great delicacy and imagination.

Although Attingham's decorations are evocative of antique models, the presentation here is of an entirely different character than that observed in similar renderings by Clérisseau and James Athenian Stuart, who reproduced the Tuscan/Roman version far more faithfully (and with much less invention). 63

The carved-wood pilasterlike panels encircling the Saloon at Dodgington Hall, Cheshire (c. 1798 - following page), offer another example: This work was done under the direction of Samuel Wyatt; and although these decorations are unattributed, they are French in design, having affinities with similar work at Southill - which is unmistakeably by Delabrière. 64 (figures, page thirty-six)

Understandably Delabrière would not be the only French artist to be working in England during the Revolution, and of the recorded few that were of any standard, most would be capable of these achievements. However in the absence of any

The quadri riportati (without illusionistic foreshortening) roundels and oblong panels in this room are in the manner of Biagio Rebecca (1735-1808). Croft-Murray catalogues this Italian artist, whose name is often linked with Antonio Zucchi and Zucchi's wife, Angelica Kauffmann (1741-1807) and their contributions to Robert Adam's interiors. Amongst the other notable English architects with whom Rebecca collaborated, one finds the names of Sir William Chambers (Woburn Abbey, 1770-1), Henry Holland (Berrington, before 1781, the 3rd Drury Lane Theatre, before 1794, and the first phase of work at the Royal Pavilion, Brighton, (c. 1787), (continued)
recorded knowledge, it is worthwhile to observe the similarities:
The painterly techniques presented here are refined, but not particularly feminine in character (although one is a boudoir). They do however illustrate the training that is intrinsic to both the culture and philosophy that produced these artists in France.

(continued) James Wyatt (Heveningham Hall, c.1797-9, and the Pantheon, London, 1771-2), and James's Brother Samuel (No.15, St James's Square, London, 1794, and perhaps at Doddington Hall, after 1777). Croft-Murray gives no mention of the pilasterlike panels discussed here; and whilst it is possible that Rebecca could have painted them, one would have to admit that in an overview of his portfolio, this very French statement would be a singular instance indeed (Croft-Murray states that Rebecca had painted grotesques in the "ancient" manner (writer assumes "after Raphael") at both the Pantheon and, it is thought (because of the Royal Pavilion connection) at Old Ship Tavern, Brighton (before 1788)). What is more typical of his work are the studio-painted oils on canvas or paper, which were subsequently inserted into an architectural context. Gordon Nares concedes the Rebecca association at Doddington; but whilst allowing this, asserts that "...there is a tradition that [the decoration] was French." Without documentation, it would be just as fair to say on one hand, (continued)
Finally, it may be instructive to observe the work of the French decorative painter Irrouard (Gerard) le Girardy (Gerardy). Today the only remaining verified work by Le Girardy in Britain can be seen in the Drawing-Room (1788) at Inveraray Castle, Argyllshire. The Drawing-room displays yet another example of the playful liberties French painted decoration took with what would have been otherwise a formal English Neo-Classical exercise. Here tangential floral sprays extend the circular fans (done in trompe l’oeil) of the ceiling design. The rigid compartmentalisation is elaborated by this artifice to the degree that its character is significantly altered. As Walpole would confirm (see pages 54-5), one could not call this a French ceiling; however, it would be true to say that this painterly extension makes it an altogether unique supplement to the prevailing ethic of the day. One may also observe, the device allows the ceiling’s participation (or conversation) with the room’s featured decorations. These are the Aubisson tapestries reproducing the Rococo designs of J.-B. Huet, whose painted decorations will be seen at Champs and Hôtel de Rohan. It was behind one of the tapestries where Le Girardy declared

(continued) that Rebecca could be responsible for the decorative elements as a piece, as it would be to say, on the other, that an accomplished French artist could also have done the entire work. The third possibility, of course, is that Rebecca may have done the fine art, with a French artist accomplishing the architectural decoration. Croft-Murray, E., Decorative Painting in England 1537-1837, vol. two, Country Life Books (Middlesex-1970) pp.258-61; Nares, G., “Doddington Hall, Cheshire” Country Life, 13 Feb. 1953, vol CXIII, p.417.

his authorship of the painterly enrichments at Inverary. These included wall panels and over-door decorations in addition to the ceiling designs.

An interior, similar in theme to Inverary's, is Newby Hall's "tapestry Room". Here, Adam's equally compartmentalized ceiling contains painted roundels. Understanding that this is an Adamitic autograph, the roundels coincidentally reflect those in the Neo-Classical Gobelins tapestries - the room's decorative focus. Clearly the beige ceiling is a further extension of this sympathy; yet, even with Chippendale's furniture extending the tapestry motif (or perhaps because it is so much a piece with the walls), there is a schism resulting between the ceiling and a wholly French statement below. Ultimately the ceiling dominates - or excuses itself from the theme (a form of domination), which is not the case at Inverary.

In however patrimonial a translation it may have appeared at Carlton House or anywhere in Britain, it is difficult to question that even in these contexts, French decorative artistry could have been anything but exquisite. More

* In addition to Newby Hall's, "Tapestry Rooms" by Adam include those at Osterley Park House, Middlesex, Moor Park, Hertfordshire and at Croome Court, Worcestershire. Whilst differing in background colour (Osterley's and Croome Court's are rose - Newby Hall and Moor Park tapestries are gris pierre or beige in colour), the theme of medallions on a damascened background is common to all. Adam created six rooms to house sets of the same number. The remaining three being installed at Goodwood House, West Sussex (3rd Duke of Richmond - French Ambassador 1765-6 (remained in France until 1768) and a descendant of Louise de Kerouaille\Charles II), Moor Park, Hertfordshire (Sir Lawrence Dundas) and Welbeck Abbey, Nottinghamshire (the 3rd Duke of Portland). Thus, between 1764 and 1789, two thirds of the nine sets created by the famous Gobelins manufactory were ordered by English clients. Croome Court's (chairs by Mayhew & Ince) were the first and are now part of the S.H. Kress Collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Moor Park's are now at Aske, Richmond, Yorkshire, but the chairs by Fell/Turton, upholstered (as with those at Osterley, Newby, and Croome Court) in matching Gobelins tapestries are now at Temple Newsam, Leeds, and in the Philadelphia Museum of Art). I am grateful to Donna Dempsey of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and K. Hiesinger of the Philadelphia museum for their help; Cornforth, J., English Decoration in the 18th Century, Barrie & Jenkins (London-1986)pp.43-5; Hardy/Tomlin, Osterley Park House, V&A Museum (London-1985)pp.66-78; Sproule/Pollard, pp.122-3,295. Yarwood, D., Robert Adam, Charles Scribner's Sons (New York-1970)p.130; Standen, B.A., European Post-Medieval Tapestries.... Vol. I, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (New York-1985)pp.385-396.
importantly, French Neo-Classicism, whatever its sources may have been, had evolved in concept to parallel English practice, and as such, allowed French decorators to collaborate with their cross-Channel counterparts, without any need for an indigenous translation. It should also be obvious that their employment in England suggests as well - few local artists were capable of this standard of work.

The French influence on George, Prince of Wales.

A connoisseur is not by definition a centre of fashion. This status requires an ambition. The prince of Wales’s early leanings to a French aesthetic underscore not only an awareness of the comparative opulence this taste displayed, but also an appreciation of its finesse. In Wild’s views of Carlton House interiors (c.1817) - painted after it was much altered from Holland’s days - The Circular Room must be seen as hardly changed from its original state. Circular describes this space, which was alternatively used as a Music Room, a Dining Room, and as a reception room for formal levees.  

The room has also been described as “The Star Chamber”. With its shimmering wall surfaces surmounted by an enormous dome, this space was the second of three large, connecting staterooms - the others originally being the Drawing Room and Eating Room. The treatment of the dome can be compared somewhat to the larger dome of Ledoux’s hôtel Thélusson (fig. 24). Aspinall, A., The Correspondence of George, Prince of Wales, 1770-1812, Vol.I, Cassell, (London-1963) p.303.
sky-painted dome, stellar is also an apt description. Wild’s view shows the bronze basso-relievo decorations on panels of silver gilt. This motif was applied to doors, trumeau surrounds and the alcoves – one of which is seen to the right in figure 42. Columns with silver gilt capitals supported an entablature also largely in silver gilt. The frieze reflected the wall decorations with garlands and putti painted in bronze. The columns themselves were porfido rosso (red porphyry) scagliola, which is echoed in the rosso-coloured carpet and diapered wall pattern. The whole is a scene both augustan in nature and ethereal in aspect, the gleaming qualities of which bring to mind the boudoir at Fontainebleau (following page).

Recalling Walpole’s 1785 description of the as yet unfinished Pall Mall palace as “...the most perfect in Europe.” the reader will be invited to imagine, or visually pierce the veil, as it were, of the “motley” transformation it had

---

*a* Stroud reports that the scagliola work at Carlton House, done c.1789, was carried out by Domenico Bartoli (presumably in concert with his brother Giuseppe (fl.1765-94). Scagliola is a plaster-like material combining gypsum, sand, glue, isinglass and (most often) marble chips to give it colour and texture. Usually a factory operation, as opposed to being done in situ, scagliola, when highly polished, is practically undistinguishable from the marble or porphyry, etc. it imitates. The Italian invention was introduced into England in the late seventeenth century (The chimney-piece in the Queen’s Closet, Ham House (c.1670) and the Hall niche at Castle Howard (c.1710) are early examples). Wild’s watercolour reproduces well the colour and texture of porfido rosso scagliola. The writer’s photo shows the actual article in another French-decorated villa of the 19th century – Gunnersbury Park. Stroud, D., Henry Holland, Country Life Books Ltd. (London-1966)p.72; Jackson-Stops, G., The English Country House, A Grand Tour, Weidenfeld & Nicolson (London-1985)face-pg.189; Tomlin, Ham House, Victoria and Albert Museum (London-1986)p.10; Beard, G., Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England 1660-1820, pp.36,245.

*b* Joseph Farington recorded on 3 May 1806: (continued)
become by the time Wild painted the major interiors.  

Certainly, Carlton House was intended both at its inception and later redecorations, to be the penultimate statement of style at the very centre of society. In this regard it should be noted that its occupant was himself, the focal point of that society. His principal residences were not the Balmoral and Sandringham retreats enjoyed by the royals of today, but highly conspicuous edifices. In the case of Carlton House, not only was this so, but Nash's Regent Street redevelopment (1817-23) in the heart of London, was designed to accentuate the point.

(continued) "Although Carlton House as finished by Holland was in a complete & new state, He [the prince] has ordered the whole to be done again under the direction of Walsh Porter (a gentleman dealer) who has destroyed all that Holland has done & is substituting a finishing in the most extensive and motley taste." Farington exaggerates, but a transformation most certainly occurred. Much of Holland's work did survive, and this is the subject of the present investigation. Grieg, J., ed., The Farington Diary by Joseph Farington, R.A., Vol.III, George H Doran Co. (New York-1924)p.214.

- The exception would be Cumberland, or the Royal Lodge at Windsor, which was designed as a retreat. Summerson, J., John Nash, Architect to King George IV, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. (London-1949)pp.143-5.
The French Influence on George, Prince of Wales

The prince was erudite with a demeanour that was both easy and engaging. His address was remarkable for its elegance;* and although he would not journey from England until he become sovereign, the prince spoke fluently the principal modern languages. He was a tasteful musician, and was well tutored in the classics, English literature and history.** His knowledge of military tactics was extensive.*** All this combined to give him mastery of the very important ability to speak in public with fluency, dignity, and vigour. The public face was laudable; the private man largely reflected - as did his friends - society's seamier side. George, like Fox**** and Sheridan, was utterly reckless with money - an attitude which was to remain largely unrestrained throughout his lifetime and a symptom of the extravagant life-style he epitomised.**** The commonly uninhibited behaviour of the French aristocracy found a collateral in the young prince, who discovered encouragement amongst the peripheral members of his own family.*****

A preference for French decoration was intrinsic given its European preeminence since the days of Louis XIV, and the prince's desire to be at the centre of fashion.******

---

* Princess de Lieven, wife of the Russian Ambassador 1815-34) gives this description: "Unquestionably he had some wit and a great penetration; he quickly summed up persons and things; he was educated and had much tact, easy, animated and varied conversation, not at all pedantic. He adorned the subjects he touched, he knew how to listen, he was very polished. For my part I had never known a person like him, who was also affectionate, sympathetic and gallant. ..." Fitzgerald, p., The Life of George IV, Harper & Brothers (New York-1881)p.899; Leslie, S., George The Fourth, Little Brown & Co. (Boston-1926)pp.134,143,148; Fulford, R., George IV, G.P. Putnam's Sons (New York-1935)pp.281-2.

** Thackeray reports that Charles James Fox was a "dreadful" gambler, and cites his losses as £200,000. He does not say if this is accumulative. Thackeray, William Makepeace, The Four Georges, etc., Estes and Lauriat (Boston-1881) p.87.


**** The prince's friendship with George 'Beau' Brummell evidences his life-long preoccupation with manner and appearance. Priestley describes Brummell as a "dictator of the world of the beaux. ...his constant aim was towards a sober but exquisite perfection. ... He had genuine good taste in everything - his house, furniture, library and all his possessions were much admired..." In this arena, the prince was a rival, as he considered himself the arbiter of taste. In matters of dress, however, the prince's portly figure placed him at a (continued)
But an informed appreciation amounting to connoisseurship requires not only a predilection in this regard, but capacity, study, the assistance of expert councillors, and of course, the money to carry it off.

Other than those near the prince at a very early age, it is difficult to believe that any one person however catalytic to the development of his taste would have been instrumental in forming it. But if "a seed does not fall far from the tree", it is not unreasonable to look to George’s immediate family for this influence. In spite of the mock-warfare between son and father, the king’s interests and efforts on behalf of the arts and sciences would have been difficult to overlook, especially for this particular son. Although George III was not a great collector of pictures, his appreciation of artists and the development of the arts in Britain was very strong. In 1762 he acquired the collection of Joseph Smith, a former British consul in Venice. As well as many coins and antiques, the collection contained the largest assemblage of Canalettos in the world.71 The same year he purchased from Cardinal Albani a rare collection of drawings and prints.4 In 1768, on the advice of Sir William Chambers, the king’s tutor in architecture, George III founded the Royal Academy of Arts, with Sir Joshua Reynolds as its first President,72 followed in 1792 by the king’s favourite painter, Benjamin West. To this end, George III personally supervised the draft of the Academy’s constitution, provided free quarters in Somerset House, and covered from his private funds, the fledgling society’s annual deficit (over £5,000) in its critical first years.73 Although not an artist himself, the king was an accomplished handicraftsman and artisan.74 Perhaps these abilities contributed to his understanding and support of men whose genius marks the era, b but such was the unselfish character of this man, that those encouragements as he could give would have naturally come from him regardless of his


a James Adam, in Italy at the time, accomplished this for the large sum of £3,000. Lees-Milne, James, The Age of Adam, B.T. Batsford Ltd (London-1947) p.28.

b From the standpoint of its innovative manufacturing process, the Stafford pottery of Josiah Wedgwood (1730-95) fascinated the king. This is but one example in an era that produced not only the great furniture designers, Chippendale, Hepplewhite and Sheraton, but also Watt, Crompton, Cartwright, Darby, etc. who heralded the Industrial Revolution and earned Britain the title of “Workshop to the World.” Long, J.C. George III, Little, Brown & Co., (Boston-1960) p.189; Fleming, John & Honour, Hugh, The Penguin Dictionary of Decorative Arts, Viking (New York-1989)p.881; Trinder, B., The Iron Bridge, Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust (Salop-1979) passim.
own abilities. The king collected musical manuscripts and was an accomplished musician himself, playing at least three instruments: flute, harpsichord and pianoforte. He was one of, if not the greatest book-collector of his day, beginning his library by purchasing in 1762, the Thomason collection of 32,000 items, and in 1765, the Joseph Smith collection. The King's Library comprised 65,000 books and 450 manuscripts at his death, and although paid for from his own private purse, was created not for his personal use, but as a national centre of learning to which any scholar was welcome. In 1823, it was made a gift to the nation by George IV, who in that same year, successfully petitioned the government to purchase the Angerstein collection of art as the start of a national collection.

We think of George III as a straightforward and honest man, not possessed of the wit and sophistication that characterized his eldest son; but his interests, guided by some of the great minds of the day, were genuine and almost always with the nation's welfare as first consideration. So many of these were shared by the prince of Wales, that it is difficult to credit anyone else as the source from which George IV's taste developed.

Regarding the French taste however, there is one to whom much has been attributed: the reprehensible Louis Philippe Joseph, duc de Montpensier-cum-duc de Chartres-cum-duc d'Orléans (alias Citoyen Philippe Égalité). John Harris, writing in 1991, is perhaps the latest author to suggest the friendship between the prince and the duke may have contributed to George's interest in French design; and if this assertion is so, it is supported by precious little documentation. There is however a great body of writing to suggest the

---

Harris, J., "A Carlton House Miscellany", Apollo, Oct. 1991, Vol. CXXXIV, no.356; Apollo Magazine Ltd, London, p.254. Harris cites Dorothy Stroud as being "the first to refer" to the friendship, avoiding the argument of a French art influence, which Stroud states directly, by correctly pointing out the duke's rampant Anglophilia. Stroud is of course not the first to refer to this, but she has been echoed by other authors in what may be the first contention of a Wales - Orléans symbiosis that generated the Prince's avid interest in French architecture and decoration. Stroud cites Mme Campan's Mémoires de la Vie Privé de Marie Antoinette, but her reference is vague; and the inference that "...the Prince and the Duc had a marked effect on trade between their respective countries..." is stretching Mme Campan's memoir, which comprises the following: "... Those engaged in trade were the only persons dissatisfied with the treaty of 1783. That article which provided for the free admission of English goods annihilated at one blow the trade of Rouen and the other manufacturing towns throughout the kingdom. The English swarmed into Paris. A considerable number of them were presented at Court. ..."; and "... The repeated visits of the Duc d'Orléans to England had excited the Anglomania to such a pitch that Paris was no longer distinguishable from London. The French, formerly imitated by the whole of Europe, became on a sudden a nation of imitators, without considering the evils that arts and manufactures must suffer in consequence of the change. Since the treaty of commerce made with (continued)
relationship was one substantially based on a French-English entente between these two nations' arch-bon viveurs. Being socially disposed to a devil-may-care lifestyle and politically positioned against the established authorities in their respective countries, they would have had, at least superficially, a lot in common. Orléans was of course, of the highest rank of French nobility. He was extremely graceful in his deportment, affected a caring manner, and flattered the young prince by dressing not only himself, but his entire livery à l'anglais." All this could not help but to have contributed to the young prince's somewhat fantasized idea of French nobility and grandeur that was to serve at least as a guide for his own surroundings. There is however no evidence Orléans was anywhere near the connoisseur that George was or ultimately became - or for that matter, a connoisseur (speaking in an artistic sense) at all. The only gift (other than England at the peace of 1783, not merely equipages, but everything, even to ribands and common earthenware, were of English make. ..."

Nowhere in her memoirs does Mme Campan mention the prince of Wales, or in fact, the English, themselves, as being interested in French goods (Which of course, they were; but that is beside the point). Stroud, Dorothy, Henry Holland, Country Life Ltd (London-1966) pp. 63-4.; Campan, Madame Jeanne Louise Henriette Genet, Memoirs of Marie Antoinette Queen of France and Wife of Louis XVI (trans. Mémoires sur la Vie Privée de la Reine Marie Antoinette), P.P. Collier & Sons (New York-1910)pp.161, 212.

* A rare instance of true taste. In the years preceding the French Revolution, English tailors succeeded in attaining a world standard for style and quality of material in men's fashions that continues to this day. The same can be said for women's fashions on the part of the French. Laver, J., Costume and Fashion, a Concise History, Thames and Hudson, 1969, ed.1992, pp. 149-51, 157-8

b That the duke of Orléans may have encouraged the prince in his aesthetical interests is, in the opinion of this writer, more a factor of the duke's deportment (which reflected a gracious and caring manner, and would have appealed greatly to a similarly endowed George P.) than the result of erudite counsel. Very much in contrast to George, Orléans reflected most of the French Royals (Bourbon and Condé specifically), with his inability to express himself publicly with any polish whatsoever. Still, appropriate to his position and political ambitions, he surrounded himself with wits and intellects, many of whom, including Mirabeau and Laclos, wrote speeches for him and provided the polemics designed to give him an undeserved reputation for political acumen (The transparency of Orléans's ambition to become the next monarch of France, eventually left Mirabeau with the correct impression of the duke as being an unscrupulous conspirator). It may be significant that Orléans was fifteen years' senior to the prince. At this stage in his career, George, as exemplified by his almost disciple-like attachment to Fox, was very much guided by older people. Orléans was the great-grandson of the Regent, Philippe II, d'Orléans, who was equally dissipated (but a real connoisseur). He was born in 1747 and upon the death of his grandfather, became duc de Chartres, in 1752. Already fabulously wealthy, his marriage in 1769 to Louise Marie Adelaide de Bourbon-Penthîèvre made him the richest man in France. Five years later (two years after Louis XVI came to the throne) the then twenty-nine-year-old Chartres was given Richelieu's old residence, the Palais-Royal, which he systematically transformed into the architectural, at any rate, cradle of the French Revolution. Finally it was the death of his father, in 1785, which provided him with the funds to complete the project he had started in 1781. The garden at the back of the palace (continued)
had over time become surrounded by houses. With architect, Victor Louis (1731-1800), Orleans replaced the various façades with a gallery of monumental proportions that effectively walled the garden. Arcades housed cafés, theatres, shops, and establishments of more dubious recreation - a mix designed to attract the "republican" clientele, from the upper echelons of society to the scum of the earth - all significantly immune from the police scrutiny which protected the royal (and cultural) centre of Paris. Given the widespread poverty of the city, the alcohol-driven atmosphere of the Palais-Royal guaranteed an eventual political consensus; and it was here on July 12, 1789 that the crowd gathered to march on the Bastille. None of this had any apparent impact on the very royalist prince of Wales (or Louis XVI, who recorded the days events as "rien").

The first mention this writer can find of the friendship of Orleans and the prince of Wales lies in references from Hibbert and Stroud who refer to amorous advances paid to the discarded Mrs. Robinson whilst in Paris circa 1782, with Orleans acting as intermediary between the prince and Mrs. Fitzherbert whilst she was in Paris in 1784. This is also the year in which Roberts has him as a frequent visitor to Brighton, with a house at Lewes. Following the Bastille incident, in October of the same year, La Fayette (of American Revolution fame) persuaded the French king to send the duke to England, where he remained until July, 1790. During this time Orleans rented a house in Brighton (Grove House) and purchased another near Hyde Park in London - indicating perhaps that he intended to sit out the Revolution in England. Fitzgerald writes that it was at this time Orleans' schemes became common knowledge and that a coolness arose between him and the prince of Wales. Most historians indicate the estrangement was more in service to the public eye than the result of genuine animosity. The duke's celebrated portrait by Reynolds, removed during the Terror from its honoured position at Carlton House, was restored as of Wild's 1817-18 paintings. Seemingly also for appearance sake, the prince had Orleans expelled from the Je ne sais quoi Club (held at the Star and Garter), with the dramatic gesture of having his name scratched from the roster by a waiter. However sincere or otherwise, the result was social ostracism for the royal visitor, and by July of 1790, Orleans returned to France and took his seat in the Assembly. In October of that year the Assembly acquitted him of any complicity in the Bastille incident, and it is from this time that he seems to have regretted his treacherous behaviour, attempting in vain to reconcile himself to the royal family, and helping fugitives to escape the impending Terror. This did not however dissuade him from voting, January 20th, 1793, for the death of Louis XVI. In April of that year, following the flight of his son, the future King Louis Philippe, he was arrested, and condemned and guillotined on November 6th. Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol.14, pp.420,423-4, Vol.16, p. 910 (Chicago-1942 ed.); Carlyle, T., The French Revolution, A History, Avon ed. F. M. Lupton Publ. (New York) pp. 494-7; Ward, W. H., The Architecture of the Renaissance in France, two vols., Vol.II, B.T. Batsford (London-1911) pp.428,430-1; Watkin, D., The Royal Interiors of Regency England, The Vendome Press, (New York/Paris-1984)p.108; Schama, Simon, Citizens, A Chronicle of the French Revolution, Alfred A. Knopf (New York-1989) pp.134-5, 370-1, 662, 608; Taine, H.A., The Ancient Regime, Peter Smith (New York-1931)p. 41, 53-4, 70-1; Fitzgerald, P., The Life of George the Fourth, Harper Brothers (New York-1881) p.37; Greig, J., The Farthing Diary by Joseph Farington, R.A., Vol.I, George H. Doran Co. (New York-1923) pp.16, 249-50; Solé, Jacques, Questions of the French Revolution, Pantheon Books, (New York-1989)p.53; Roberts, H.D., A History of the Royal Pavilion Brighton, Country Life Ltd. (London-1939) pp.32-3; Yale Center for British Art, drawing B1977.15603; Brooke, J., King George III, McGraw-Hill Book Co., (New York-1972) p.346; Jouvenel, Henry de, The Stormy Life of Mirabeau, Houghton Mifflin Co., (Cambridge-1929) p.239; Pierre Ambrose François de Laclos is discussed in Solé, J., Questions of the French Revolution, Pantheon (New York-1989)p.53.
money) the prince received from Orléans was a herd of fallow deer. When the duke's famous art collection was sold to pay for his political ambitions, a great masterpiece was so layered in dust and varnish, that it was not identified until the obscuring materials were removed; and whilst it can be said that the duke would not have been responsible for the painting's condition, he had not corrected it either - hardly the mark of a cognoscente.

Whilst being the discriminatory measure of European taste, French decoration had no real sway in English society. Still it had been significantly in evidence since the days of the first duke of Montagu's Bloomsbury house (c.1678) and his addition to Boughton House, Kettering (c.1689-94). French furniture and objects of virtue had been conspicuously imported since the days of Charles II; and reached flood proportions in advance of the French Revolution and afterwards. George did not need Orléans

* Christopher Hibbert explains loans of £20,000 each were made to the Prince and his brothers York and Clarence c.1789. George IV, Prince of Wales 1762-1811, Harper & Row (New York-1972)p.126.

b The Palladian attitude towards French decoration is stated clearly by Isaac Ware: "Let us banish French, Chinese and Gothic Decoration, equally mean and frivolous, equally unworthy a place where the science is observed, and equally a disgrace to the taste of the proprietor. Let all be of a piece, and all will be proper." Ware, I., the Complete Body of Architecture, T. Osborne & J. Shipton (London-1756)p.473. What a surprise to discover on page 525 of the same work: "...We have proposed to introduce into the ceiling as much of the French taste as is compatible with grace and propriety..." (displaying a lavish rococo ceiling for Chesterfield House (fig. 50)), and adding: "This was the original design of the French ornament; thus it continues to be practised by those few in that light nation who have any conception of its intent and origin; and thus we should, when we adopt their practice, follow it." Ware was the titular architect and decorator of Chesterfield House, Mayfair (compl. late 1740); indubitably the most lavish, and thorough statement of French Rococo interior decoration to exist in England - probably ever. How differently his client expressed himself in his 30 July 1748 letter to the marquise de Monconseil: "...J'ai accommodé la plupart de mes chambres entièrement à la Française...Enfin, venez la voir, Madame; il n'y a qu'un pas de chez vous ici, et j'ose vous assurer, qu'à l'exception de la bonne chère, de la bonne compagnie, et de tous les agréments de la société, vous vous croirez encore à Paris." Bradshaw, J., The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, Vol.II; Allen & Unwin Ltd. (London-1926)p.878; Pearce, London's Mansions, The Palatial Houses of the Nobility, B.T. Batsford Ltd. (London-1986); Bedford Lemere Photographs, National Monuments Record, Fortress House, Saville Row, London, Nos. 3150, 8135, 12789.9, 12790, 12791.11, 12792, 12795, 12798.18, and under "Chesterfield House", Buildings Boxes, Furniture and Interior Decoration Department, V&A Museum, London.

c Civil unrest at any time has always made available great works of art at bargain-basement prices. One need only remember the German confiscations during the last Great War to empathize with Waagen's descriptions regarding the dispersals that occurred from the time of the French Revolution until the fall of Napoleon. He indicates that the availability of works held in private hands and by the Church was extraordinary. France sold off much of the royal art collections, furniture and decorations; and as other countries fell to French invaders, many other great collections (continued)
or an international exposure to develop his taste (and appetite) for luxuries, which were within a stone's throw of his doorstep. In St. James's Square stood splendid Norfolk House. Its rebuilding (1748-52) was the work of the architect, Matthew Brettingham (1699-1776), who combined the original Norfolk House with an adjacent structure. Its sober façade was not unlike Ware's 1748 chef d'oeuvre for the Earl of Chesterfield;" and likewise its interiors, although following Palladian discipline, contained the most glorious Rococo designs to exist in England. In 1820, Thomas Creevey described the house as a "Capital Magnificent Shop". But Walpole had conjured another stellar comparison when the house was opened to society in 1756: "The Duchess of Norfolk has opened her new house: all the earth was there last Tuesday. You would have thought there had been a comet, everybody was gaping in the air and treading on one another's toes. In short, you never saw such a scene of magnificence and taste." 79

Likely considered old-fashioned when Carlton House was rebuilt, the sumptuous nature of these interiors still would still not have been lost on the prince of Wales. b

(continued) became available (and ultimately the property of especially English bankers and collectors). Waagen gives a list of the great collections in Italy to go on the block, as well as a detailed account of the celebrated Orléans collection which was sold to the marquis of Stafford. He lists as well the main English collectors to benefit from the political unrest - among whom is found George IV. Waagen, G. F., Works of Art and Artists in England, John Murray (London-1838) vol 1, pp.45,50-7.


b Walpole, in yet another account, describes Mary "Molly" Lepel, Lady Hervey ca.1775 as having lived in France for a number of years, where she became a friend of "Mlle de Charolois, sister of the Duke of Bourbon...(and) the Duchess Dowager d'Aiguillon, the celebrated Madame Geoffrin, the Président de Lamoignon, and Monsieur [Claude-Andrien] Helvétius." He adds that upon her return to England "...she built a very elegant house in the French taste in St James's Place." (continued)
Carlton House

The prince of Wales's Pall Mall palace effused a statement of style and culture seemingly anomalous to the times. Although it did not begin that way, its stance, both inside and out, was with a distinctly French flavour - all accomplished during an era of world-wide unrest in which France and Great Britain were at least in a politico-economic sense, arch rivals. Notwithstanding the English aristocracy's affinities with French culture, one might question if such an extravagant aesthetic were well-endorsed by a future head of state, especially in view of the fact that his forbears had housed themselves with a prudence suggesting they half expected to be thrown out of the country at any time.


* The creation of French interiors has never been a frugal exercise. The fatal extravagance of the "three Louis" was, in an English translation, comparable to that of George IV. Windsor Castle accounts illustrate a contrast in spending habits between father and son: Those for Windsor Castle (George III's principal residence) totalled £27,080.14.5* for the years between 1806 and 1812, and included all work done to the private apartments of the king and queen, The prince and princess of Wales, the dukes of Kent, Sussex and Cumberland, the Princesses Mary, Augusta, Sophie and Amelia, as well as the Coffee, Dining and Concert Rooms. The sums spent at Carlton House and the Marine Pavilion at Brighton between 1812 and 1820 totalled £264,889.0.5* and £19,347.3.3* respectively (and this was after all major works on these projects had been completed). PRO Chancery Lane, LC9-367, "Carlton House 1812", pp.1-19, 72-5; PRO Chancery Lane, LC9-369, (no title), sub-heading "Windsor Castle" pp.1-53. Extending the above dates, Colvin states that "During the 15 years of George III's major works at Windsor, 1800-1814, some £150,000 had been spent." Colvin, H.M., *The History of the King's Works*, 1973 (Windsor Castle)p.378.
On the ground that the heir knows no minority, the prince was declared of age, January first, 1781. In 1783, at twenty-one, he took his place in the legislature; arrangements were begun for supplying him with an income; and he was provided a separate London establishment - Carlton House. This residence had belonged to his grandmother, the dowager princess of Wales, and had remained empty for eleven years since her death in 1772. Parliament had voted £60,000 for its rehabilitation, with the Palladian-cum-Neo-Classical architect Sir William Chambers (resident Surveyor General and Comptroller of the King's Works) to undertake the necessary repairs. The king's architect did not last long. 1783 was also the year in which the prince became a member of Brooks's Club, the bastion of the Whigs, whose members stood in opposition to George III and his Tory landowners.

The architect of the club house, who was rapidly becoming associated with the Whig establishment, was Henry Holland (1745-1806) - one of the few highly talented Neo-Classical architects to succeed in a second-generation of the 'Adam school'. Brooks's is in essence a small country house in the heart of London. Its most important interior is the Great Subscription Room, which was deliberately kept as decoratively uncluttered as possible to keep members hopefully concentrated on gambling, the room's principal function. Holland's reputation as an architect is largely that of one who developed a much less

---

\[a\] In The History of the King's Works, H.M. Colvin gives a concise account of Carlton House before its acquisition in 1732 by Frederick, Prince of Wales and father of George III. Briefly, the house takes it name from Henry Boyle, Lord Carleton, a Whig minister who owned the property for many years until his death in 1725. From Carleton, it passed to his heir, Lord Burlington who gave it to his mother; and it was she who sold it to the prince of Wales (George III's father) in 1732. William Kent, as surveyor of the prince's works with Isaac Ware as measurer, carried out some alterations; but in spite of these, the building remained an irregular, unimpressive structure. Two years after the accession of her son, George III, the dowager princess of Wales acquired the adjoining property and absorbed the structure into the Carlton House complex. Over the next six years £15,000 were spent on renovations and after Princess Augusta's death in 1772, maintenance was continued until the property was given to George, Prince of Wales on his coming of age. Colvin, H.M., Gen. Ed., The History of the King's Works 1660-1782, Vol.V., Her Majesty's Stationery Office (London-1976) pp.138-9.

\[b\] The commission of Brooks's was followed by projects for other club members, including the duke of York, Francis, 5th Duke of Bedford, George John, 2nd Earl Spencer, Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Samuel Whitbread and his son. Stroud, Dorothy, Henry Holland, Country Life Ltd (London-1966) p.52
complicated approach to interior decoration than was characteristic of Adamitic design." It is certainly true. But it should be pointed out that simpler decorative concepts by many architects were as much a symptom of prevailing economic conditions as they were aesthetically motivated, and would include for instance, designs by Samuel Wyatt, George Dance (the younger) and Holland’s former clerk, Sir John Soane. A comparable approach might have done for Carlton House, had Holland’s patron been any other man, but a simple, refined surrounding was hardly what the prince of Wales had in mind.

Henry Holland

Without the prince’s patronage, and a very fine biography by Dorothy Stroud, Holland would probably be historically ranked with most of the Late Georgian architects, whose names are less than household words. He was a product of the English architectural scene, and without the royal encouragement he received, probably would have never acquired the limited international exposure he had. No originator, his design vocabulary was cultivated from studying the Neo-Classical works of other architects - both English and French - and like many, he assembled an extensive library and collected casts from the antique.

---

a The Period characterised by the American and French Revolutions and the advent of Napoleon cost the English an estimated £800,000,000. By 1795 expenditures were at roughly £20,000,000 a year. Four years later taxation was almost doubled from the 1796 revenues of £19,000,000 to £32,500,000. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol.10 (Chicago-1942)p.691.
b Stroud reports that ceiling ornaments and a sketch for a frieze intended for Cadland (c.1775, dem. 1950s) were indicated by Holland as coming from Bernard de Montfaucon’s L’antiquité expliquée (issued in fifteen folio volumes from 1719-1724), Vol.5, part 1, page 76. Stroud explains that the engraving for a cinerary urn decorated with leafy arabesques, forming circles in the centre of which are quatrefoil rosettes "...was to provide Holland with one of his favourite motifs for enrichment. She also describes the next page of his sketch book as having as a description for a window moulding ‘see Stewart’s Athens for the ornament’. Cook gives a reference to Antoine Desgodetz’s Les Édifices antiques de Rome (publ.1682) and Colvin mentions the French publications of Peyre, Patte and Gondoin. The writer suggests the engravings of Pierre Contant d’Ivy, published by Taraval, and presented to the Académie, 11 June, 1770, are also a possible design source. Holland’s frieze for Brooks’s Club Great Subscription Room is a nearly exact copy of Contant’s balustrade detail for the Grand Escalier (c.1765), Palais-Royal, Paris, created for the father of George’s friend Orléans. However, one should not be misled, as this favoured design, which also appeared at Southill (after 1795), is derivative from Raphael’s Vatican frescoes. What appears there as a guilloche variation, is employed by Constant and Holland as a series of unconnected circles. Stroud, Henry Holland, Country Life Ltd. (London-1966)pp.39-40; Middleton/Watkin, Neoclassical and 19th Century Architecture/I, Electa/Rizzoli (New York-1980)p.66.; Cook, O., The English Country House, an Art and a Way of Life, G.P. Putnam’s Sons (New York-1974)p.202.; Colvin, H.M., A Biographical Dictionary of English Architects 1660-1840, John Murray (London-1954)p.291; Baritou, J.-L., Poussard, D., et al., Chevotet-Contant-Chaussard, Un Cabinet d’Architectes au Siècle des Lumières, La Manufacture (Lyon-1987)pp.92n, 138; (continued)
within the few remnants of his documents, such as they are, can be found references as to his sources; and we would know a great deal more had not his nephew and executor, Henry Rowles, dispersed his papers in 1807, one year after his death.  

Far from being a gambler and elegant gadfly or like Nash, a court strategist, Holland was apolitical, discreet, dependable, and careful with financial matters - very much a contrast to his royal patron and friends.  

Often characterised as "French-inspired", the architect described his style as "Greco-Roman", which was stylistically very much within the main stream of English Neo-Classicism. He was a friend of Fox, and might have shared the Whigs' Gallic sympathies. These sympathies were however, political leanings - not architectural ones; and although much has been written of this Whig connection, it is a stretch to assume a French design ethic developed from it.  

The essential Holland contribution must be seen as beginning well within the Adam stamp. There is scarcely anything French about Brooks's Club. Rather it is Adamitic or Palladian, or both. One can point to the frieze detail of (continued) (Lyon-1987) pp.92n,138; Hall, D. et al., The Cambridge Library etc., Gallery Books (New York-1991)plt.31.  

There are two sketch books surviving (indicating by their numbering that a wealth of these existed at one time) at the RIBA Drawings Collection, London, and a scattering of drawings and records, some of which are at the Soane Museum, London, and the Yale Center for British Art, New Haven. My thanks to Tim Knox, of the RIBA, Christina Skull, of the Soane Museum, and Suzanne Beebe of the Yale Center for British Art.  

Practically every writer on Holland makes the Whig-French connection. Stroud demonstrates (not without a dispute) that French detailing occurred as early as Holland's work at Cadland, and again three (continued)
the Great Subscription Room as perhaps coming from Contant d'Ivry (who may have been himself inspired by Raphael's Vatican Frescoes), but its treatment is within an entirely English, Classical context.

Writers refer to Holland's simplicity as French inspired, but none of them seems to define what he means by this. Verlet, who one might expect to be prejudiced in his review of decoration, says only (page 83, Volume II) that after Adam "...Des Architectes avides de nouveautés s'intéressant au style gothique ou au style grec.", not mentioning a French derivative aesthetic in any way. But briefly pursuing this course: it would be misleading to consider the exquisite Louis XVI interiors of the French Court as models. However refined, they show little abatement of the luxury that catapulted this elite to disaster.

Stepping down a social notch, Peter Thornton and Elisa Maillard have illustrated a Moreau engraving which is more to purpose, and incidentally, not greatly different in character from that of the Great Subscription Room at Brooks's. Margaret Jourdain asserts that although there was a great similarity with French interiors of the day, the latter arranged classical elements (and, à Moreau, evidently themselves) in a much more informal manner than that found in English interiors.

The reader may be confused as to exactly what is meant by this chaste "French" influence. Aside from a few details, which certainly are French-derived, the inference might be related more to the size of rooms.

(continued) years later (1775) at Berrington Hall, both before the Brooks's commission. Quoting Stroud, Harris does not see a "decidedly French character' at Berrington Hall (and neither does the writer), but the decoration of the Drawing Room and Boudoir have French elements which are thought to be original. Stroud, D., Henry Holland, Country Life Ltd. (London-1966)pp.39-40; Harris, J., "A Carlton House Miscellany", Apollo, Oct.1991, vol.CXXXIV, no. 356, p.254; Evans, D., Berrington Hall, The National Trust (London-1991)p.15,

* Most architectural writers refer to Southill Park, Bedfordshire (1796-1800) as being archetypal of Holland's mature style. This country house, mentioned in connection with the French architect/decorator Delabrière, is a model of genteel restraint, formal yet intimate - the embodiment of what has been ascribed to the years of the Regency Period (1790-1830 vs. the historical Regency dates), as the last flowering of taste. (see endnote 93)
and the fact that Neo-Classical interiors, in comparison to Palladian concepts, had generally become smaller in scale—"petits appartements" as it were, with detailing less profuse—and consequentially, more refined. Walpole alludes to some decorative differences in his December 25th, 1765, letter to Anne Pitt:

"...Nothing could have given me more pleasure than your commission [to perfect the plan and decoration of her house]... You forbid ornaments, and tell me the room is to be hung [Papered]. On those terms it is impossible to make it resemble a French room. The chimney and the panels of the doors may admit French designs: all the rest can have nothing but a bead and baguette... The proportions of your windows and doors are as un-French as possible; the former, to be like those of this country, should be much higher, and the others not near so wide. I have seen but one idea in all the houses here; the rooms are white and gold, or white; a lustre, a vast glass over the chimney, and another opposite, and generally a third over against the windows compose their rooms universally. In the bedchamber is a piece of hanging behind and on each side of the bed; the rest of the room is stark naked. I have seen the Hôtels de Soubise, de Luxembourg, de Maurepas, de Brancas, and several others, especially the boasted Hôtel de Richelieu, and could not perceive any difference, but in the more or less gold, more or less baubles on the chimneys and tables; and that now and then Vanloo has sprawled goddesses over the doors and at other times, Boucher..." [He is of course referring to Rococo interiors.] "If I can succeed in executing your commands, Madam, there is nothing I will not try, if you will be so good as to explain your intention a little farther. May the mouldings or baguettes be carved? May there be any ornament to the ceiling or cornice? May the chimney be widened, without which it can never be a French chimney, which is always very low and straddling? May the corners of the doors be rounded off, without which the panels must be square too, and then they will be English doors? All these, I doubt, are necessary demands, and at last, I fear, the proportions of the windows and doors will
destroy all Gallicism..." [It is noteworthy that Walpole is referring to proportions of elements, not the space itself.]

He writes again five months later, this time describing a Neo-Classical design:

"At last, Madame, I have the honour of sending you the design of a ceiling...I enclose Monsieur Mariette's letter as a pièce justificative, which will prove to you, Madam, that I had teased him with my impatience.

The design, I think, very beautiful; it is in the newest style, and taken in some measure, as everything here is now, from the oldest style, that is the antique. It may be executed either in stucco, colours, or chiaroscuro, and fills only the cove, leaving the ceiling, as you ordered, vacant, except the small rose in the middle. The directions accompany it."

Both the design and Mariette's letter are lost, but even with Walpole's advice, one might doubt a French room would have resulted.

Needless to say, the French, as did the English, designed spaces of all shapes and dimensions, so it cannot be volumetric or geometric comparisons that offer clues as to what is meant by "French". Could it be in proportional considerations that they lie? Walpole refers above to the proportions of elements, such as chimney-pieces, windows and doors; but it would appear that a "French" result, considering a basically unadorned interior, would rely on the proportions of the space itself. In this regard, the only parallel comparison that can be made is that of the divisions of wall areas. Here one might study dado widths, wall heights, and the depth of frieze, cornice and/or cove elements below the ceiling, and make the following observations:

<p>| Table I |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dado</th>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Frieze*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plate 81, pg. 102, Blondel, J.-F., De la Distribution des Maisons de Plaisance... 1737 (Rococo)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate 70, pg. 87, Blondel, J.-F., De la Distribution des maisons de Plaisance... 1737 (Rococo)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pierre-Jean Mariette, architectural critic, bookseller, engraver, and author of L'Architecture Française (1727). A powerful member of the Parisian cultural establishment, Mariette's publication, which is a compilation of architectural works from Maret to contemporary artists (such as Blondel), was a highly influential source for both French and English architects and writers (including Lady Dilke). In many ways Mariette would have been the French counterpart of Horace Walpole. Pérouse de Montclos, J.-M., Histoire de l'Architecture Française, de la Renaissance à la Révolution, Mengès (Paris-1989)p.172; Dilke, E.P.S., Lady, French Furniture and Decoration in the XVIIIth Century, George Bell & Sons (London-1901)pp.9,10,23,52,n.1, 90, 146-9.
| Plate 191, Briseux, C.-E., Des Maisons de Compagne... 1761 (Rococo) | 17% 76% 8% |
| Hotel d'Uzès, Rousseau, design for the salon (rejected), c.1765, Gallet, Paris Domestic Architecture... 1772 (Neo-Classical) | 21% 70% 9% |
| Hôtel Grimod de la Reynière, Salon, Clérissette, (1776), McCormick, plates 140-1 (Neo-Classical) | 21% 71% 8% |
| Hôtel Soubise, la chambre du Prince de Soubise, Design G. Boffrand, 1737-9, Babelon, J.-P., 1988, pg. 19 (Rococo) | 20% 71% 9% |
| Versailles, Salon des Nobles de la Reign, Rousseau, A., 1785 (not executed), Beylier, 1991, pg. 47 (Neo-Classical) | 18% 72% 10% |
| Versailles, The Gilded Chamber of Madame Adelaide, 1753, Pérouse de Montclos, Versailles, p. 281 (Neo-Classical) | 18% 74% 8% |
| Versailles, Cabinet du Conseil, 1755, A.-J., Gabriel, Tadgell, plates 34-5 (Rococo) | 16% 73% 11% |
| Wilton House, Salisbury, The Double Cube Room, I. Jones & J. Webb, McCorquodale, Plate 87, pg.105 (Palladian) | 17% 73% 10% |
| Versailles, Chamber of Marie-Antoinette, 1783, R. Mique, Pérouse de Montclos, Versailles, p.281 (Neo-Classical) | 19% 70% 11% |
| Chesterfield House, Boudoir, I. Ware, 1749, Bedford Lemere series 12790-98, 1884, National Monuments Record (Rococo) | 15% 57% 28% |
| Chesterfield House, Ballroom, I. Ware, 1749, Bedford Lemere No. 6612, 1886, National Monuments Record (Rococo) | 12% 67% 12% |
| Norfolk House, Music-room, M. Brettingham / G. B. Borre, c.1756) Survey of London, Vol. XXX, pg. 158 (Rococo) | 19% 70% 11% |
| Southill, Dining Room, H. Holland, 1795, Stroud, plate 103 (Neo-Classical) | 10% 82% 8% |
| Southill, Mrs. Whitbread's room, H. Holland, 1795, Stroud, plate. 104 (Neo-Classical) | 22% 70% 8% |
| Southill, Drawing Room, H. Holland, 1795, Cornforth, English Decoration..18th Century, plate 101, pg. 117 (Neo-Classical) | 18% 74% 8% |
| Blenheim Palace, The Third State Room, decorated 1898, Vanburgh (Original architect), Blenheim Palace, ©Duke of Marlborough, 1988, p.32 (Baroque / Rococo) | 16% 80% 4% |

| Tuscan Order | 21% 69% 10% |
| Doric Order | 20% 69% 11% |
| Ionic Order | 21% 69% 10% |
| Corinthian Order | 21% 69% 10% |
| Composite Order | 21% 69% 10% |

* Frieze: a cove or deep cornice can take the place of a frieze, but provides the same function of capping the wall section. Such cases are indicated with a "C" for "Cove", or "N" for cornice.

** Shallow cove, highly decorated in the Rococo manner and extending considerably onto the horizontal plane of the ceiling (which is otherwise plain). This gives the cove a visual width greater than its actual vertical dimension (not considered in the percentages, but the effect would be to increase the percentage of the cove at slight expense to the dado and panel percentages).

Note: Percentages are approximate some rooms were (continued)
Taking the Classical orders as a guide, it can be noticed that roughly 70 per-cent of the total height is that of the column and capital, 20 per cent represents the pedestal, and half that dimension represents elements above the capital and below the cornice. In every case, given some small variance, the French spaces chosen illustrate these divisions, regardless of the style periods represented. So too does one such space by Holland at Southill. The other English spaces selected, differ in proportion, to the degree that the spatial impact varies significantly from the French examples — in spite of the fact that they are all decorated with French design motifs. As a case in point, it is perhaps worthwhile to examine two spaces that, whilst not of the same dimensions, are volumetrically similar in character: the Cabinet du conseil at Versailles, and the Boudoir at Chesterfield House. Both spaces contain an imposing coved ceiling (which is a Palladian/Baroque feature). The Versailles Cabinet, very much on the order of The Double measured from photographs. Classical Orders were taken from measured drawings: Chitham, R., The Classical Orders of Architecture, The Architectural Press (London-1986), with dimensions: dado = base and pedestal; wall area = column and capital; frieze = facias, tenia, frieze cavetto, filet, and ovolo (or include a cove if it visually participates with the wall composition).

The two exceptions are Holland’s room for Mrs. Whitbread, and the Norfolk House Music Room. As mentioned, Mrs. Whitbread’s room was decorated by the French architect and decorator, Delabrière, and the Music Room at Norfolk House was designed by the Torinese (Piedmont) architect and decorator, Giovanni Battista Borra (1712-86), and executed largely by the French sculptor, John Cuenot (fl.1744-62). Piedmont’s links with France are historically as close as those with Italy (in fact, as could be expected of a bordering community, the Piedmontese dialect contains French words and
Cube Room, Wilton House (c.1653), is in fact the result of a combining of two rooms (not resulting however, as a double cube). Both Jones/Webb and Hardouin-Mansart/Le Brun have made a distinct separation of the wall areas from that of the cove and ceiling. The Chesterfield House boudoir illustrates an indecisiveness in this regard.

Whilst decorating the cove in a manner similar to the ceiling plane and separating it with only a simple moulding, it relates in treatment, coloration and (because of its near verticality) plane, so closely to the wall decorations that a unity of these two elements is caused. The result is that the cove has the effect of a giant and totally disproportionate frieze.

One might compare two other examples - however different in aspect - in the three State Rooms at Blenheim Palace and a volumetrically similar interior at Château de Champs. C. 1892, the ninth duke of Marlborough instigated the French-inspired decorations at Blenheim, judging rightly that the delicate (but Louis XIV-style) detailing was out of scale. (continued pronunciations), and it is a natural phenomenon that French aesthetic be adopted in this region. Borra's work in England was accomplished in the 1750s and can be seen at Stowe, Woburn Abbey and Stratfield Saye (a house also associated with Benjamin Dean Wyatt). Geoffrey Beard has demonstrated that the bulk of the carved decoration at Norfolk House is the work of Cuenot. The best descriptions of the House, Borra and Cuenot can be found in the Survey of London, Vol. XXX, and in Desmond FitzGerald's scholarly The Norfolk House Music Room. For these and other references see endnote 101.

---

a Louis XIV's council chamber (1701, Hardouin-Mansart and Le Brun) was square in plan, with its successor not quite doubling the space. The general profile of the original space, however, remained essentially the same for the 1755 (Gabriel) remodelling, retaining many original features, including mirrors, window frames, the chimney-piece, and perhaps even elements of the frieze. The remodellings feature some Rococo designs, but the room is essentially Palladian/Baroque. Pérouse de Montclos, J.-M. Versailles, Abbeville Press (London-1991)pp.268-9; Favier, J, Projets pour Versailles, Dessins des Archives Nationales, Hôtel de Soubise, Archives Nationales (Paris-1985)pp.42,70.

b With respect, the refurbishing of these existing spaces had an impossible mission to accomplish: complement an enfilade of adjacent rooms, done by Vanbrugh and Hawksmoor almost two hundred years previous, and accommodate the enormous tapestries commemorating the first duke of Marlborough's successful campaigns against the "Sun King". It is no wonder that something ended up out of proportion. Green, D., Blenheim Palace, Alden Press (Oxford-1988)p.28
Here were English Baroque spaces, whose monumental proportions proved far too imposing for embellishments which are ultimately relegated to picture-frame decoration—filling voids not occupied by the massive tapestries. The writer finds no problem with this approach to decoration—assuming that a purely French statement was not the design intent. At Blenheim, it clearly was not, given the retention of Vanbrugh chimney-pieces, which are idiosyncratic to this architect, and the general retention of room proportions and elements, such as frieze detailing and cove cartouches (which imitate the Louis XIV-style cartouches by Vanbrugh’s partner, Nicholas Hawksmoor). Any of the three Blenheim State Rooms is however dimensionally comparable to the Louis XV-period interior illustrated in figure 61. The Régence Bed room at Champs displays the proportions discussed above, but here, given a correspondingly high ceiling, the architect has made a different decision: rather than stretching the wall panels, he has increased the height of the dado (with chair rail or dado cap), dwarfing as it were, the furniture and chimney-piece.* This room is

* An essential relationship between architectural scale and its relationship with movable elements—which are of course related to human scale, is demonstrated here. Typically, the height of backed seating, such as chairs or couches, is slightly above the chair-rail of the dado, with the chimney-piece (however “low and straddling”) higher still. Although it is true that architects (unlike Clériseau) rarely include furniture when drawing interior elevations, consideration of these elements cannot be overlooked with any expectation that the occupied space will be a success.
also a redecoration of an existing space. Additionally at Champs is Christophe Huet’s Chinese Drawing Room, painted for Madame de Pompadour during her residency there. Here, the decorations demonstrate an interesting innovation regarding chair-rail heights and the problem of Classical proportioning. In the Salon, there are in fact two chair rails (or a split chair rail) of differing thicknesses. The lower (and narrower) corresponds to the movable furniture, whilst the upper is exactly the same height (and width) as the mantel shelf of the chimney-piece - thereby integrating it precisely with the panelling. This same device was employed by Pierre-Henri de Saint-Martin with Lange and Huet, in the celebrated Salon des Singes, Hôtel de Rohan, Paris, (figure 63).

In a study of proportions, one can find few parallels displaying such a marvellous synthesis of architectural elements - which can and should include furniture - with the whole ultimately relating to human scale. At

62 - J. Christophe Huet Château de Champs, Chinese Drawing Room (c. 1747-50 or c. 1757) Faniel, pg. 194.

The architect of Champs was Jean-Baptiste Bullet de Chamblin, a Hardouin-Mansart disciple, who completed the château in 1707. According to Fiske Kimball, Champs was acquired by the marquise de Pompadour in 1747*, who within three years of this date spent some 200,000 livres on its redecoration. The bed-room illustrated has design affinities with Pompadour’s chambre à coucher, at Champs, which Fiske-Kimball insinuates, but does not state directly, was the work of Jean Cailleteau, called Lassurance. In the Salon At Champs, Jean-Christophe Huet (d.1759) painted on existing panelling, his famous chinoiserie, echoing his work in the Salon des Singes, Hôtel de Rohan, Paris (1750). Kimball, F., The Creation of the Rococo Decorative Style, (orig. publ. 1943) Dover (New York-1980)pg.194; Wheeler, D., & eds. Réalités-Hachette, The Châteaux of France, The Vendome Press (New York, etc.-1979)p.147.

There are many variations on this theme. Typically, if an order is combined with the panelling, the resultant space between the split chair-rail corresponds to the column base. In a more usual situation (with a single chair-rail) the column base and/or moulding occupy the space directly above, with the column shaft and capital corresponding to the height of the decorative panelling. Examples include the Salon de Compagnie, Hôtel du Châtelet, (Cherpital), Galerie Dorée, Hôtel de Toulouse, Gallery, Hôtel de la Vrillière (De Cotte/Vassé), Salon, Hôtel de Tourolle (Boulée).
Blenheim Palace, Vanbrugh’s Saloon, illustrates another successful attempt to integrate decoration with the architectural envelope. This cavernous space was decorated by the French painter Louis Laguerre (1663-1721), who, using a composite order, aligns the pedestal bases with the plinths of Vanbrugh’s signature chimney-pieces, cleverly raising the entire issue of proportioning above the floor with a trompe l’oeil spectator gallery.

The examples from Table I should not lead the reader to think English architects were less exacting than their French counterparts with the classical proportioning of interior architecture. The Double Cube Room at Wilton is evidence of this, as well as perhaps countless other examples. A few are offered in Table II below.

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Dado</th>
<th>Wall</th>
<th>Frieze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood, Library, Robert &amp; James Adam, Works in Architecture, Vol. I, Part II, Plate 5 (1764)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterley Park, Etruscan Dressing Room, Adam (1773) ref. Gore, plt.111, pg.94.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heveningham Hall, Hall, James Wyatt (1778-84) ref. Watkin (Neoclassical...) plt.268, pg.168.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newby Hall, Entrance Hall, Adam (1771) ref. Beaud (Georgian Craftsmen) plt.115, pg.157.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick House, Blue Velvet Room, Kent/Burlington (1727-29) ref. Wilson, plt.23, pg.93</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English schooling in Classical discipline was specifically addressed by Thomas Hopper* in his testimony supporting Benjamin Dean Wyatt's suit against the duke of Sutherland, 23 December 1841:

In describing alterations to designs:

Question: Would it affect any other part?
Answer: It would affect all the proportions; because all the proportions are to be brought into unity...

Q: What would be the effect of the increase in height of the podium?
A: It would change the whole proportions throughout.
Q: The proportions of the columns?
A: Not the columns only, but its acciporries [sic] altogether.
Q: Would it affect the entablature at all?
A: It would clearly affect the entablature because the entablature must be in proportion to the height of the columns and the height of the columns is generally the ruling principle. .... (elsewhere in his testimony) I wish to put this in a way in which you may understand my meaning if originally you made and afterwards altered the drawings, for instance if a drawing were made of a room with a pilaster and after it was made the employer were to come and say I will alter all the pilasters and if you alter one pilaster you must remember the whole thing has to be pulled to pieces; to judge of that you will see that whereas at first it was in proper proportion afterwards when the alteration is made it is out of proportion.**

With this brief investigation of Classical proportioning, the writer hopes enough has been said on the subject to illustrate that Classical principals of design were fundamental to all serious architectural study, irrespective of cultural peculiarities. And as seen, even with the seemingly carefree superimposition of rococo curves and scrolls, a Classical sensibility provided the foundation for their arrangement. In this context, one may demur at Digby Wyatt's summation of the French Baroque: "Vast in extent, but poor in proportions, the architecture of the Frenchman of Louis XIV's time was no bad reflection of the characteristics of Louis himself..."**

So it is neither volumetric, geometric, nor proportional considerations that are to determine the "French" in Holland's work. The clue lies elsewhere, and it is probably the simplest and most obvious one of all. Returning to Horace

* Hopper (1776-1856) was a highly successful eclectic architect, who had done his apprenticeship with James Wyatt. Unlike Benjamin Wyatt, he made it his business to be conversant in several styles, and an advocate of none in particular. Amongst his notable works were the Gothic Conservatory, Carlton House (1807-9) and the Neo-Norman Penrhyn Castle (Bangor), which was under construction at the time of this testimony. Colvin, A Biographical Dictionary... 3rd ed., pp.512-16; Country Life, Vol.CXIII, Feb. 13, 1953, p.417; Lever, J., Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the RIBA (G-K), Gregg (London-1973)p.140.
Walpole once again, by way of his letter to Lady Ossory, 17 September 1785:

... We went to see the Prince’s new palace in Pall Mall; and were charmed. It will be the most perfect in Europe. There is a august simplicity that astonished me. You cannot call it magnificent; it is the taste and propriety that strike. Every ornament is at a proper distance, and not one too large, but all delicate and new, with more freedom and variety than Greek ornaments, and though probably borrowed from the Hôtel de Condé, and other new palaces, not one that is not rather classic than French [writer’s bold]. ... How sick one shall be, after this chaste palace, of Mr Adam’s gingerbread and snippets of embroidery!

Walpole is obviously not referring to proportions, as he would have been aware of the design parameters touched on in the above comparisons. His reference is again to French elements applied to the interiors - not to the spaces themselves. Holland’s work at Woburn Abbey (begun 1787) features one such space more “classic than French”.

The Library is included in a string of remodellings which replaced offices in Woburn’s south wing. Whilst displaying a Neo-Classical vocabulary, they echo well Flitcroft’s earlier Palladian interiors, substituting however, Louis XVI-style elements, such as chimney-pieces, console tables and glasses. The chimney-pieces are “low and straddling” (typical of Holland), embellished with French candelabra and clocks and surmounted by trumeaux. Low book cases between the windows replace the usual console tables, and are
likewise in combination with trumeaux - and also French in character. But is this a French design statement? One would have to include many English interiors, announced often by title, as being of another culture.

Paine’s “Chinese” State Bedchamber at Nostell Priory is case in point. In spite of its lavish rococo ceiling, and Sino-French (Neo-Classical) furniture and Sino-French (Rococo) glass, the architectural statement is main-stream English Palladian. At no time for instance, does one expect a covey of mandarins suddenly to make their presence known. An example in the same vein as

a The insertion of extravagant Rococo stucco ceilings into English Palladian architecture is a subject in itself - and one covered with authority by historian, Geoffrey Beard. Beard’s publications on Georgian craftsmen, stucco and decorative plasterwork describe the great Rose and Bernasconi families of plasterers, the great 18th Century Italian stuccatori, amongst whom the names of Francesco Vassalli, Giovanni and Giuseppe Artari, Giovanni Bagutti, and Joseph (Giuseppe) Cortese, who significantly contributed to great country houses, such as Castle Howard and Cassiobury Park. Direct reference in this investigation will be made to the Bernasconi family who continued into the 19th century as the preeminent decorative plasterers in England. As will be seen, the majority of stuccatori were replaced by the nineteenth-century manufacturers of papier-mâché architectural ornaments. Beard, G., Georgian Craftsmen and their Work, Country Life Ltd. (London-1966) passim; Beard, G., Stucco and Decorative Plasterwork in Europe, Thames and Hudson (London-1983) pp. 136-, 169-71; Beard, G., Italian Stuccoists in Yorkshire, (from lecture, King’s Manor, York, 6 Oct., 1984) (York-1986) passim.

Thomas Chippendale, decorator and preeminent furniture designer, procured the ‘Indian Paper’ for this and three adjacent rooms at Nostell Priory. Very little need be added here to the wealth of commentary describing this virtuoso cabinet-maker and interior decorator. Interestingly, Chippendale’s The Gentleman and Cabinet-Maker’s Director, (1754) illustrates “Gothic”, “Chinese” and “Modern Taste”, with the latter being rendered in variations of French Rococo design. By 1765, it is evident from this redecoration at Nostell Priory, that Chippendale had included works evocative of the Louis XVI style into his repertoire. Jackson-Stops, G., Nostell Priory, The National Trust, (London-1990) pp.26-8, Bell, J.M., The Chippendale Director, Wordsworth Eds. (Hertfordshire-1990)passim.

I am grateful to Derek Linstrum for his suggestion, via Christopher Gilbert’s The Life and Work of Thomas Chippendale, Artlines Ltd. (Bristol/Avon-1973), that Chippendale’s firm was a precursor of the multi-faceted decoration firms of the mid- to late-19th century. Like them, Chippendale offered a wide range of products and services in addition to the furniture manufacture for which he is renowned. They included Glass, metalwork, marble, china and glasswares, wall papers, carpets, removals & repairs, bed hangings and bedding, leather, window curtains & blinds, etc..
the State Bedchamber at Nostell Priory is the Colonnade Room (formerly the King’s Bedchamber) at Wilton House. A painted singerie ceiling is featured here by Andien de Clermont (fl.1716/7-1783), a contemporary of Huet. Yet again, one cannot describe this room as either French or Chinese-influenced, despite the artistic synthesis of the two cultures presented here.

The writer would suggest that the so-called “French” influence in Holland’s work is simply a factor of subtle borrowings in support of his own design ethic - “august simplicity” as Walpole put it - rather than a conscious effort to gallicize it; and this would be true of any other ancient or modern element he may have adopted to create his understated compositions.

As seen, the French had arrived at a parallel development in Neo-Classical painted ceilings. The Colonnade Room at Wilton was designed c.1653, during the same period as the Double Cube, and Single Cube Rooms. In 1735, when de Clermont painted several spaces at Wilton, the closets were removed from the then “Kings Bedchamber” and the colonnade added, giving the room its present name. Between 1801-1812, James Wyatt carried out a major programme of alterations, destroying a staircase painted in “Arabesco” by de Clermont. He also contemplated the destruction of this room, but eventually settled for the addition of the grossly over-scaled wall mouldings, which echo a very popular Louis XVI panelling detail. Bold, J., Wilton House and English Palladianism, Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, (London-1988)pp.30,58-9.


The reader will be aware that the French terms Chinoiseries and Singeries (broadly Chinoiseries with “monkey” comedies) have (continued)
decoration to the extent that their efforts could inconspicuously embellish an English interior. Should it surprise anyone that at some juncture wholesale (or modified) elements such as chimney-pieces and trumeaux could also find their way there with a similar comfort? The examples of Chinoiserie and Singerie can be described as an aesthetic more of nuance than substance. Can Holland's work for the prince of Wales be described as more "Françaiserie" than French? Probably as it was initiated at Carlton House, but certainly not as it appeared in Wild's watercolours. What this most circumspect country house architect caught along with his once-in-a-lifetime royal commission was a comet by the tail. At Carlton House, the continuous additions and redecorations, occurring during the successive tenures of at least four architects, must be seen as largely attributable to the prince himself.

Holland at Carlton House

Carlton House was taken over by Holland towards the end of 1783 and was most certainly unfinished at the time of Walpole's visit two years later. The Pall Mall (north-east) façade of the House remained as Holland received it and bore little resemblance to the one Lord Carleton built. Only the north wing remained of a structure that looked as though a major demolition had occurred. How it ended up in this state may have been caused over the years by structural problems with the original building - causing, the pruning evident in Louis Bélanger's watercolour. (following page)
This at least is one rationale to account for how such a fate could have befallen any prestigious residence, much less that of the dowager princess of Wales. A comparison of the house plans, before and after Holland, reveals the southwest or garden front and its string of rooms were largely unaltered in the new design. It was into these rooms — which Walpole described — that the prince took up residence in 1784; and it is from here that he would live, advise and consent in a veritable construction zone for another nine years. One observes the Pall Mall façade is largely a reconstruction of Lord Carleton's house, and very likely utilized the original foundations (adding the Corinthian portico cum porte cochère where a simple Georgian)

Both Colvin and Arch, et al., describe the only regular portion of the Pall Mall façade (and the house behind it) as being a separate structure, the residence of one George Bubb Doddington. Upon his death in 1762, this structure was purchased by the Dowager Princess Augusta, and incorporated into Carlton House. This evidence would contradict The Builder's view of the original building which clearly includes Doddington's wing as part of the overall structure. The uniform garden-front façade would support The Builder illustration, unless this had been part of the £15,000 renovations done for by the Board of Works for Princess Augusta following her acquisition. Another hypothesis, would be that, given no clear common wall between the two buildings, Carlton House had been subdivided at some juncture. Arch supports the view that the Doddington façade was modified and balanced with a corresponding wing in Holland's design. Colvin, H., ed., The History of the King's Works, Vol. V, 1660-1782, Her Majesty's Stationery Office (London-1976)p. 139; Arch, N., et al, Carlton House, The Past Glories of George IV's Palace, (catalogue) The Queen's Gallery, Buckingham Palace, London-1991)pp.55-6.
doorway had once been positioned.

By 1785, the Prince's debts had forced a halt to the building progress, and very likely at his patron's suggestion, Holland took this opportunity to visit France for a first-hand observation of what he had seen only in publications. In spite of his persona non grata status with the House of Bourbon, the duc d'Orléans would have been in a position to welcome his friend's architect, and introduce another très humble serviteur (figure 9, page 20) into the royal environment. No known documentation exists to support this theory, yet when Holland returned to England and earnest reassumption in 1787 of work resumed at Carlton House, he produced some literally French designs. 1787 was also the year that the prince began work at his new Pavilion at Brighton.

Stroud quotes the second earl Spencer in a letter of 8 October 1785 as Holland "...not being returned from Paris." and Farington also makes a less specific reference, in his entry 29 October 1979, to Holland's first visit as having taken place before the French Revolution. Stroud, see endnote; Greig, J., ed., The Farington Diary, by Joseph Farington, Vol 1., George H. Doran Co. (New York-1923)p.107.
Construction began in April of that year, and with the efforts of nearly one hundred and fifty workmen, was finished by the beginning of July. Again, as with the comte d'Artois's pavilion, the construction schedule was extremely short; and again, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the design concept was already in the architect's head. If a dome flanked by oval-shaped chambers is not enough to connect this little building with Bagatelle, one need only examine the rotunda's decorations. Two years after its completion, Rowlandson sketched an interior which bears remarkable affinities to a scheme Bélanger had proposed for Bagatelle's dome. Given Bélanger's humility and undisguised respect for the English Neo-Classists, it would not be unreasonable to assume he had proudly shown his designs to the prince's architect.

At Carlton House, the Grand Staircase is completed with a balustrade of unmistakably French origin, and one, had Walpole seen it, which would have provoked particular comment. Holland's design echoes a style popular in France between roughly mid-century until the seventies. Models of a similar type had been published by both Chambers (who identified them as

"Tuscan", and Neufforge (who gives no source but significantly, renders the motif "en ferrurerie"). As can be seen from one Neufforge example, the Tuscan was often combined with fretwork, which was itself an echo of the design idiom known in France as à la grecque (or grec). It was noted with some amusement by Walpole in his letters to Horace Mann:

[9 April 1764] ...They begin to see beauties in the antique - everything must be à la grecque, [sic] - accordingly, the lace on their waistcoats is copied from a frieze. Monsieur de Guerchy seeing a Doric fret on a fender at Woburn, which was common before I went abroad, said to the Duchess of Bedford, 'Comment! Madame, vous avez là du grec, sans le savoir!' 110

[30 November 1769] ...I was diverted at Paris with Monsieur d'Aubeterre, their late ambassador at Rome. I was taking notice that all the new houses at Paris were built à la grecque. He said, with all the contempt that ignorance feels when it takes itself for knowledge, 'Bon! There is nothing in that: it is all stolen from the frieze of the Pantheon.' With much difficulty I discovered that he thought the Doric fret comprehended all Greek architecture. This was after passing six years at Rome. a 111

a No one should be impressed from Walpole's superficiality that the French had not made an exhaustive investigation into the Classical styles, which included all the orders and appeared not only as columns, but entire wall assemblies including doorways and window openings with their framing elements and decorations, regardless of whether or not the columnar orders were present. For instance, the architect L.-F. Trouard, whose bannister detail is shown on the following page, constructed his entire house in Paris (1758) in the Greek taste. Neufforge is exhaustive in his analysis of (continued)
Examples of "Doric Fret" appear in Gabriel's balustrade at the Petit Trianon and in some new Parisian hôtels. As Walpole describes them, frets appear to signature the style in France. Gabriel gives only a hint of this direction, as does Holland (in the fret-sunburst surrounding the royal cypher, upper landing balustrade at Carlton House).

Gabriel's balustrade features paired elongated ovals separated by balusters composed of gilded husks - a general arrangement of elements similar to that by Lanoue de la Couperie (figure 82). Holland employs a continuous guilloche detail of the Tuscan variant which is the more common French design. This detail, in wrought-iron (Holland's design would suggest the baluster section was in cast iron), was adopted by the French to such a degree that it has been historically associated with the Louis XVI style. Common to both Gabriel and Holland, the oval elements are joined by horizontal bars, which is not a typical detail. The Carlton House balustrade features a Vitruvian scroll motif to frame the balusters, whilst Holland's study (figure 84) indicates that a semi-circular motif was initially

considered. Both the semi-circular and scroll details appear in Gabriel’s design. Had Holland visited the Petit Trianon? Considering the massive character of both balustrades and the generous amount of gilding in similar contexts, it would be difficult to conclude otherwise.

Wild's view of the Grand Staircase is taken on the ramp, just below the principal floor. Reinforcing the French flavour of the space is a Rococo pedestal clock (c.1735-40); but this was not installed until 1816, ten years after Holland’s death, and roughly twenty years from the time he last worked at Carlton House. Mentally removing the clock, it is the stair balustrade alone that is French in an otherwise English statement. Yet there could have been a French source for ramp soffit decorations. In the writer’s experience, they are unique to English decoration, and like the ballustrade, are neither recalled nor repeated in Holland’s work. Could the source of these details be Clérisseau?

---

* Nigel Arch et al., note the maître-ébéniste François Duhamel’s stamp within the door of the clock, giving his dates as 1750-1801. The Caffieri-style clock is presumed to have come from Versailles, and was bought for the prince regent by Lord Yarmouth 15 June 1816. Giving the clock’s date of c.1735-40, it is thought that Duhamel’s work was that of a restorer, versus the original designer or maker. One year after its delivery to Carlton House, Benjamin Lewis Vulliamy (1780-1854) restored the clock again and repaired the original Farine movement. At that time, he added “Vulliamy/London” to the face. Arch, N., et al., *Carlton House, The Past Glories of George IV’s Palace*, The Queen’s Gallery, Buckingham Palace (London-1991)p.82; Watkin, D., *The Royal Interiors of Regency England*, The Vendome Press (New York-1984)p.104.
Returning once again to Lansdowne House, similar details may be observed in the Frenchman’s unsuccessful design for the much studied Library (previous page). Clérisseau’s overall concept returned to the Adam arrangement, substituting two domed squares (for Adam’s octagons), connected by a long gallery. His treatment of the domes, which can be seen in the central section of Figure 86, employed a motif of highly sculptural trapezoidal mouldings framing a roundel, and this is almost exactly what Holland produced to decorate the curves of the stair ramps. Clérisseau made his presentation to Lord Shelburne in 1774, and Holland worked at Lansdowne House three years later. It is highly likely he had occasion to view all the unsuccessful Library-cum-Gallery designs, and this circumstance would have allowed him yet another opportunity to gather additional details to his collection. Clérisseau’s design may have been the first Holland had seen as a serious proposal for a contemporary project. Somewhat unobtrusively, they also appear in Chambers’s Treatise..., not only in the trapezoidal forms applied to the Grand Staircase but also in the notched rectangular panel designs which alternate with them. Holland may be given credit for creatively adapting to ramps what both Chambers and Clérisseau intended as dome decorations, but beyond this, Figure 89 illustrates a very refined notched rectangular panel with unframed corner rosettes (Holland uses only the frames at the corners, but features a large rosette in the central frame - not unlike that included in the Chambers illustration, Figure 88). The French version became a signature motif for the Louis XVI style - 19th-Century examples of which appear in England at Luton Hoo, and elsewhere (see pgs. 469+).
his designs are almost a synthesis of Chambers's illustrations and the Frenchman's designs.

In a brief tour of Carlton House, it will become obvious Holland has borrowed from both Adam and Chambers. But before moving on, it might be useful to revisit Perrache's rendering of the upper-staircase and dome (Figure 77), to see what a collection of diverse elements is to be found. There is very little of the vaunted chaste simplicity here. It appears almost as if a collector is displaying an assortment of architectural details he found at Crowthers or some other emporium of antique artifacts.

Few Holland drawings survive to give an impression of the palace which delighted Horace Walpole and those who followed him before Walsh Porter arrived with his festoons. What all the draperies concealed is lost. But it is worth a perusal of Wild's views to discover the remnants of this most perfect palace and see of course, the lavish royal apotheosis into which it was transformed.

Holland's section through the porte cochere, Hall of Entrance and Octagon with the Grand Staircase beyond, are to be seen largely as they were when Wild arrived on the scene. Other rooms painted by Wild can be identified on the following plan:

90 - Holland Carlton House, Principal Floor section of Entrance, Hall & Octagon (c.1787) Yale Center for British Art, B1975.2.640+.

The only variance of significance appears to be the greater height of the Hall of Entrance, which would have been done by Holland in any case. Various authors, such as Peter Thornton and John Morley, have reproduced the Chinese Drawing Room, located on the ground or basement floor, southwest elevation, which was first illustrated in Thomas Sheraton's Cabinet-maker and upholsterer's Drawing-Book (1802). Probably painted by the French émigré painter John James Bolleau (fl.c.1788-1851), who was a specialist in oriental motifs, this room was the decorative precursor of the Royal Pavilion at Brighton under Nash and the decorator Frederick Crace and his descendants. Bell, J.M., The Sheraton Director, Wordsworth Editions (Hertfordshire-1990)p.40; Croft-Murray, E., Decorative Painting in England 1537-1837, Vol.2, Country Life Books (Middlesex-1970)p.172; Aldrich, M., The Craces: Royal Decorators, 1768-1899, John Murray, The Royal Pavilion Art Gallery & Museum (Brighton-1990)pp.12-27.
From the views of Carlton House to follow, what might strike one about nearly all the interiors is the copious amount of gilding, and in the instances of the Rose Satin Room, Crimson Drawing Room and the Ante-Chamber to the Throne Room, an almost claustrophobic use of draperies. These enhancements - if they can be so described - were largely the work of Walsh Porter and James Wyatt, whose tenures are listed below.

1783: Sir William Chambers  
c.1784-96: Henry Holland  
c.1804-13: James Wyatt  
c.1805-9: Walsh Porter  
c.1807-9: Thomas Hopper.  
1813-28: John Nash
Regency architects (amongst whom the writer includes Holland) largely avoided the gorgeous qualities which often characterise Louis XVI and Empire styles. Yet it is clear from contemporary accounts, some of Carlton House's interiors glittered from the onset, as they did when Wild recorded them.

The Throne Room

The Throne Room and the Circular Drawing-Room (page 39) were the only major apartments to survive as Holland intended. Before the Regency of 1811, the Throne Room had been titled at various times, the Great Drawing Room, Gilt Room, Ballroom, or Saloon. Gilt was certainly an apt description for this space; and it is likely, for its time, no other in England was more so. The central motif of the ceiling was a wheel of circular medallions wreathed in laurel; a concept used by Adam for the Music Room at Harewood House* - and one with which Holland

* Harewood House Music Room (c. 1772) lends itself exactly to the circle-in-a-square motif. The illustration gives only a hint of the ceiling design, but this is, as is often the case with Adam, reflected in the carpet pattern. The ceiling roundels which depict classical (continued)
would have been familiar (his addition here being the favourite French motif of cupids within a painted sky). Circle-in-a-square design requires flanking rectangular panels to complete a ceiling of oblong dimension - again, a standard approach for Adam and other Neo-Classical architects. A white-painted background was discernable on both the walls and ceiling, and was accented by the pair of Sicilian marble French-made chimney-pieces, installed during Holland's era. They cannot be seen in Wild's view, as the now Regency throne with its crimson accoutrements disguised one, and the other was behind the artist. All the panels, whether they be door, over-door, spandrel or ceiling were painted with polychrome designs of Italian Renaissance derivation on a fond of gold leaf.


Holland began his association with Lancelot (Capability) Brown (1716-1783), in 1771, one year before his future father-in-law submitted plans for its landscape design. For the next ten years (1772-82) Brown was involved with this project. Adam's decorative schemes at Harewood date from 1765, with the first to be completed (the Gallery) in the year of Brown's submission. Fleming, L., Gore A., The English Garden, Spring Books, (London-1979)p.243; Piper, J., Harewood House, Raithby Lawrence & Co. (Leicester-undated)pp.8-9.

This specifically English term is interchangeable with "statuary", and indicates the marble has come from Carrara, Tuscany. I am thankful to Miss Rosalind Griffon, Keeper of the Collection, Waddesdon Manor, for her advice.
The work was done by French artists, including Boileau, Chantpré and Delabrière.* 112

There are elements of the room's decoration that are of special interest: the Daguerre-supplied b candelabra pedestals

* John James Boileau (fl.c.1788-1851), was one of a group of French artists brought over by the upholsterer John Sheringham of Great Marlborough St.. Others included one Boulenger (fl.1788-d. before 1851), one Dumont 'le Romain' (fl. 1788-90), not to be confused with the history-painter, Jacques Dumont (1701-1781), also called 'le Romain'; one Peuglet (fl. before 1801); one Joinet (fl. 1807); A.-J. Chantpré, who is referred to by Arch et al, as having participated with Delabrière and Boileau in painting the "Chinese Room" (published by Thomas Sheraton-1802). The writer can find no other reference to Chantpré and Delabrière. Stroud disputes Sheringham's role in the enlistment of Delabrière - stating that this artist would have been of a much higher standing than the others, and suggests his invitation to England probably came from Holland himself. Croft-Murray would perhaps agree with Stroud, as he groups all the French painters (with the exception of Girard) - whose presence he ignores at Carlton House) under Delabrière. Wyatt Papworth, who Croft-Murray lists as a source, mentions only "Labrière", Boileau, Dumont le Romain and Boulanger. (see also footnote a, pg.32) Papworth, W., John B. Papworth, Architect to the King of Wurtemburg: A Brief Record of his Life and Works, Privately Printed (London-1879)p.11; Croft-Murray, Decorative Painting..., pp.172, 175, 202, 207, 225; Stroud, Henry Holland, p.74; Arch et al., Carlton House..., pp.22, 218. Watkin asserts that Biagio Rebecca painted "Raphaelesque groteschi" (c.1794) to what must be the margins of *an elaborate stuccoed and painted ceiling in the style of Chambers*, although he may be confusing work here for panels Rebecca provided to Holland's dome at the Royal Pavilion, Brighton (refer pages 68-9). Croft-Murray does not recognise Rebecca's presence at Carlton House. The margins are certainly Italian Renaissance-inspired, but are not grotesques. Rather they are polychrome renditions of the Roman acanthus scroll (or rinceaux) which are favourd components to groteschi, but should not be construed to be grotesques themselves. There is an interesting subtlety of the Throne Room ceiling, which is worth noting - the punctuation of the margins with grisaille medallions (having a black fond) which can be seen at mid-points and corners of the margins. A variation of this approach can also be seen in Delabrière's work for Holland at Southill (ref. figure 39), which is highly unusual if not unique to English decoration. It is however, a standard arrangement of the richly ornamented coves to be found in French Baroque and Rococo design, as well as in late nineteenth-century designs as published by Daly in his 1877 edition Decorations Intérieures Peintes. These observations would seem to support the view of a largely French contribution, which may have included a design input. Daly, C., Interior Designs of the 19th Century, Bracken Books (London-1988)pls.6,15,28,33; Watkin, D., The Royal Interiors of Regency England, The Vendome Press (New-York-1984)p.114; Croft-Murray, pp.172,199,259.

b Dominique Daguerre, whose other clients included the duke of Bedford, was a cousin-in-law of Simon-Philippe Poirier (c.1720-1785), perhaps the most prominent of the great Parisian marchand-merciers of pre-Revolutionary France. Daguerre went into partnership with Poirier in 1772, succeeding him at the latter's retirement five years later. 1777 was also the year of his involvement with Delabrière et al at Bagatelle. In addition to the comte d'Artois, the firm had an impressive list of clientele, the most illustrious of whom were successively Madame de Pompadour, the duchess du Barry and Marie Antoinette. Significantly, the list also included the duc d'Orléans. Daguerre took a partner, Martin-Eloi Lingneraux c.1785, and, following the Anglo-French treaty of 1786, opened a show-room on Piccadilly under the partners' joint names. Daguerre's association with Holland and the prince of Wales officially began in this year, when he replaced as principal adviser, the decorator(-cum-cook!) Guillaume Gaubert. (continued)
and a pair of council chairs.\textsuperscript{a} The pedestals incorporate the white and gold of the general decorative scheme. Supporting bronzed terms, they echo the bronze and ormolu caryatids of the chimney-pieces. The serpentine fluting is also a feature to be seen at the base of the chimney-piece caryatids, which might indicate that the pedestals were designed ensuite to this detail.\textsuperscript{b}

Seen almost showcased in Wild's view a "council chair", which is in fact a throne (or \textit{thronos}) in its own right. The chair illustrated is one of a pair delivered to the prince regent in 1812 by Tatham & Co.\textsuperscript{c} Their inspiration is thought to be from etchings of Roman architectural ornament by Thomas Tatham's (of Tatham & Co.) younger brother, Charles Heathcote Tatham (1772-1842).\textsuperscript{d} The etchings (1799 and 1806) (continued) Daguerre's participation was not a small one, with the 5 January 1793 accumulated account being £15,500.-.-. After three years (1789), the Revolution made commuting to Paris an impossibility as well as any importation of furniture and \textit{objets d'art}. Thereafter, Daguerre's involvement was exclusively with English and French émigré craftsmen such as François Hervé. File GD147/56/1/11, 1982, Royal Collections File, V&A; Watkin/Middleton, \textit{Neoclassical and 19th Century Architecture}, p.175; Stroud, pp.75-8,83; Arch et al., pp.11,18,21,39; Eriksen, S., \textit{Early Neo-Classicism in France}, p.215-6; Stroud, D., pp.73,79.

\textsuperscript{a} The pedestals (c.1794) and chimney-pieces are from Holland's time, and the Council chairs (1812) are from Wyatt's. Arch et al, Carlton House..., The Queen's Gallery, pp.75,90; Harris, J., et al, Buckingham Palace and its Treasures, Viking Press (New-York-1968)pp.57,195.

\textsuperscript{b} Serpentine fluting, a favourite French (and Italian) motif is rare, but not altogether overlooked in English Neo-Classicism. The motifs taken from Roman antiquity, where the detail was employed in the flat as well as a variation to the orders. Wilton-Ely, J., \textit{The Mind and Art of Giovanni Battista Piranesi}, Thames and Hudson (London-1978)pp.54,102; Roman sarcophagus, Pocock, Cleveden, Buckinghamshire; Hope, T., \textit{Household Furniture and Interior Decoration}, reprint, Dover (New-York-1971)plt.XX, fig.3.

\textsuperscript{c} Arch et al describe these chairs as having been purchased from Tatham & Co., and listed in Carlton House accounts of January 1813 with the description "2 very large Antique Elbow Chairs Cases &c.", the cost being £587-12-0. Morley illustrates (figure 98) a second chair which is identical to that in Wild's view of the Throne Room with the exception that the back of the chair is upholstered in crimson velvet. If one looks closely at the Morley illustration it is apparent from the abrupt truncation of the sphinx's rinceau tail, that this upholstered chair-back is a later alteration, possibly because at some point, the original was damaged. PRO Chancery Lane, "Carlton House 1812" LC9-367, pg.2.

\textsuperscript{d} Tatham, architect and designer, is remembered chiefly for his books of designs. His 1799 Publication, \textit{Etchings of Ancient Ornamental Architecture} is most pertinent to this study. He entered Holland's office c.1789, after spending a few unhappy months with S.P. Cockerell, and became John Soane's draughtsman. (Soane had been with Holland since 1772, one year after the Holland/Brown partnership came into being.) Also at Holland's office was the French draughtsman, Jean-Pierre Théodore Trécourt, whose draughting technique Tatham greatly admired, and on which he patterned his own. Two Holland Sketchbooks survive at the
included studies of two thrones - one, with sphinx supports, from the Vatican, the other with a rounded back from San Gregorio, Rome. By 1812 however, this decorative theme was hardly unknown to English conoscente. As a variation to the classic Greek version, which seems to be always a lioness with human female torso -

most often with wings, Thomas Hope published a throne design, similar to the Vatican model, but substituting the historically correct braided Greek female with the more ancient Egyptian device of a pharaonic torso (curiously perhaps - but traditionally correct) with human female breasts).

Hope is of course the author of Household Furniture and Interior Decoration, an 1807 publication illustrating his 1801 Portland Place house interiors and their furnishings. The house itself became a great curiosity in its day; the book has however, come to us largely as the most "authentic and complete record to exist of English Regency Design". Hope’s artistic direction paralleled and was probably influenced by the Directoire style and the early work of his friend Charles Percier," as much as it was by direct study of the antique.¹

The Picture Gallery of Hope’s London house, featured four of the pharaonic thrones described above. They pre-date Tatham’s Carlton House council chair by at least twelve years.¹¹ Napoleon’s architects Percier & Fontaine pre-date Hope’s published design (1808) by seven - using lions (monopode and without breasts) in their prototype for one of Napoleon’s thrones (following page).

A closer look at Tatham & Co’s offering to the prince regent reveals this particular sphinx with a rinceau tail containing rosettes. This detail is not identical to the

¹ Watkin in his introduction to the Dover edition of Household Furniture... points out that Hope’s book was in "conscious emulation" of Percier and Fontaine’s illustrations. The Frenchmen published in serial form, six plates per year from 1801 until 1812, when all 72 appeared as Recueil... four years after Hope’s book was published. This influence can be construed certainly, but the reader should not be led to believe that his furniture was derivative from the Frenchmen’s published designs, as his house was completely furnished in the year the first six illustrations mentioned were made available. Watkin, D., Household Furniture..., Dover Publ. (New York-1971)p.viii.

¹ Born (1769) into a wealthy Amsterdam banking family, Hope’s Grand Tour began at age 18 and lasted an almost incredible 12 years (until 1795 - the year his family fled Napoleon and settled in London). His wanderings took him to Spain, Italy, France, Germany, Egypt, Syria, Turkey and Greece, where he studied architecture and design, social manners and costume, and collected antique objets d’art. His Duchess Street house was purchased in 1799 - the remodellings being largely complete two years later. Pierre-François-Leonard Fontaine (1762-1853) and Charles Percier (1764-1838) studied art and architecture in Paris, probably meeting there in 1779. Both had studied in Rome (Percier being a winner of the Prix de Rome - Fontaine with a second prize from the Royal Academy). The Frenchmen were nearly the same age as Hope, and may have made his acquaintance during this period. In any event their work was in evidence in the French capital from 1791 onwards; and from 1799 the year of their introduction (by the painter Jacques-Louis David) to Joséphine Bonaparte (and Malmaison), they became France’s celebrated (certainly titular) creators of what became known as the Empire Style and impetus for "le dernier des grands styles français" Watkin, D., introduction to the Dover reproduction of Hope’s Household Furniture and Interior Design, Dover Publ. (New York-1971)pp.v-vi; Appelbaum S., Empire Stylebook of Interior Design (introduction to the Dover reproduction of) Percier and Fontaine’s 1812 Recueil..., Dover Publ. (Toronto-1991)ppiii-iv; Verlet, P., Styles, meubles, décors..., Librairie Larousse (Paris-1972)p. 106; Encyclopædia Brittanica, Vol.9, pg.451.
Vatican example, but it is also not unknown to English Neo-Classicism - being a favourite embellishment of Robert Adam. Adam’s mirror and Louis XVI-style chairs for the State Bedroom, Osterley Park (c.1775) for instance, feature pairs of such creatures. They can be seen in the design executed by John Linnell*, as being rather benign and bearing a contemporar

* Linnell (1729–96) was an expert and highly fashionable furniture designer / cabinet-maker. His work encompasses three stylistic phases: Kentian Baroque (Kedleston House), Adamitic (Osterley and Shardeloes - Beard reports furniture here as being by John’s brother William) and finally Regency (Woburn, and perhaps Carlton House). During this final stage he was closely connected with Henry Holland. Many of Linnell’s studies are in the V&A drawings collection, (No. E.333. W.8.C.20 is a Neoclassical design, influenced by both the Louis XIV and XVI styles. It is signed by Holland, and inscribed “at the Duke of Bedford’s, Woburn” (see fig.154). In spite of the Holland association, C.H. Tatham would, through his own interest in furniture, already (continued)
furniture design, these two illustrations demonstrate an essential difference between Early and Late Neo-Classicism, which from Bélanger's (et al's) early showings at Bagatelle, are roughly parallel developments in both England and France. The significance of the Carlton House chair, is not only its regal theme, but also its stunningly opulent presentation - qualities which are certainly a departure from the "august simplicity" Walpole admired. The rich character of this ballroom is doubtlessly the single factor that saved it from destruction when its function changed to Throne Room, but the change by title alone must be seen as a significant addition to traditional rooms described according to purpose.

Today, the intimidation of a "throne room" is perhaps an expected phenomenon. Evidence of thrones of course dates to Tutankhamen, and Knossos has one built into a wall half way down the length of a rather intimate space. Prior to the French and English Empires, there was in western Europe, very little if any occurrence of a "throne room" in architectural terms. At Versailles there are only two official rooms that would identify the resident monarch - the Kings Office (Cabinet Intérieur), and the Chamber of the King's Council - but no "throne room". A perusal of Pyne's three volumes of The History of the Royal Residences... reveals two rooms containing thrones. One is at Hampton Court Palace, where the throne appears as an unpretentious, velvet-upholstered armchair - backed by a similarly-clothed drape containing the royal Arms and surmounted by a canopy (cloth of estate). The arrangement appears medieval, as if it could be moved at any moment. Pyne also shows a similar composition at Buckingham House (George III), where a chair of gilded wood and velvet upholstery is set on a simple dais - positioned as with the Knossos throne, roughly half way along the length of the room. This display is located between two windows, draped with a similar velvet, but other than the decorative sympathy, it appears quite incidental to the rooms general decoration. Peter Thornton reproduces, with the same assemblage as those which appear in Pyne, an engraving of an enthroned Queen Elizabeth I. The queen is posed wearing her crown and holding the orb and sceptre - but there is no environmental suggestion. Van Somer's c.1620 portrait of James I, shows a crowned king with the same orb and sceptre, standing in front of a window, with Jones's Whitehall Banqueting House in the background.

(continued) have made Linnell's acquaintance, as his father, William Linnell (fl. 1730-63), had built a prosperous cabinet-making business located in Berkeley Square, where Tatham's mother lived. Fleming/Honour, The Penguin Dictionary of Decorative Arts, Viking, (London-1989)p.488; Stroud, D., Henry Holland, Country Life Ltd., (London-1966)p.83; V&A Drawings Collection, all drawings in Box W8.C.20 (and a chimney-piece insert in the lower level pre-19th-century France section); Beard, G., Craftsmen...,
Again, there is no connotation of a "throne room" attached to this portrait, in spite of its including all the symbols of power. Van Dyck’s portraits of Charles I, whilst depicting a monarch of noble bearing, show none of these symbols, nor do any subsequent portraits of British royalty — until Lawrence’s coronation-portrait of George IV; where we see the new king, with his crown placed on a table.

Contrasts and parallels between this portrait and one of Napoleon are too obvious to ignore. In Lawrence’s view we perceive, however richly done, a personified dignity and blissful refinement that stood for the old aristocracy. With that of Napoleon, we see a head-on “Neo-Roman” emperor, surrounded by the emblems of autocratic rule and possessed of a cold stare that would have suited the sphinxes described above (excepting Adam’s oblique, benign creatures). Upon seeing this portrait, Jacques-Louis David exclaimed: “In the past altars would have been erected in honour of such a man!” He was not far from a physical description — for the painting might itself substitute as an altar-piece — as could any like portrait installed — say — over a monumental chimney-piece — as is the case with George IV’s portrait in Nash’s Throne Room St. James’s Palace (following page). Within a generation, the sense of power seems to have shifted at least pictorially, from an expectation of deference to one of glorification — And as it happens, one which now seems to have required an appropriate sanctuary.
Napoleon's Parisian venue was a "great throne room",\textsuperscript{121} provided by Percier & Fontaine in the old palace of the Tuileries.\textsuperscript{a} George had progressively two at Carlton House - both presumptive - and both chronologically after Napoleon's.\textsuperscript{b} Certainly, it was Napoleon who brought about this change,\textsuperscript{122} which along with its divinity connotation implied an architectural addition to royal ceremony. The ethic, which remains with us today, certainly changed the look of Carlton House, and brought with it the decorations and furnishings that were to replace much of Henry Holland's late eighteenth-century discriminations.

\textsuperscript{a} Percier & Fontaine restored and redecorated the Grand Trianon, Versailles, the châteaux of Compiègne, St.-Cloud (destroyed with the Tuileries during the Commune of 1870), le Raincy, Eu and Rambouillet for Napoleon. One of their most important interiors to survive is the Throne Room at Fontainebleau (Napoleon's principal residence). Pérouse de montclos, Versailles, p.194-97; Watkin/Middleton, p.213; Verlet, p.111; ward, pp.477, 480; Aprà, p.4; Dynes, Wayne, Great Buildings of the World, Palaces of Europe, Paul Hamlyn Publ. (Middlesex-1968)p.84.

\textsuperscript{b} In addition to George IV's Throne Room at St. James's, two others were provided for the new monarch: the throne rooms at Buckingham Palace and Windsor Castle. Watkin illustrates the King's Audience Chamber at Windsor Castle as outfitted for George III. Except for a new Neo-Classical chimney-piece and an elaborate canopy of architectural character, what is essentially a drawing-room remains as designed by Hugh May (1621-84), and painted by Antonio Verrio (c.1639-1707), during the reign of Charles II. This room was truncated and made into George IV's (continued)
In the principal rooms at Carlton House, the Empires influence is largely via the furniture additions - not architectural embellishment. The cluttered wall and ceiling designs of Percier & Fontaine were considered passé in England, with the rejection of Adamitic "filigree". The Scotsman had created however, a sterling example of what might pass to the untutored eye for the Frenchmen's work, nearly twenty-five years before this celebrated team began its mature career: Adam's (1775) Glass Drawing Room, Northumberland House, London.


Whilst his elevation suggests early Neo-Classical architects' preference for pastel colours, the room was intense in its coloration - with dense, metallicized red and green tones, simulating porphyry, back-painted on glass panels and overlaid with gilded metal decorative elements. The doors, dado and frieze were painted to imitate the vibrant green of malachite. These are Empire-or-"English Empire" colour values, the combination of which for instance, Sir John Soane (perhaps the finest of all Regency architects) chose for the library/dining room of his own London residence, as did Percier & Fontaine for the Music Room at (continued) Ante-Throne Room during Wyatville's renovations, when almost all of Verrio's work at Windsor Castle disappeared. Beard, G., Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England 1660-1820, p.289; Watkin, D., The Royal Interiors of Regency England, p.29.

a Both Percier and Fontaine returned from Rome to Paris in 1791, with the Revolution in full swing. Fontaine took refuge in London (1792), but soon returned to work with Percier, now a scenic designer to the Opéra. Percier's friend Thomas Hope was still on his grand tour, and would probably have been unavailable to introduce Fontaine to the architectural world (if indeed he were in a position to do so at that time). Fontaine's English connections are unnamed at present. Still, he would have had minimally, a first-hand awareness of the English Neo-Classical scene. Fleming, J., Honour, H., p.312; Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol.9, p.451.

b Now the Soane Museum, Lincoln's Inn Fields. Soane is one of the few architects to capture the Regency style with the true intimacy and grace of the culture it reflected. There is for instance, no pedantry evident in his interiors, which even in their most formal presentations, (continued)
Malmaison. Still, the reader should not be necessarily impressed that by his more Antique-inspired designs, Adam directly influenced either the Empire or Regency styles; but in the body of his work, there are distinct indications that a literally Romanized interior was well within his repertoire, and as such he certainly forecasted them. The Ante-Room of Syon House, c.1765 (also for the duke and duchess of Northumberland) is a case in point. Here the central features of the decoration are Ionic capped columns, the verde-antique shafts of which were recovered from the Tiber. These elements are complemented by pilasters of verde-antique scagliola, which are executed with such skill that it is impossible certainly for the writer to detect any variance from the ancient marbles they imitate. The present duke of Northumberland would affirm as of this writing, the Antique nature of this space is underscored by its Regency/Empire furnishings of “X-shaped” stools and chairs of klismos-derivation.

In a furniture study, dated 1777, Adam displayed not only his dexterity with the Louis XVI style, but also a precocious interest in Greek vase design, which he expounded in the Etruscan Dressing Room at Osterley (c.1776). The continued effect a quiet refinement that is the hallmark of his early mentor, Henry Holland. Summerson/Watkin et al., John Soane, Academy Editions (London-1983)pp.9-11, 25-48.

* There are, of course, significant differences between the work of Percier & Fontaine and Adam’s Classical interiors. If anything the Frenchmen’s designs are often much more profuse - as if every available square inch of surface had to be packed with Classical ornaments. Matthew Digby Wyatt observed a peculiarity of the French artistic mind, persuading well his observation that, whilst influenced perhaps, French artists are constitutionally incapable of directly copying a design: “It is one of the special characteristics of Gallic temperament that it can never be satisfied with simple reproduction. Of this tendency I had many amusing instances on endeavouring to keep the French sculptors of ornament to a strict restoration... It was scarcely possible to turn one’s back for a few hours without finding, on returning, that the workmen had been attempting to smuggle in a little “motif”, as he called it, of his own. A comparison of the “style d l’Empire” with real classical work will at once prove how hard it is for a Frenchman to copy when he has the slightest chance of originating.” Wyatt, M.D. The Arts of Decoration at the International Exhibition at Paris a.d. 1867. Class XV, Decoration, &c, privately printed (London-1868)p.6.

b “Etruscan” in this context is not to be confused with (Continued)
chair detail illustrated seems to be a study for (or a variation of) the actual articles supplied to the Dressing Room. In his sketch, he liberates the winged creatures from the back support (seen also at Osterley and identical to those of the glass in figure 102) and makes them as griffins, the entire arm elements. The Dressing Room chair not only displays the general character of Regency/Empire style, but also displays a more literal translation of the antique than is usually assigned to Adam’s furniture design.

Holland’s principal interiors at Carlton House show a pronounced Adamitic influence. Of those which underwent significant alteration under succeeding designers and craftsmen, it can be noticed that what has been retained from the original program (disregarding budgetary constraints) is largely due to its decorative compatibility with the new Regency/Empire additions. Where this harmony was to prove undesirable, or impossible, the rooms were either entirely redone, or altered beyond any recognition of their former appearance.

(continued)Le style étrusque. Here the term refers directly to Etruria, the pre-Roman (8th to 1st Century b.c.) civilization in central Italy. A product of Phoenician and Greek colonization of the central and western Mediterranean, the wealthy Etruscans were great traders, and it is largely from their tombs in Tarquinii, Chiusi, Orvieto, Vulci and Caere, that Greek pottery is known. Pallottino, M., Etruscan Painting, Skira (Lausanne-1952) pp.8-13.
Ante-Chamber to the Throne Room

The Throne Room at Carlton House, was adjoined by the previous Throne Room, now described as the Ante-Chamber to the new one. Here to the right in Wild’s view, can be seen two armchairs en gondole. They largely reproduce designs by Percier and Fontaine, published in 1804, as they had been

115 - Percier & Fontaine/Jacob Frères armchair en gondole, originally published, 1804, Recueil... (1812) plt.15, fig.10. 116 - Perino del Vaga Vatican, Sala dei Pontefici, spandrel detail of Jove (c.1521) Marabottini, fig.171, pg.294.
produced for them by the great Parisian furniture-maker Jacob frères. The design incorporates a winged-back mounted on a barrel form - externally dividing the chair into two distinct parts. Certainly Antique-inspired, a similar detail by Raphael’s collaborator, del Vaga, appears in the decorations (c.1521) of the Sala dei Pontefici, The Vatican (previous page). It has a more contemporary occurrence in the Louis XVI style, illustrated below, which was also inspired by ancient Roman aesthetic.

Figure 113 illustrates a chair design in which the arm support is essentially a continuation of the leg, but demonstrates as does that in figure 117, a careful regard for structural support. The French Empire armchair in figure 118 shows only a perfunctory recognition of the legs joining to the chair base. A simple modification perhaps, but the reader can readily see a dramatic change in design emphasis: The Louis XVI armchairs, in spite of their Classical motifs, embody all the grace, finesse, and confidence of a resident power, whilst the Empire example, by the slightest change in detail, evinces the unblinking authority of a throne.

Aside from the two bergères en gondole and the French-made chimney-piece they flank, there is one other element of the Ante-Room’s decoration that is distinctly Empire in character - a section of the drapery. Antique-inspired, and sparing in arrangement it is a typical decorative symbol of Napoleon’s Romanized military masquerade. This upholstery design became the height of fashion in France,* which would

* This is so to the extent that drapery designs of this type became a popular wallpaper motif (see fig. 120). The Raphaelesque grotesque designs championed by Clérisseau, Lhuillier and others, achieved similar popularity to the degree that they as well became the subject (continued)
have been assured if only through its use by Louis Berthault’s bedroom-decoration for Joséphine.

The Ante-Chamber’s symmetrically arranged drapery, couch and torcheres evoke like offerings by again, Percier & Fontaine, who designed similar schemes. Garneray recorded one for Queen Hortense who is seen in her boudoir surrounded by the same blues and golds (following page). As extreme an

(continued) of decorations made available to clients not prepared for the expense of original artistry. The great Parisian manufacturer, Jean-Baptiste Réveillon produced many such motifs before his factory was burnt by a Revolutionary mob in 1789. (This event caused him to take whatever remained of his stocks to England where one sees examples of grotesque work in papers thought to be by Réveillon, in the Round Drawing Room, Moccas Court.) Thompson, N., “Moccas Court, Herefordshire-II”, Country Life, CLCLX, Nov.25, 1976, pp.1555-0; Honour/Fleming, pp.679-80.

Peter Thornton illustrates not only Queen Hortense’s Boudoir, but also other European interiors displaying this theme. They include Mme. Récamier’s bedchamber (1802) and that for the Queen of Prussia in Berlin (1810). Thornton, Authentic Decor, Viking (New York-1984)pp.188-9, 194-5.
upholsterer's dream-commission as this may appear, it is preceded by an interior almost identical in character with Bélanger's chambre à coucher, Bagatelle, where the draperies might suggest the speed in which this small château was built. Although modern eyes would discount the teneur of these decorations, they were meant to honour the comte d'Artois's rank as Grand Master of the Artillery - a guise en militaire that was catalytic to much of Empire style. The prince of Wales was also a devoted of military scenarios, giving this very fashionable element at Carlton House a further meaning (but perhaps stretching, the point).

Featured in Holland's Ante-Chamber ceiling are renderings of sphinxes (with rinceau tails), vases, and scrollwork which after Adam offered no novelty. His employment of the Greek fret as a central motif is unusual and may suggest...
a knowledge and innovative reuse of a decorative surround to ancient Greek vases (for instance, that found within the bowl of a Kylix, or from a more modern source - Neufforge’s Recueil Élémentaire, for instance). This pattern is again, an almost overworked reminder of the ancient motifs dear to the artistic soul of the period. Chambers illustrated it within an Italian Renaissance context, and Adam employed it in its Antique context at Harewood in both the Entrance Hall and the Cinnamon Drawing-Room. In the latter example one sees the fret motif as the upper border to the cove, which relates to the Roman punctuation of the vault in Nero’s Domus Aurea. The Entrance Hall frieze is a most useful study, as this is

precisely the detail Holland used at Carlton House, repeating rosettes for Adam’s alternating bucraniai. Whatever Adam’s source, or sources may have been, the writer knows of no other instance where this precise variation of the Greek fret can be found in England (or anywhere), and assumes, given Holland’s early association with Harewood, that the design is with this slight modification, a straight lift. 

The Rose Satin Drawing-Room

Wild’s view of the Rose Satin Drawing-Room reveals another ceiling design, which is also reminiscent of Harewood—in this instance the Gallery. Adam’s design (1769) was completed by 1772, the year “Capability” Brown arrived on the scene. Here the oblong panels, painted by Biagio Rebecca, are repeated in the same context by Holland; who allowing that the room existed upon his arrival, elected to frame the entire ceiling with these elements, as opposed to the Adam scheme which positioned them only along the room’s length. This partie taken, the bow being an extension of the room’s width, required the panels to circumvent the ceiling’s edge.

Holland embellished the bow ceiling with a detail similar to one Adam had published in Works.... This fan has almost nothing whatever to do with the central motif of the ceiling; whose design would indicate, if not demand, that a similar element be balanced opposite. This is what Adam did at Kenwood, the project from which the
fan design had been published. At Carlton House this room abuts the Grand Staircase - so fixing the rooms length. One cannot fault Holland for doing his best with a task that was demanding, not only in response to his client's notions and expectations, but also because of the largely inflexible structural constraints he faced. He was probably using every fashionable device within his well-stocked repertoire in order to please this once-in-a-lifetime patron.

In analysis, if a "bow" room has as its length an extension of the bow - and the ceiling is to be of divisions - the architect has a near impossible task. He must either focus on the bow and give the compartments a curvilinear response (as will be seen at Belvoir), or ignore the bow - in the sense that the room's greater volume becomes the artistic focus. This is Holland's dilemma, and he does not solve the problem.

Irrouard le Girardy painted the original ceiling panels as well as the overdoors and one above the chimney-piece. These could have been replaced at any time during the several transformations occurring before Wild's painting. Their disappearance could be due to a number of reasons, not the least of which might have been that their colours clashed with any of the succeeding schemes that found their way here. Girardy's work embellished a room whose walls, draperies and furnishings were upholstered in lemon Satin, when Walpole made his visit. Less than ten years later the colour was of "the richest green ground

---

a Girardy's work at Carlton House was done 1883-7, under the direction of its first "artistic" director, Guillaume Gaubert. Rooms he helped decorate are listed as The Grand Saloon, Council Hall (1785) and little apartments (1786), and are thought to have been stylistically similar to his work in the Drawing-Room (pg. 37, fig. 40) and Dining Room at Inveraray. Cornforth, J., "Inveraray Castle, Argyll - I, Country Life, vol. CLXIII, June 8, 1978, p.1622.

b Arch et al. reference European Magazine, which described a fête given at Carlton House, 10 February, 1784. In this article, the room, named as the "Saloon", was also appraised as the "chef d'oeuvre" of all those opened, with the following: "...every ornament discloses great invention. It is hung with a figured lemon satin. The window-curtains, sofas, and chairs are of the same colour. The ceiling is ornamented with emblematical paintings, representing the Graces and Muses, together with Jupiter, Mercury, Apollo, and Paris. Two ormolu chandeliers are placed here. It is impossible by expression to do justice to the extraordinary workmanship, as well as design of the ornaments. They each consist of a palm, branching out in five directions for the reception of lights. A beautiful figure of a rural nymph is represented entwining the stems of the tree with wreaths of flowers. In the centre of the room is a rich chandelier. To see this apartment sans son beau jour, it should be viewed in the glass over the chimney-piece. The range of apartments from the saloon to the ball-room [now Throne Room], when the doors are open, formed one of the grandest spectacles that ever was beheld." As the reader will readily notice, with the exception of the ceiling, all the original decorations (including the chimney-piece (that in Wild's view had been pirated from the now vanished Chinese Drawing-Room) had disappeared. Thackeray, W.M., The Four Georges, Estes & Lauriat (Boston-1881)p.96; Arch et al., p.213.
brocaded satin". By 1803 the material was crimson damask, with seat coverings in blue satin; and this seems to have been the final scheme, although the material itself might have been renewed by 1810, with seat coverings to match.  

The Crimson Drawing-Room

Adam influence also finds its way into the Crimson Drawing Room, which in Wild’s view, now supports another upholsterer’s fantasy. The overpowering impact of these draperies can be contrasted with what originated as plainly panelled walls in verde antique scagliola (see figure 110). Whilst a common substitute in English interiors for marble columns and pilasters, Scagliola is comparatively rare as

---

134 - Wild Carlton House, The Crimson Drawing-Room, watercolour (c. 1816) RL22176, © H.M. Queen Elizabeth II.

a This scheme may have been abandoned before its completion. Arch et al., pg.214.

b Carlton House accounts list the sum of £933-5-6 for the Bartoli Brothers’ scagliola work (ref. also ftnt.a, pg.40). Italian by birth, the Bartolis were England’s foremost scagliola contractors, to the extent they enjoyed a practical monopoly in architectural work. Some of their important commissions were done for the Wyatts, including Trinity House and Shugborough for Samuel – Heveningham Hall and Heaton Hall for James. Perhaps their most spectacular space was done under Borra (pgs.48,56,57-a) at Stowe, where the Marble Saloon’s rotunda is supported by massive Doric columns of Jasper scagliola. The Bartoli’s work in the Crimson Drawing-Room did not outlast Holland’s tenure. In 1794, he noted it had to be replaced by stucco so the prince could hang his pictures. Arch et al, p.224; Colvin, A Biographical Dictionary (1954)p.313; Bolton, A.T., The Architecture of Robert and James Adam, Country Life Books (London-1922)p.239; Croft-Murray, p.245; Stroud, pp.72-3; Jourdain, p.67; Carlton House File (The Royal Collections) V&A dept. Furniture and ID GD147/56/1/11/, 1982; Watkin, The Royal Interiors of Regency England, pp.72-3.
panelling. However, a fine example can be seen in what is now the last remaining great London Mansion: Stafford House (now the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre, St. James’s). Here the Grand Staircase Hall is sheathed in the *giallo antico* version. The ribbed and coffered ceiling of the Crimson Drawing-Room is too closely comparable to Adam’s Marble Hall, Kedleston (c.1777) to pass without comment. Published in *Vitruvius Britannicus IV* (1768), it would be difficult to imagine this design went unnoticed by anyone connected with art and architecture.

Adam’s work is faithful to its antique precedents, certainly in spirit if not precise métier. His ceiling decorations are not too far removed an interpretation of stucco designs he could well have seen during his Italian Tour. Any good history of Roman art will discuss the delicate low-relief plasterwork (often raised from a pigmented pastel background) the making of which was described in detail by Vitruvius. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Vitruvius’s directives were studied and practised by architects and artists including Bramante, Michelangelo, Raphael, Palladio, Vignola, etc. For today’s visitor to Rome, the Museo del Stazione Termini preserves an excellent example of this artistry. This rather large remnant exhibits low-relief figures and foliage on a light blue pigmented background. (writer’s visit to the museum.) Raphael’s Villa Madama (Rome, c.1516) features extremely delicate plasterwork, which includes the grotesque designs seen repeated in spirit by Clérisseau, et al. Fletcher, Sir B., p.636, Speltz, p.346, plt.204, no.5; From the standpoint of decorative painting, Dorigo illustrates four plates demonstrating the ancient Roman aesthetic that would have inspired Kent’s ceilings at Wimborne House and 44 Berkeley Square, and some of Adam’s geometries. Dorigo, Wladimiro, Late Roman Painting, Praeger (New York-1971) plts.7-10.
difficult to see how faithful Adam was at Kedleston to his ancient sources. And here as well as at Syon, it would not be a surprise to see Kedleston’s Marble Hall embellished with Regency/Empire furnishings.

Returning to the Crimson Drawing-Room, the central ceiling design can be seen as too much an Adam creation for a lengthy discussion here. Variations of this theme were published in Works, and appeared as well, for instance, in Adam’s Tapestry Room and Etruscan Dressing Room at Osterley Park. Alistair Rowan published two ceiling studies (one, illustrated on the following page) which are all but exactly what Holland provided. The cove decorations are

Figure 138 is included as a reference to Newby Hall (figure 41) where the interconnecting geometries are far less static an arrangement. An ancient example of Adamitic "filigree" is also demonstrated in fig.138, where squares and circles featuring subjects in relief, were substituted by Adam and others with oil-painted canvases.
another matter. Here the decorations include putti having rinceau extensions, and domesticated griffins terminating with the same devices. This is Roman ornament - but Holland's source is more likely to have been Chambers than Adam. Owen Jones's *The Grammar of Ornament* (1856) illustrates a relief from the Forum of Trajan, Rome. This is most likely Chambers's source for his own illustration in *Treatise...*, and *Treatise* is probably Holland's source for the cove decorations.

Also embellishing the Crimson Drawing Room are a pair of console tables made especially (1813) for this space by Tatham, Bailey and Sanders (following page). Although Arch et al. cite the possibility that these tables (as had been the Throne Room council chairs) were taken from sketches by Charles Heathcote Tatam (publ.1799), it is also possible their design is inspired by Holland's cove details. Should this be the case, these furnishings are with the Throne Room candelabra pedestals, another example of en suite design taking its clue from existing architectural elements. The console tables's general composition is not unique. Repeating the point of parallel developments in France, one sees in the Parisian hôtel de Beauharnais, a remarkably similar

*They would have related to the architecture even more had the Drawing-Room's original wall material survived. Specifically, both console tables have verde antique scagliola bases and tops. Arch et al., p.87, Author's visit to the Queen's Gallery exhibition, 1991.*
sphinxian example supplied (c.1804-6) to Napoleon’s stepson, for the Salon des Saisons, hôtel de Beauharnais, Paris."

So much has been said by others of the French influence dominating the interiors at Carlton House. Yet the writer hopefully has extended Walpole’s early observation that the purely architectural statement, was originally and in its final transformations, largely dominated by an English Neo-Classical ethic - never truly eclipsed by the Prince’s Gallic avocations. All the precious pieces of French furniture and objets d’art certainly went a long way to suggest French aesthetic; but even containing the largest collection of these treasures to be assembled outside France, the artistic exercise is by and large one more of parlance than a wholehearted attempt to reproduce a grand Parisian hôtel at the centre of London society. In some of the secondary rooms,

a The extensive decorations for this Boffrand-designed hôtel (now the German Ambassador’s residence) were done under the direction of Nicolas Bataille (for whom the writer has no references). There is a parallel between Eugène de Beauharnais and the prince of Wales as regards excessive expenditures on interior decoration: Son of Joséphine by her first marriage, de Beauharnais’s step-father was compelled to rebuke him in a letter, 3 February 1806, for having spent a million and half francs on its embellishment - a sum which greatly exceeded the hôtel’s original purchase price. Frénac/de Pierre Fauchex, Belles Demeures de Paris 16e - 19e Siècle, Hachette Réalités (Paris-1977) pp.136-8; Friedman, J., Inside Paris, Phaidon (London-1989) p.107.

b The statement is true in context, but not exactly true as Carlton House appeared from Pall Mall. Holland provided an entrance courtyard to Carlton House, separated from the street by a screen of paired Ionic columns. Very much a French device (the Palais-Royal, Paris), the hôtel aspect was seemingly lost on the English. A contemporary jingle goes: (continued)
where much of the furniture collection was arranged, the decor most definitely did take on a French look. This was not an Empire aesthetic augmenting Holland’s Neo-Classicism, but one that looked back to the ancien régime and the eras in which the furniture had been produced.

The Ante-Room to the Bow Room and the Advent of the Louis Quatorze Style

The Ante-Room to the Bow Room, south of the Great Hall is decoratively much simpler space than those illustrated above. The ceiling supports a minimum of ornament, which is much more to Holland’s pure sensibilities than the Adamitic echoes of the other rooms. The Louis XIV drop-front secrétaire which is not exaggerated in Wild’s perspective, dominates the space with its fifty-six inch height; and adding to the bulk of this piece, is the brilliance of its Boule contre-partie adornment.⁵

Although undergoing four colour transformations prior to Wild’s view, the room remained relatively plain until the years between 1811 through 1816. During this time gilded embellishments were added by Edward Wyatt¹⁴ and the firm of Fricker & Henderson, significantly changing the character of the décor. Except for Wyatt’s additions to the frame of Pompadour’s portrait (extending the chimney-piece trumeau), the remainder of the Louis XIV-style (continued) "Dear little columns all in a row, What do you do there? - We really don't know." Pulford, R., George The Fourth, G.P. Putnam’s Sons (New York-1935)p.23; Chancellor, E.B., Wanderings in Piccadilly, Mayfair and Pall Mall, p.53.

⁵ "Contre-partie" is of course the opposite of "première-partie", and represents the technique by which fine layers of brass (brass typically, but pewter was also used) and tortoishell were layered and cut. The precision of the workmanship is such that two usable veneer combinations occur: one of brass design inlaid into a tortoishell frame, and the other of the reverse. Usually the process was repeated in order to have veneers for a pair of each design. Furniture can also feature both première- and contre-partie on the same piece (Wallace Collection Cabinet F17.pg.)12. Lewis/Darley, p.61; Watson, F.J.B., Wallace Collection Catalogue - Furniture (London-1956)passim.
embellishments, including door and over-door carvings, were done following the arrival of the secrétaire. Madame Pompadour is at least by ordinary reputation, a reminder of the Louis XV style; the Chimney-piece is with the four bergères included, within the next stylistic development in France, and the pair of Louis XIV marriage coffers with the secrétaire are the chef d'œuvres which set the theme for the room's redecoration. The resulting scheme is consequently not an emulation of any one Louis period, but a pastiche combining reminders of the last three great styles of the ancien régime. It is important to underline that the room's final appearance came about as a reaction to the furniture additions, retaining whatever decorative elements from earlier schemes that may have been allowed to survive and integrate with the new. What is developmental at Carlton House, will shortly be seen done as original concept elsewhere.

147 - Wild Carlton House, The Blue Velvet Room, J. Wyatt, E. Wyatt, Fricker & Henderson, Vulliamy, watercolour (c.1818) RL22184, © H. M. Elizabeth II.

The Blue Drawing-Room

The Ante-Room served opposite the Bow Room, the most lavishly appointed for its size and function: The Blue Velvet Room is also a developmental result; and although it contains the same decorative multiplicities as its ante-room, for all its chops and changes, this singular space is perhaps the only one to attempt a "type-Louis XIV-style" appearance. The writer's description is couched with the word "perhaps" - not owing to the usual literary conjecture, but because the Gallic input to this space, whilst being undeniable, has with the Ante-Room, no model in authentic
French decoration. For comparative purposes, the writer has selected two similarly gilded interiors, which precede the Blue Velvet Room (completed 1809) by over a century: The cabinet des muses, (c.1700) hôtel Lambert, Paris, and the Gold Drawing-Room, Polesden Lacey (also c.1700 - installed here c.1906) - a northern-Italian transplant to this country home in Surrey. All interiors display a similar artistic emphasis. The Polesden Lacey example has been described - as could they all be - as "over-the-top".137


The gilded elements of the Gold Drawing-Room are thought to be from a palazzo in Northern Italy, which as mentioned, was highly influenced by French design of this and later periods. The refitting of these vestimetni is the work of Sir Charles Carrick Allom (1865-1947) of White Allom (now Holloway White Allom Ltd., London) who received a knighthood from George V, following his work at Buckingham Palace and Windsor Castle. During the same period (c.1906) White, in collaboration with (Baron) Joseph Duveen (1864-1939) arranged panels, painted by Fragonard (the four largest of which were done c.1770, for (and refused by) Madame du Barry) to (continued)
Hôtel Lambert's cabinet features a typical period approach with its painted cove, which at Carlton House is largely decorated with a Roman Scroll detail. This motif is certainly a popular one in the "Louis Quatorze" style in England, but it would be highly unusual if not unique, to find its employment as a sculptural cove embellishment in France. Certainly this detail was never employed as a screen which allowed the decorative theme of a painted sky to extend into the cove.* The Blue Velvet Room's addition of painted panels to the cove, corresponds to those seen at Polesden Lacey (where the decorator, Charles Allom altered the original decorations in order to fit the new architectural envelope). Cove panels, on a much grander scale can also be seen at Versailles, in the Queen's Guard (1676-81 by Noël Coypel) and Ante-chamber, and the Salon of the Nobles (Vignon and Michel Corneille).

The walls feature gilt-framed panels of Garter Blue, (continued) create the celebrated "Fragonard room" at the Frick mansion (now museum), Fifth Avenue, New York (This room also contains an original chimney-piece from Bagatelle). With Caroline reredos in the Entrance Hall and Gallery, a Georgian dining room, Louis XVI tea room, and William & Mary Library, Polesden Lacey is a magnificent example of the Edwardian eclecticism (pg.500+). Behrman, S.N., pp.42,186,164; writer's visit to the Frick Collection; Aslet, Clive, Country Life, 19 Feb.,1981,p.444; Polesden Lacey guidebook, The National Trust, 1991, pp.23-5.

* The writer can find no reference as to exactly when sky-painted ceilings came into vogue in France. Italian Renaissance ceilings contained many heavenly themes, densely populated with all kinds of noble and ethereal figures. A guess would be that a "pure" sky, containing a minimum of floating putti and/ or infant angels, is a Louis XVI-style device. Guy Cadogan Rotheray gives the book definition of this art as a literal interpretation of the word "cælum which is also means "covering of the chamber". He adds that in architecture, the technical term, cælum, refers to the "inner lining of a roof, and to the lining of the under part of a floor". He also notes Holland employed this device at Carlton House as decoratively unobtrusive enough to "suit any accessories of wall coverings and furniture". Rotheray, G.C., Ceilings and their Decoration, Frederick A. Stokes Co. (New York--no date (c.1930?) pp.14, 248.

Arch et al refer to these eight panels, representing British naval victories, as probably having come from the former "Admiral's Room". That being the case, they contribute literally to the military theme here. It is also significant that this room was adjoined by one entitled the "Military Tent Room", and was indeed draped like a tent. Arch et al, p.219.

Coypel (1628-1707) was the founder of a dynasty of painters to work for Louis XIV, during his initial operations at Versailles. He was a protégé of Charles Errard, a rival of Le Brun. Le Brun, in a coup of diplomatic strategy, was successful in recommending Errard to be the first director of the French Academy in Rome (1666). Coypel's prodigious son Antoine (1661-1708?) accompanied his father to Rome (1672) when the latter was appointed director to the Academy. Within three years, the great Bernini had recommended the son for studies with Corregio, as well as other great northern Italian masters. Antoine's most notable work to survive is the Baroque ceiling of the Royal Chapel, Versailles (c.1708). It signals a lighter palette, and a freer technique - the beginnings of Rococo. Pérouse de Montclos, p.330; Blunt, A., Art and Architecture in France, pp. 251(81), 273-6.

Garter blue, known today in some quarters as "Midnight" or "Navy" blue, is of the deepest indigo value short of black. (Some scholars have traced the word blue to root words meaning black.) This was (continued)
within a greater panel of peach-coloured velvet. The peach colour extends the gilded frames, and as such simply joins a chorus of tribute to the visually dramatic voids of dark blue. A voided presence was not the original intent for these panels. Fricker & Henderson supplied corner flourishes,\(^{139}\) which were not at all characteristic of Louis XIV design nor of the next French development, which often took the entire corner into a plunge of curvilinear forms. (This detail was to find favour with George however, as Fricker and Henderson supplied it again for Nash’s 1822 Entrée-Room and Throne Room remodellings at St. James’s Palace - see figure 106). Architectural in this context, the corner detail reminds one almost of a gold on blue collar appliqué, the current military vogue in England as well as in France. Many examples of uniforms for the military “brass” suggest a decorative metaphor may have been intended for this room - further evidence of which is substantiated by a plethora of gold-embroidered ornaments that were ordered for, but never applied to these panels.\(^ b\)


(continued) also the signal colour of Napoleon, as well as that for the highly braided uniforms of both the early nineteenth-century English and French military “brass”. Indigo, like crimson, was a very expensive colour to produce. Birren, p.114; Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol.12 (Chicago-1942) p.255.

\(^{a}\) In many other examples, such as Vaux le Vicomte (1656-60), Hôtel de Gruy (later Lauzun) (mid-17th century), Paris, and certainly Versailles, panel geometries, are more or less “clean” and unencumbered by moulding or frame enrichments of any kind. The elaborate decoration of this period was generally not allowed to interfere with the with panel frame. However, the white and gold boiserie of Louis XVI’s small Games Room, Versailles, have similar corner flourishes to those of the Blue Velvet Room panels. Van der Kemp, pg.125; Ward, Vol.II, p.297; Friedman, pp.94-5; Cook, Sir T.A., Twenty-Five Great Houses of France, Country Life (London-no date, c.1925) pp.406-18.

\(^{b}\) Arch et al, p.219, describe the 12 February 1812 accounts as comprising ninety-six oak leaves and acorns, eighty-four leaves with roses, 170 sprigs and eleven large gold embroidered anchors.
The *fleur-de-lis* motif of the carpet, draperies and seat furniture is also symbolic, but given the prince's regard for the French royal family, must be seen for its day as being in questionable taste; unless of course the entire room is metaphorical, with the *ancien régime* represented in the ceiling cove above - the military theme comprising the middle ground of walls and seating furniture - and finally the royal French cypher below, being laterally trod and sat upon - all arranged within the volume as an allegory of recent political events. This is not without the prince's sense of humour and/or grasp of the paradox, but it is probably unlikely that this was his intention.

The room is very much a balanced design. The sky-painted ceiling and cove are echoed in a blue and gold carpet, and echoed again in the satin draperies and furniture coverings. What ultimately unifies the decorations, however "over-loaded" or "gaudy" the effect, is the gilding, which is extended even to the gold-coloured, satin glass curtains. Uniform coloration has through the ages, brought many diverse forms together. Not only can an interior scheme be made cohesive in this way, but also entire towns such as Santorin, Greece, where white-painted walls visually unite a great diversity of architectural forms. In spite of its French elements, the Blue Drawing Room was not designed with any real historical model in mind; the simple statement of supreme richness (or riches and their associative power) is the real decorative theme.

The furniture displays the same *mélange* found in the Ante-Room. A second pair of *bergères en gondole*, matching those of the Ante-Chamber to the Throne Room, display Napoleon's laurel wreath without the "N". Also featured are Regency or *English Empire* sofas and tripod stands, a French-inspired English Neo-Classical chimney-piece, probably after designs by John Linnell for Henry Holland, and doors which

---


* Vulliamy supplied the chimney-piece in 1807, after both Holland and Linnell were dead. The reader should be aware that the writer's opinion is based purely on the design of this chimney-piece as it corresponds to others found at Woburn and Althrop. Certainly evocative of Louis XVI-style designs, where the plinth (by and large ignoring the favourite English placement of a central plaque) is of the same dimension as are the flanges, Linnell shows by his many studies, he was not working from any particular French models, which to the writer's knowledge do not carry the decoration of the flanges into the plinth. Further, the writer knows of no other example of this particular chimney-piece design that cannot be traced to Linnell and/or Holland.
have been embellished with Edward Wyatt’s* carvings to resemble those of the Louis XIV style. When Carlton House was demolished in 1827, the salvageable materials, including Wyatt’s doors, were reinstalled in Windsor Castle.\(^b\) A very similar pair to those shown in Wild’s view can be seen in figure 159 as they were installed in the Castle’s magnificent Crimson Drawing-Room. The disastrous fire of November, 1992, all but gutted this space.\(^c\)

\(^a\) Edward Wyatt I was a carver of true excellence, and has been compared as a craftsman with Gibbons and Verberckt. Highly influenced by French carving of the 17th and 18th centuries, his sketchbook includes trophies from the Salon de la Guerre, Versailles, and Rococo frame details. He could read and write in French, and possessed a very extensive library which revealed one who was much more than a self-taught artist. His son, Edward II is responsible for much of the carving and gilding at Buckingham Palace. Robinson, pp.158-60

\(^b\) Some embellishments, such as the chimney-pieces seen in figures 95 & 131, eventually made their way to Buckingham Palace, but the greater number are at Windsor.

\(^c\) Giles Worsley writes of Wyatt’s carvings in this room as (continued)
where the loss of Wyatt’s work seems only a small misfortune within the greater catastrophe. Considering however, the precious, irreplaceable nature of perhaps his finest carvings, their loss is of particular significance. The writer includes here a hopefully surviving example of Edward Wyatt’s exquisite detailing which one normally sees only as peripheral decorations in paintings and photographs.

In summary, both the Blue Velvet Room, and the Ante-Room adjacent are without doubt French inspired, but cannot be confidently labelled French. To this end one may recall the Empress Eugénie’s attack on Garnier’s successful design (continued) being either severely damaged or lost. Worsley, G., “Windsor Castle, Berkshire”, Country Life, Vol. CLXXXVII, No. 3, January 21, 1993, p.31.

Jean-Louis-Charles Garnier (1825-1898), certainly the doyen of the Second Empire style, was without any real rival architect. The brilliance with which he accomplished both the new Paris Opera (completed in 1875, five years after the fall of Napoleon III) and the Casino, Monte Carlo (begun 1878) earned him a RIBA gold medal in addition to his Grand Prix de Rome, and changed the direction of French architecture. (continued)
(1861) for a new Paris Opera House: “Qu’est-ce que ce style-là? Ce n’est pas un style! ce n’est ni du grec, ni du Louis XVI, pas même du Louis XV!” Garnier responded then “...C’est du Napoléon III...”. But to describe these rooms created a generation earlier at Carlton House, he may well have answered: “Exactement! De plus, ce n’est pas même du Louis XIV; quoique, c’est certainement du Louis Quatorze.” This seeming contradiction in terms describes in fact two entirely different decorative styles, which are historically separated by over a century. The first refers of course, to the final Palladian/Baroque traditions which hallmark the court of the “Sun King”. These as indicated, were exported all over Europe and found their way to England via Charles II and William and Mary (and several of the nobility, most notable of which was the first duke of Montagu).

“Louis Quatorze”, whilst employing a number of French decorative devices, is a totally English style. The framework was necessarily Classical, but other than this, the implementation of Louis-XIV design elements and/or any French motif from this and the next two Louis-identified styles, was considered worthy of an architect’s or decorator’s consideration. The flood of French furniture, panelling, and objets d’art increased greatly after 1815 over what it had been in Revolutionary times. On this occasion, in addition to the marchand-merciers and the impoverished nobility, the French Government itself was a vendor. These materials did not necessarily come to England en suite as they had been originally arranged. Rather they came in a stylistic multiformity representing one hundred and fifty years of French artistic development. Necessarily different pieces were then arranged by their new owners, in whatever settings seemed appropriate. John Fowler has made an observation that not only defines this era, but others to come: It is precisely here that most architects began to take a secondary role in interior decoration. A new society with new sources of wealth, advised by marchand merciers and decorators - few of whom could be expected to have an architectural understanding, lead taste. The new direction, in addition to the collectibles factor, represented also a sympathy for the 1814-15 restoration of the ancien régime in France (and a reaction against Empire aesthetic). Given the melange of French imports to be trophied, the decorative result, necessarily retrospective, was by corporate definition tous les Louis. With the national euphoria following Napoleon’s defeat, the studied architectural principles that stood for (continued) These buildings significantly influenced theatre design throughout the western world. In England, the work of Paris-trained Frank (Francis Thomas) Verity’s (1867-1937) now maligned Criterion Theatre and Restaurant for instance, is highly influenced by Garnier. Middleton/Watkin, pp.253; Beard, G., Stucco and Decorative Plasterwork in Europe, p.174; Survey of London, Vol.XXX, The Parish of Westminster, Part One, South of Piccadilly; The Athlone Press, University of London (London-1960)p.256; Gray, A.S., pp.29, 360-2.
aristocratic dignity were supplanted by an extravagant display of pure wealth. Although the architectural contributions of this time were not necessarily naive, the overriding design ethic aspired to an atmosphere of glittering opulence and luxury. Existing elements within a decorative scheme, which could not be integrated into this new lusciousness, were either gilded into a visual harmony, or thrown out.

A Change of Order

With the fall of Napoleon, Britain was unchallenged in the world's political scene; and in spite of the crippling expenses spanning the French Wars to Waterloo, she was also the richest nation in the world. Factors contributing to the Pax Britannica (1815-1914) which reached its peak by mid-century - and essentially continued until the first World War - are detailed in any competent English history of this period. Essentially, an industrial revolution beginning during the early reign of George III became the source and sustenance allowing Britain to stem the War effort at a time when the last ten years of conflict saw its cost rising nearly thirty per cent from eighty-four millions a year to one hundred and six millions. William Lecky is quite right to suggest that statues to Watt and Arkwright be placed side by side with those of Wellington and Nelson; because it was they and men like them who produced the revenue base that sustained Britain's war effort, and achieved the unparalleled prosperity which was to last so long. Just as the development of railroads, canals, highways allowed a mass movement of people and goods from the land into the towns and factories, machines increasingly substituted for much of the work that had formerly been done by hand. This was a necessary consequence, not only reflecting the entrepreneurship of select individuals, but responding to an unprecedented population explosion, which was reacting to higher standards of living and demanding even higher ones. The shift from the country is demonstrated by figures which show that by 1851, the urban population of Britain was equal to that of the rural. Ten years later the ratio was five to four, and by 1881 the urban figure was more than double the rural. Contained within these ratios is the fact that by mid-century over a third of the workforce was employed in manufacturing, and this figure would hold until 1900. There were

---

* John Robinson describes the euphoria and quotes from prince Pückler-Muskau's Tours in England: "...England is now in a similar state to that of France thirty years before the Revolution...everything is in the highest degree of ultra-aristocratic." Robinson, The Wyatts..., p.110.

only eleven master carvers at work in London when Wyatt and Fricker & Henderson worked at Carlton House, and although "Carvers and Gilders" would advertise themselves in the hundreds, only the latter category applied. From this and other small firms of specialty craftsmen developed the great nineteenth-century decoration firms, which in a few instances would evolve into the huge emporiums of Waring and Gillow, Schoolbreds and Maple & Co. They provided literally anything that could be desired in the way of interior decoration and much more.

King and Company, The Louis Quatorze Style

Louis Quatorze describes a style of English interior decoration, which first appeared with James Wyatt's work at Carlton House. A Neo-Classicist and Gothic revivalist of considerable talent and versatility, Wyatt, with this French addition to his repertoire - however momentary an episode in his overall career - can be seen to have produced within a single architectural practice, the three predominant styles of the early nineteenth century. It is however to his son, Benjamin Dean (1775-1850?), that credit must be given for the Louis Quatorze style in its most accomplished expression.

Benjamin Dean Wyatt

Benjamin Wyatt is certainly a second-echelon architect if one is considering Soane, Nash, and the few other illustrious men of his generation, yet he is indisputably the finest designer of his time to work within a French aesthetic. His projects done for clients of considerable social and political standing, did much to popularise the style. Indeed, although other architects and decorators subsequently produced similarly directed designs, Benjamin Wyatt's name historically leads the list, and has come to us as synonymous with "Louis Quatorze" decoration.

In 1798, three years after matriculating at Christ Church, Oxford, Wyatt went to India as a writer for the East India Company and became a private secretary to Richard Colley Wesley, Marquess Wellesley. Two years previous

*a* Nobody knows precisely when Wyatt died, but it was certainly in obscurity. For whatever reasons, Benjamin Dean never received the support from his father, that was enjoyed by his younger brothers, Matthew Cotes and Philip, or for that matter his cousin, Jeffry Wyatt (Wyatville). However, relationships with his brothers were for the most part friendly, as he collaborated with one or another on the projects for which he is best known. Colvin, H.M.A Biographical Dictionary of English Architects 1660-1840, John Murray (London-1954)pp.720-1; Linstrum, D., ed., Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the RIBA, The Wyatt Family, Gregg International Publs. Ltd. (London-1973)pp.14, 25.

*b* Richard Colley Wesley Wellesley (1760-1842), eldest son of the earl of Mornington and brother of the famous duke of Wellington. Wellesley was governor-general of India from 1797 until his return to England in 1805. With the able assistance of his brother Arthur, it was during this short time that Wellesley transformed the East India Company from a commercial entity into an instrument of imperial power. Encyclopaedia Britannica, vol.23 (Chicago-1942)p.497.
(1796), the marquess's younger brother Arthur (future Duke of Wellington - 1814) had been sent to India as a lieutenant-colonel of his regiment. Upon Richard's arrival, Arthur became his unofficial adviser, and shortly thereafter was appointed to the supreme military and political command at Mysore. Wellington's career begins with his triumphs in India (1796-1805), and progresses to the posts of chief secretary of Ireland (1807-9), ambassador to the Court of Louis XVIII (1814-5), and prime minister (1828-9). The two Wellesleys and Wyatt returned to England in 1805, and it seems possible that Wyatt became secretary to Arthur Wellesley from this time until the termination of his employer's Irish appointment in 1809. It was then that Wyatt, aged thirty-four years, decided to become an architect. Beginning training in his father's office, it was from here he entered the competition for the new Theatre Royal, Drury Lane - replacing Holland's theatre which had burnt in 1809. Wyatt senior objected to his elder son's entry as it competed with that of his younger brother Philip. When Benjamin's design was selected as the winning entry, his father refused to have anything more to do with him. The Drury Lane theatre was completed 1811-12, and the following year James Wyatt was dead.149

From the onset of Benjamin Dean's career, he had certainly through Wellington, an introduction into the top echelons of government and power. Drury Lane however, would have attracted the notice of the prince of Wales in spite of this connection, as it was to his Royal Highness that the various submissions were made and to whom the selection sub-committee, including Samuel Whitbread (Holland's Southill Park) and Thomas Hope, made its recommendations.* A description of Wyatt's theatre in The Builder, November 12, 1915, cites as his inspiration, Victor Louis's Grand Théâtre (Louis XVI style, 1777-80) of Bordeaux. b

* Aspinall reproduces the correspondence mentioning the "genius" of both Philip and Benjamin Wyatt's designs. The final paragraph is as follows: "That the chairman do [sic] submit a copy of these resolutions with all humility, in the name of the sub-committee, to his Royal Highness the Prince Regent: and do express the grateful sense entertained by the sub-committee for the condescending favour shewn by his Royal Highness in his patient & enlightened investigation of the different plans and models submitted to the consideration of his Royal Highness at Carlton House." - meaning it was probably the Prince himself who made the final selection. Aspinall, A., ed., The Correspondence of George, Prince of Wales 1770-1812, Vol. VIII, Cassell (London - 1971) (archive 18736-8)p.185.

b The Builder article records an unattributed quotation: "a large comfortable house, thanks to Mr. Whitbread". The article continues, "It was finished in 1812, resplendent in all the glory of those delicate shades of broad paintwork, hanging chandeliers and red upholstery which distinguished the theatre of the time, and boasting a magnificent vestibule and staircases." The theatre was entirely rebuilt in 1922, when The Builder made further comment on Wyatt's design, stating that the theatre was designed in 1811 "...in the Classic manner then in vogue in England". The Builder, Nov.12, 1915, p.354a, April 14, 1922, p.556d.
Louis’s concept is a three-quarter parterre.) Wyatt himself, with a dedication to Samuel Whitbread, published an account of this work in 1813, which illustrated a design more in the vein of Holland’s burnt theatre, and with very little French detailing.  

The Duke of Wellington and Apsley House - First Programme

Wyatt’s next major commission came from his old employer, Arthur Wellesley, now duke of Wellington. In 1817 Wellington purchased Apsley House at Hyde Park Corner from his brother, marquess Wellesley. The house, a plain brick structure comprising five bays, had been built by Adam (1771-8) for baron Apsley (second earl of Bathurst), and has retained its original title to this day. Wyatt was commissioned to do repairs and at this time (1817) placed Canova’s statue of Napoleon (a gift from the prince regent) in the staircase. (Adam’s simple

161 - Robert Adam original Apsley House, watercolour by Edward Dayes (1810) Jervis/Tomlin, pg. 7.
163 - B. D. Wyatt Apsley House Dining Room (1819) watercolour by Thomas Shotten Boys (1852), Country Life, April 1, 1993, Vol. CLXXXVII, No. 12, pg. 45.
164 - B. D. Wyatt Apsley House Dining Room (1819) cornice detail, writer’s photo.

* Figure 161 illustrates Adam’s Apsley House of 1771-8 (in the foreground). The structure was roughly square in plan and as seen in fig.161, abuts the house to the south. Wyatt’s addition to the south did not interfere with the Adam plan. This indicates that the adjacent house had been demolished by 1817 and the duke had purchased a part of the southern property in order to accommodate the addition. The remaining property, numbered 148 Piccadilly became the site of the future residence of Baron Lionel de Rothschild, which will be discussed.
balustrade received its Rococo embellishments c.1830, long after Wyatt had found his French inclination.) Two years later (1819), Wyatt added the Dining Room in a vein much more to Holland’s taste and the heart of Regency design (figures 163 & 164). Detailing is simple and well conceived. The pilasters are of Sienna scagliola with their capital projections being exactly that of the pilaster depth. This consideration is reflected in the ceiling border moulding, being the same depth as the pilaster and showing the capital extension precisely in the corner details. It is clear from this early example, that whatever inventiveness historians may think Wyatt lacked in architectural concept he could be meticulous when it came to interior design and its detailing. With the exception of the Drury Lane theatre, all eight of Wyatt’s major commissions occur in the 1820s - four are c.1825, and two of these were at the instigation of the duchess of Rutland.

Elizabeth, Duchess of Rutland, Belvoir and the Elizabeth Saloon

This beautiful, vivacious lady was an enthusiastic architectural amateur, whose drawings were considered to be of a professional level. She landscaped the park at Belvoir, her husband’s country estate, and designed the home farm there as well. She painted landscapes in the manner of Claude le Lorrain. Although Mrs. Arbuthnot, a great friend of the duke of Wellington’s, described her as “...certainly a woman of genius and talent mixed up with a great deal of vanity and folly”, her great beauty and talent certainly made up for the last two attributes. She and her husband were amongst the duke of York’s closest friends - the duchess eventually becoming his mistress. The relationship between the king’s brother and the duchess would contribute to Wyatt’s invitation to his greatest commission - Stafford House (and it would be the controversies over this project that would effectively end his career).

The Elizabeth Saloon, Belvoir Castle, appears to be the pivotal commission which oriented Wyatt to French design. The style that resulted is not an extension or elaboration.

* Shane Leslie offers: "His [the duke of York’s] great love affair was with the Duchess of Rutland," and Creevey tells how "...he walked her up and down Kensington Gardens till she was ready to faint from fatigue, so he ran off puffing and blowing and brought a pony upon which he aired her up and down for two hours longer. When the Regent heard of this he is said to have chuckled with delight exclaiming, 'York is in for it at last.'" Leslie, S., p.128; The relationship is also indicated in the Wilson edition of Charles Greville’s Diary, vol.1,p.61, and most recently by James Yorke, Country Life, June 30, 1994, vol. CLXXXVIII no.26, p.64.

b In 1814, the year following their father’s death, Matthew Cotes, Benjamin Dean and Philip Wyatt (who would work with Benjamin on Crockford’s Club House and Londonderry House (and as sole architect for Londonderry at Wynyard Park, Durham), all visited France. Benjamin returned in 1815 and 1817; Philip on two occasions in 1819; and Matthew, who was entrusted to purchase the Saloon’s boiseries, was again in France in (continued)
of Holland's refined Gallic Neo-Classicism, but an amalgam of Louis XIV and XV styles. Unlike the Carlton House examples, it is not an effort to provide precious pieces of furniture with an appropriate setting; and unlike Chesterfield House, it does not attempt to reproduce a genuinely French interior. Wyatt begins at Belvoir, with period boiseries of authentic French manufacture. As will be seen, the architectural problem was not one of cutting down the original work to fit a space - as was the usual situation with Charles Allom\textsuperscript{154} (figures 148 & 158) and other late nineteenth-century decorators. Wyatt's task was the reverse - to use a limited quantity of existing materials, and make them work in a space much larger than that for which they had been originally designed. The writer believes this is the first instance in England, where authentic boiseries determined the decorative theme.\textsuperscript{b}

Work at Belvoir was begun c.1800 as the fourth rebuilding of a structure which occupied the Leicestershire site from the days of the Norman conquest. The architect, James Wyatt, received his commission here, following the start of his (continued) 1824 and 1830. Robinson gives as his sources: Belvoir, Rutland mss, 2.20.3, and the Royal Library, Windsor, 18971-8. Robinson, J.M., \textit{The Wyatts}, p.107.

\textsuperscript{a} Bruno Pons, Conseiller pour la recherche et les relations extérieures of the \textit{École Nationale du Patrimoine}, Paris correctly described the Elizabeth Saloon at Belvoir as a "pastiche", whose proportions are "bizarres". Whilst this portrayal is correct, the interior utilizes genuine Louis XV components. I am grateful to M. Pons for his correspondence, 28 September 1993, and 2 March 1994.

\textsuperscript{b} The one exception is possibly the decoration for the long vanished second Montagu House, Bloomsbury. The first Montagu House (finished 1676) was built in the French style from designs by Dr. Robert Hooke. Evelyn described it when newly opened, and also gives an account of its destruction by fire ten years later. As Montagu was Charles II's ambassador to the court of Louis XIV (1666-78), the Sun King dispatched an architect with a team of artists and craftsmen to build the second Montagu House, which is illustrated by Campbell in \textit{Vitrivius Britannicus}, vol.I. The architect's name was one Boujet or Pouget, who rebuilt what was London's first Parisian hôtel with even more Gallic flourish than could have been expected from Hooke. Pouget was assisted in this effort by largely Huguenot craftsmen, including those named in Montagu's accounts as Gideon du Chesne, stone carver, John and Thomas Pelletier, woodcarvers and gilders; Peter Russet, joiner; Remy, George and Francis Lapiere, upholsterers. At the same time a great addition to Montagu's country estate, Boughton House, was accomplished, also in the current French style. The Victoria and Albert Museum, London, displays panels given by the 7th duke of Buccleuch which are fine examples of late 17th-century French carving. It is possible that these were done by some of the craftsmen listed above. Van Dishoech, F., \textit{Netherlandes Yearbook for the History of Art}, "Daniel Marot and the First Duke of Montagu", G. Jackson-Stops (Haarlem-1981)p.255; The 25th Volume of the Walpole Society 1936-7, Oxford University Press (Oxford-1937) pp.95-6; Victoria & Albert Museum number W.184-1923.
project to Gothicize Windsor Castle. His charge was primarily to remodel the exterior; and in spite of a 1816 fire which destroyed much of the castle, his work survives in the south-eastern and south-western ranges. The Elizabeth Saloon occupies the principal storey in the north-east tower - rebuilt by the Rev. Sir John Thoroton, an amateur architect who had replaced Wyatt upon the latter's sudden death in 1813. Thoroton was chaplain and friend to the fifth duke of Rutland, and may also have been the very busy James Wyatt's site representative from the start of the works. The loss of the principal architect left his eldest (Benjamin) and second (Matthew Cotes) sons responsible for the interior decorations, and it is they who are credited the major interiors of the house. These include the Picture Gallery, the Dining Room and what came to be known as The Elizabeth Saloon. The first two, whilst very well executed in white and gold, are undistinguished. The Elizabeth Saloon however, is a watershed in the development of French-influenced interiors in England, adjunctly providing Benjamin Dean with what became his professional passport.
The decorative style of the saloon is often misleadingly described as "Louis XIV style". The heaviness of the ceiling and cove decorations certainly suggest a seventeenth-century approach, but the wall decorations are Rococo, a hallmark of Louis XV style and its decorative reaction to the cold, formal monumentality of Louis XIV decoration.

As indicated, the Wyatt brothers’ task involved the integration of Rococo elements - which included with the boiseries, trumeaux and doors with their surrounds - not into a space similar to those from which they had been originally arranged (petits appartements), but one of vast proportions. Their solution was to treat the panels, coming from at least two different sources, as pilasters (appropriate to Louis XIV style decoration), rather than as a continuous wall treatment. Another reason for separating the panels could have been to keep them from an adjacency that would have revealed their differences. Whilst the panels’ overall character is similar, the details differ to the point of incompatibility. One design features a mid-panel cartouche of a complex oval configuration, similar to that of le grand salon, Hôtel de Lassay, Paris (after 1725), la chambre de la reine, Versailles (1735) and la chambre du prince de Soubise, Hôtel Soubise (figure 169). Of identical detail are the room’s corner panels, which differ only in that

169 - Germain Boffrand (with Nicolas Pineau?) Hôtel de Soubise, La Chambre du Prince de Soubise (1737-9), Babelon, pg.19. 170 - Gabriel / Verberckt Versailles, The Gilded Chamber of Mme Adélaïde (c.1753) Pérouse de Montclos, pg.266.

168 - B.D. Wyatt et al Belvoir Castle, The Elizabeth Saloon, panelling arrangement, writer's photo.
they are crowned by oval frames, now containing mirror-glass. These would most likely have originally contained a painted or carved panel. The pair flanking the bow window (figure 166) are entirely mirrored and are of a greater length than the pair opposite. One might be led to believe that these particular panels, altered to fit the Belvoir interior, were damaged, or had been warehoused in France over such a length of time that some of the original elements had disappeared by the time of the Rutland acquisition. Oval-crowned boiseries are a favourite French detail, as can be seen in Gabriel and Verberckt's work (1753) in the Gilded Chamber of Madame Adélaïde, Versailles (figure 170). In the latter example, one observes also the framing details, which at the base, are upward curving in a basket shape. This approach, together with a double, or "S" curve (vase-shape) is perhaps the most common design of the period (genre pittoresque)* - seen as well in Gabriel and Verberckt's panelling for the Cabinet de la Pendule, (c.1738) Versailles and Boffrand's for the Prince de Soubise (figure 169).

171 - Gabriel / Verberckt Versailles, Le Cabinet de la Pendule (c.1738) panelling detail, Palacios, pl.6. 172 - Nicolas Pineau? Belvoir Castle, panel detail (late 1730s?) writer's photo.

It is the Elizabeth Saloon's second panel design which is most unusual. Here, the central feature is of a dropped trophy, hung from a gilded cartouche which appears to strain from its burden. Innovative as this detail may be, it is the base-framing which impresses as a tour de force of elemental integration and balance. The main frame terminates in a typical hook-bill detail, which is then reversed upwards to enjoin the featured cartouche - the whole not containing the composition, as with basket or vase-shaped designs, but rather extending the design, as if in expectation of another feature below. This gesture is a favourite device of

* The second and more fanciful phase of the Rococo in France. Universally recognized as central to the development of the style, are (continued)
Meissonnier, whose published engravings (c.1735) show similar details corresponding to the forms of mobile furniture aligned directly below, and enabling Meissonnier, who often designed (impractically) a full-height panel without a dado (figures 173 & 174), to accomplish the link. Although one can recognise Meissonnier's attempt to integrate furniture with the panel decorations; it is equally clear, the effect is successful only when the furniture is exactly positioned, and only when viewed straight on and in elevation. Thus, the exercise works only on paper, as any perspective view would immediately destroy the relationship.

Practical, prolific and enormously inventive, Nicolas Pineau is the genre pittoresque designer, who is historically viewed as the most effective artist to bring this phase of French decorative development to its greatest expression. In addition to his extraordinary abilities as a designer, Pineau had trained as a carver, and therefore brought both essential creative talents to his (continued) the designers Jacques de Lajoue (1686-1761), Juste-Aurèle Meissonnier (1695-1750), and Nicolas Pineau (1684-1754). Lajoue was a painter and ornamental designer, who had considerable influence on designers of printed cotton, silks and embroidery, but was of limited architectural importance. A Toronese and contemporary of his countryman, Giovanni Baptista Borra (1712-86 - see pages 56 tbl & 57n), Meissonnier trained as a goldsmith. In 1726 he succeeded Berain (son of the famous Jean Berain) to become Directeur de la Chambre et du Cabinet du Roi, and held the position until his death. His decorations for court fêtes and ceremonies (and occasionally architecture) are not architectural in the strictest sense. When freed from the physical constraints of built work, his designs were fantastical compositions, produced largely as ends in themselves. In the abstract (Oeuvres de Juste Aurele Meissonnier...published, Paris c.1735) he is historically viewed as the originator of the genre pittoresque, but it is the prolific Nicolas Pineau who earned Fiske Kimball's studied appraisal: "Earlier than Meissonnier, he designed and executed rooms fully incorporating the crucial innovations. Far more than Meissonnier or any other, he fixed the character and type of detail destined to prevail in France. Among all the works, his own were to remain unsurpassed." Fleming/Honour, pp.464, 537-8; Kimball, P., The Creation of the Rococo Style, pp.154, 157-172, 170; Blunt, A., Baroque and Rococo Architecture and Decoration, p.138.
work." The writer-engraver, Charles-Nicholas Cochin (1713-1790) wrote of him:

...Il allégea toutes ces moulures & tous ces profils où Oppenor [sic] & Meissonnier avaient voulu conserver un caractère qu’ils appelloient mâle; il les traita d’une délicatesse qui les fait presque échapper à la vûe..."

As Cochin suggests, Pineau owes a degree of debt to Giles Marie Oppenord (1672-1742) as well as Meissonnier; and as regards the latter’s work, one element of the Belvoir panelling which the writer suggests is the work of Pineau, is clearly evocative. The writer refers to the cartouche, which is more Baroque in character (typical of Meissonnier (figure 175)) than of the usual clear geometries found in French design. In Oeuvres..., Meissonnier published several panel designs" - one of which is reproduced in figure 175. The Belvoir panelling not only evokes the general shape of this cartouche, but in a compositional tour de force, largely repeats it again in the framed void immediately below. Cochin refers also to a great délicatesse in Pineau’s carving and describes this as being of a quintessence nearly escaping the eye. Observing the delicate character of the cartouche’s integrated cherub wings (most likely abstracted in the Rococo from the Renaissance detail of two cherubs holding a cartouche (figure 176)), it is possible to compare similar examples of this detail in the work of Briseux, Gabriel/Verberckt and Boffrand (hôtel de Soubise, where Pineau assisted - figures 177-179),b to appraise the subtlety of the Belvoir detail. But perhaps the most convincing evidence comes from Fiske Kimball, who reproduces an engraving from Mariette, illustrating Pineau’s

a The life and work of Nicolas Pineau is well documented (re: Leon Deshaies, Dessins Originaux du Maîtres Décorateurs Nicolas et Dominique Pineau [son (1718-1786)], D. A. Longuet (Paris-1911); Edouard Rouvyere, Recueil des Oeuvres de Nicolas Pineau, Librarie des Beaux-Arts Appliqués à l’Industrie (Paris-1889); Emile Bias, Les Pineau, sculpteurs, dessinateurs du bâtiments du roy, graveurs, architectes (1652-1886), La Société du bibliophiles français chez Morgand (Paris-1892). Son of the carver Jean-Baptiste Pineau (who appears in royal accounts from 1680 at Versailles and elsewhere) Nicolas was ten years old when his father died. At thirty-two Pineau (and others) accompanied the architect Jean-Baptiste Alexandre Leblond (1679-1719) to Russia, where his chief surviving work remains the Cabinet of Peter the Great in the Grand Palais at Peterhof (c.1721). (Leblond is described by Mariette as executing ornament "...avec une très-grand délicatesse.") Pineau left Russia in 1727 - a date from which his earliest Parisian work can be traced. Allied with the architect Jean-Baptiste Leroux 1676?-1746), Pineau created superb interiors at the Hôtel de Rouillé (c.1732). The Hôtel de Villars (1732-33), the Hôtel de Roquelaure (Ministère des Travaux Publics - 1733), and the Hôtel de Mazarin (1735). Except for Roquelaure, these important works have been relocated or destroyed. Dilke, pp.23-4; Kimball, p.132, 162; Ward, p.368.

b Fiske Kimball indicates that in addition to the Grand Cabinet, Pineau’s work for Boffrand (then in his late sixties) can be found extensively throughout the major apartments of the Hôtel de Soubise. Kimball, pp.168,176,178-81.
At Belvoir, Wyatt increased the effect of the panels' height by the insertion of a "pedestal" panel directly above the chair-rail and dado, and here the duchess intended a surprise to supplement the architectural detail: the "pedestal" panels were made removable to display a marvellous collection of miniatures - today exhibited in the Castle's Gallery.

As with the boiseries, the trumeaux are of two different
decoration for the "...chambre à coucher de l'appartement de Mme. Rouillé", hôtel de Rouillé, c.1732. Not only does one observe a nearly identical rendition of the reverse curve displayed in the Belvoir panel-ling, but allowing that the hôtel was pulled-down soon after 1760, there is also the possibility that the panel-ling was held in store for a sufficient length of time to account for the missing or damaged elements, and require the compensations evident in Wyatt's installation. This is of course, pure specula-
tion. Still, the framing detail and its rendering are unique enough to strongly suggest, if the Belvoir panel-ling is not salvaged from the Hôtel de Rouillé itself, it is still most likely the work of Pineau.

176 - Roulland le Roux Bureau des Finances, Rouen, detail (1509-10) Lewis/Darley fig. 1, pg.76. 177 - C.-E. Briseux trumeau detail (Mid 18th Century) publ. 1761, Strange, pg.303. 178 - Gabriel / Verberckt Versailles, le Cabinet Intérieure (1753), Van der Kemp, pg.115. 179 - Boffrand (with Pineau?) Hôtel de Soubise, la Chambre de la Princesse de Soubise, médailon de la corniche (1737-39) Babelon, pg.22.

180 - Nicolas Pineau Hôtel de Rouillé, Paris (c.1732), Kimball, fig.216.

181 - B. D. Wyatt Belvoir Castle, open "pedestal" panel, writer's photo.
designs - the pair of chimney-glasses differing from that which reflects Matthew Wyatt's posthumous (1829) life-size statue of the Duchess. All are increased in height, with a midway construction joint disguised by a carving. An obvious after-thought, the trumeau backing the statue is uncharacteristically carried through the dado to the skirting.

Gilded frames to the damask panels, which include those full length and those positioned as overdoors or overwindows, are of three distinctly different designs. Unless one takes the trouble to scrutinize the decorations, the Wyatt brothers' arrangement of these original elements, augmented with carvings by London master carvers, arrived at a unity similar to that of the Carlton House interiors discussed - one that bridges the design diversities with a copious amount of gilding.

The ceiling, although painted by Matthew Cotes with mythological themes and portraits of the Manners family, was designed in concept by the duchess herself. Whilst allowing the duchess's sensitive handling of a compartmental ceiling as oriented to the bow (contrast to Holland's attempt, pages 94-5), a direct comparison with this design and Le Brun's ceilings of the Salons de la Guerre and de la Paix should not be overlooked.¹

The peacock, a Manners family emblem, is featured in both the ceiling paintings and in the Louis XIV-style moulded plaster coving details. Here massive sculptural renditions of birds and alternating scrollwork are presented more in the manner of Louis XV than his predecessor. Louis XIV design stressed a coved ceiling rather than a cove substituting for a frieze (and decorated with elements appropriate to the délicatesse of the wall decorations below). Although Belvoir's saloon represents a decorative statement finding no home in either French style, the writer would defer to the Wyatts, and stress that the inventive marrying of all these disparate details could have been conceptually no small task.

¹ James Yorke recalls in a recent article that the duchess recorded a 1814 visit to Paris in her journal. Her writings record a visit to Versailles with specific note of the ceilings of Le Brun and the private boudoir of Marie Antoinette. York, J., Country Life, 30 June 1994, Vol. CLXXXVIII, no.26, "Belvoir Castle, Leicestershire - II, A Seat of the Duke of Rutland, p.62.
Gorgeous as they are, when compared to Le Brun’s Salon de la Paix, the curving borders of the ceiling compartments are spare of embellishment. By keeping the heavy Louis XIV-style details to a minimum, the borders display a character somewhat sympathetic to that of the boiseries. Unlike the boiseries however, the ceiling embellishments are applied to rather than sprung from the white backgrounds. The ceiling cartouches provide focal points for trailing Roman scrollwork, and also provide clasp-like bridging connections between the borders themselves. A hint of scroll motif can be discovered painted on a white fond in the Salon des Nobles, Versailles, but largely the Roman scroll is not employed in Louis XIV interior decoration. (It is, however, a well-used balustrade motif as can be seen at the Grand Trianon, Versailles (figure 188), in a context remarkably similar to those at Belvoir. Roman scrolls are employed in the Empire ceiling decoration of the Salon des Saisons, hôtel de Beauharnais, Paris (c.1806), nearly a century and a half later (than Louis XIV - but before the Elizabeth Saloon). As seen, James Wyatt used Roman scrolls to embellish the cove of the Blue Velvet Room at Carlton House. After Belvoir, Benjamin Wyatt featured them in this context again when he returned to Apsley House. But to repeat, all these applications were not of any particular French reference.

What is interesting about Belvoir’s ceiling cartouches is that they are not of a piece, but made up of several distinct elements. They are obviously arranged on and over the simply framed flat plane of the compartment borders - so much so that one can discern the border frames travelling unbroken above them. It is possible that they are carved wood appliqués, but they could also be of gilded papier-maché; a
material which Benjamin Dean used more and more in his design of French decorative elements.

It was left to a grieving duke to complete the Elizabeth Saloon, as the duchess died of appendicitis in 1825, the year before it was finished. The Wyatts returned to Belvoir to erect a Romanesque mausoleum for her, but from a contemporary account, the Saloon with Matthew Wyatt’s statue, became in effect a mausoleum itself. Largely closed to society, this magnificent space could have given little press to the architects and Louis Quatorze style. But two years later (1827) there appeared in the heart of London, a project by Benjamin and another brother, Philip, that dazzled anyone who could afford to enter its doors: Crockford’s gaming club.

**Crockford’s**

The impression Crockford’s made on the public can be measured from the following reports:

From the Opera House we went to Crockford’s new concern which is magnificent and perfect in taste and beauty. For a suite of rooms, it is the greatest lion in England, and is said by those who know the palace at Versailles to be even more magnificent than that... (Thomas Creevey, 1828)

“Crockford’s Club-house,” at which we have now arrived, was built for its founder, the late Mr. John Crockford... It was erected at a vast cost, and in the grand proportions and palatial decorations of the principal floors, “had not been surpassed in any similar building in the metropolis.” On the ground floor are the entrance-hall and inner hall opening into a grand suite of rooms of noble proportions; on the principal floor are a suite of very lofty and splendid reception-rooms, gorgeously decorated à la Grand Monarque, approached from a superb staircase, itself an architectural triumph, and a great feature of the building. (Edward Walford)

...a gaming palace on the plan of the ‘saloon’ at Paris, but with a truly Asiatic splendour almost surpassing that of royalty. Everything is in the new revived taste of the time of Louis XIV, decorated with

---

* Greville writes on January 7th, 1834, about Belvoir’s awkward planning: "...no two rooms communicating, not even (except the drawing-room and dining-room, the former of which is seldom or never inhabited) contiguous." Reeves, H., *The Greville Memoirs*, Vol.ii. D. Appleton & Co., (New York-1875)p.209

* Disregarding George IV’s open houses at Carlton House, Crockford’s début in 1827 was the first public display of the Louis Quatorze style (known also as the Louis XIV revival. Floud, P., Edwards & Ramsey, *The Connoisseur’s Complete Period Guides*...p.1320.
tasteless excrescences, excess of gilding, confused mixture of stucco painting, etc. (Prince Pückler-Muskau)\textsuperscript{164}

In their 1842 catalogue, George Jackson & Sons took credit for the interiors,\textsuperscript{165} which were still in glittering evidence when Ralph Nevill described them in 1911.

The present building is, with some alterations, the same as the one constructed in 1827 - on the site of three houses then demolished - for the famous ex-fishmonger by the brothers Wyatt. The decorations alone, it is said, cost £94,000... The entrance hall has a screen of Roman-Ionic scagliola columns with gilt capitals, and a cupola of gilding and stained glass. The staircase was panelled with scagliola, and enriched with Corinthian columns. The grand drawing-room was in the style of Louis Quatorze, as it was understood at that day; its ceiling had enrichments of bronze-gilt, with door paintings à la Watteau. ... The gambling-room (now the dining-room of the Devonshire Club) consisted of four chambers: the first an ante-room, opening to a saloon embellished to a high degree; out of it a small curiously-formed cabinet or boudoir, opening to the supper-room. All these rooms were panelled in the most gorgeous manner, spaces being adorned with mirrors, silk or gold enrichments, and the ceilings as gorgeous as the walls.\textsuperscript{166}

Now the Jamaican High Commission,\textsuperscript{167} old Crockford's was redecorated 1874-5 by Charles John Phipps (1835-1897),\textsuperscript{a} an architect largely

\textsuperscript{a} Crockford's was the Devonshire Club from 1874 until 1976. Amongst his many projects in London and provincial towns, C.J. Phipps (1835-1897) gave the city two of its most opulent French-inspired theatres: the Lyric and Her Majesty's, Haymarket. Phipps's opulent decorations (c.1889) for F. A. Beer at 7 Chesterfield Gardens, London, were in Louis XIV style. (Bedford Lemere, photo #12299, National Monuments Record); The Building News, 14 May 1897, p.703, plt.face-pg.70; Survey of London, St. James South of Piccadilly, Vol. XXIX, pp.245-6, plt.37; The Builder, 22 December 1888, pp.453-4; Survey of London, St. James North of Piccadilly, Vol. XXXII, pp.74-6, plt.34; Greater London Council (GLC/AR/BR/19/435; Pevsner, N./Cherry, B., London, (continued)}
known for his theatre design. A few of the Wyatt's original decorations were however retained including the dining room's "Frenchy" chimney-pieces, and several aspects of the staircase hall, now known as the "Marbled Hall". Figure 190 shows the scagliola columns described by Nevill. They feature gilded Ionic capitals very much in the French manner, with draped garlands hung from the eyes of the volutes. The staircase's simple "turned rail" balusters, whilst not a unique detail to Wyatt, are also to be found in his Drury Lane Theatre and Londonderry House projects.

The Third Marquess of Londonderry and Londonderry House

Concurrently with the work at Crockford's gaming house, Benjamin and Philip were busy (1825-8) constructing one of London's great (and now vanished) mansions: Londonderry House, 19 Park Lane. The commissions for Crockford's and for the third marquess of Londonderry (a great friend and political ally of the fifth duke of Rutland), announced the arrival of Wyatt and the Louis Quatorze style at the very top of society. Now, in spite of the criticisms of architects and decorators such as Papworth, Cockerell and Morant, who felt (rightly) that in the hands of lesser artists, the French aesthetic could degenerate into maudlinism, most who could afford it paid no attention.

Londonderry House (1825-8) combined one originally called Holdernesse House, built for the fourth earl of Holdernesse (c. 1760-5) by James "Athenian" Stuart, with the house adjacent. Although retaining two magnificent (continued) Vol.I., Penguin (Middlesex-1989 ed.) p.647.


b French, generally preferred for drawing-rooms and boudoirs, was one of four retrospective styles marking the era. J. C. Loudon describes the other three as Grecian (or modern), Gothic (or Perpendicular) and Elizabethan. He indicates that upholsterers concentrated on the Louis XIV (meaning "Quatorze" which included Louis XV style) to the exclusion of persons of modest means. He described the capricious attitude of contemporary taste in summarising the "beau idéal [sic] as having a single structure display "...all the styles of Domestic Architecture that ever existed, in distinctive masses on the exterior; and in all the styles of furnishing, that ever existed, in separate rooms in the interior. As such he predicted the mid-century decorative credo that carried well into Edwardian times. Loudon, An Encyclopaedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture and Furniture, Longman, Orme, Brown, Green & Longmans (London-1839)pp.1035, 1039.

c As it happens, the fourth and last earl of Holdernesse (died 1778) was George IV's tutor when the prince was a boy. Fulford, pg.10, Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol.11, pg.639

d Both houses were originally addressed to Hertford Street, but the Wyatt remodellings relocated the entrance to Park Lane. In spite of the architectural and tenancy changes, the house was called Holdernesse House until 1872. Walpole described the Stuart house as "a formal piece of dullness", and this description seemed to stick to the Wyatt renovations (Wyatt never had much luck with the cognoscenti when it came to his exteriors). (continued)
rooms by Stuart, the remodelling’s most important spaces were done by the Wyatts. These included the Great Staircase, the Ball Room and Gallery, and the Banqueting Hall. All three displayed a progress in the development of Benjamin Dean’s French expertise.

The Entrance Hall and “imperial” staircase demonstrated an approach Wyatt would repeat in his greatest commission, Stafford House. Figure 191 displays similar columns to those installed at Crockford’s Entrance Hall. The Staircase Hall, like that to be erected at Stafford House, was central to the plan and enormous in terms of the rooms it served. The staircase itself supported three different styles of balusters: one being the simple “turned rail” design to be found at Crockford’s, with the other two

being a much more elaborate evocation of French seventeenth-century design. Tempting as it is to think of Louis XIV-style, the balusters were more like those of the émigré metallist Jean Tijou (Louis XIV era however - whose works can be seen at Hampton Court Palace, and St. Paul’s Cathedral, London), than the massive scrollwork demonstrated in Nicolas Pineau's (1684-1754) magnificent staircase relocated to the Wallace Collection, Hertford House, London. Wyatt would come much closer to Louis XIV design at Stafford House, where he improved on much of what is seen here.

Aside from foliate fluting infill to the columns and pilasters Wyatt provided in the Stair Hall and the Gallery/Grand Ballroom to which it leads, there was very little French detailing to be found in either space. A garland-festooned frieze (with an inadequate smaller garland to punctuate the column and pilaster capitals) was featured; but this is a purely Classical detail (figure 193), certainly used by the French but hardly of unique provenance. It was a standard device known to any educated architect. Wyatt’s awkward insertion of giant pilasters slicing through the frieze was naïve; and the squeezing of a one-third width smaller pilaster into the side of the giant, did little to restore the shattered structural integrity - particularly in view of the fact that he omitted to balance the detail on the opposing side. Looking into the Stair Hall lantern, one could discover another assemblage of incompatible details. The coffering of the coved ceiling offered two alternating patera designs, with a band of bound husks at the top and ends. Not discernable in figure 194 is an unrelated Greek fret, which ran, broken only by the bands, the entire perimeter of the space. The coffers were adorned by huge cartouches at the corners - and these were certainly French-derived details.

Above the coves, Wyatt employed a consoled frieze, which was again a very naïve usage of an architectural element totally out of context. (Perhaps he thought it necessary to feign a structural support for the atlantes which bear the lantern roof.) Again, it is an overwhelming luxuriance of gilded decoration that makes a unity of sorts, not the architecture itself.
The Gallery or Ball Room at the top of the staircase repeated the white and gold theme, and was lined with some of Londonderry's impressive collection of statuary and portraiture. Elegant French furniture of all three Louis periods, plus an Empire or English Empire bureau (seen to the left in figure 195) were in evidence. Central to the space, Wyatt placed a monumental Louis XVI-style chimney-piece with a curious mantel, more evocative of Robert Adam's Neo-Classical designs. The detail was appropriate to the setting's quasi-Kentian formality, and a departure from the "Frenchy" Rococo variety normally associated with Wyatt. The gilded columns repeated the details of those in the Stair Hall, this time with greater structural plausibility. A garlanded frieze, repeating the stair hall detail, was surmounted by a cove embellished with Louis XIV latticework. Above the cove, where one might expect a flat ceiling, appeared garret-like top-lighting, designed without any reference to the architectural statement below. The contrast was so uncompromising, irrespective of the lighting requirement to the space, that no decorative device could have been expected to bridge the visual schism created. This was another
architectural problem, Wyatt would solve in his later projects.

In spite of a few awkward details, the room of greatest interest at Londonderry House was the Banqueting Hall. As this room was created virtually at the same time as the decorations of Crockford's were accomplished, it is not only likely that, according to descriptions of the gaming house given above, they were similar if not identical. Located below the Ballroom and formed in part out of the old Holdernesse House Entrance Hall, 173 the space was huge. But of more significance, the very elaborate French detailing (not used in domestic dining rooms at this early date) emphasized the social power of the principal Tory hostess who presided here, and whose house had become in effect, the social headquarters of the party. 174 Lady Dorothy Nevill, a relation of Horace Walpole, gives this account:

Another Great Lady who also lent her aid to the young politician [Disraeli] was Lady Londonderry, who used to hold a sort of court at Holdernesse House... Here she would receive her guests sitting on a dais under a

* The Londonderry House records list the firm of Allen & Perry as 'plaisterers & modelers', but descriptions of what they supplied do not include the Dining Room's intricate French detailing. In their catalogue of 1849, George Jackson & Sons list Crockford's amongst their projects, and so it would be a logical assumption, given their association with B.D. Wyatt's major works at Belvoir, that the Dining Room decorations at Londonderry House were also their work. Jackson & Sons will figure prominently in this study, and are discussed separately in pages 148-156. Jackson & Sons catalogue, Part of the collection ... (1849) forward; Durham Co. R.O., D/LO/E/772 (3-5), 773.
canopy." To me she was always most affable, but I could not with truth say that, as a general rule, she took much trouble to entertain those who came to her receptions; indeed, she exhibited great hauteur, and sometimes took little notice of them. Some great ladies in old days (but not the very clever ones) gave themselves great aires; small wonder, when they were brought up to think they were the very salt of the earth..." 175

If Wyatt was a novice to Classical arrangement, he began to make up for it here in a display of obvious skill with French decorative design." The plastered ceiling and cove contained elements of the Louis XIV and XV styles; the walls combined Louis XV and XVI styles, but were not plastered nor carved. Appearing here is the first real evidence of Wyatt's papier-mâché and "composition" elements applied to simple mouldings. Figure 198 shows an elevation featuring one of Wyatt’s "Frenchy" chimney-pieces, which, together with the wall decorations, imitated Louis XV style. (One must assume the insertion of an unbalanced narrow panel to the right of the chimney-piece is a result of the irregularity of the space Wyatt inherited.)

The year (1828) Wyatt's work at Londonderry House was completed, he returned to Wellington and Apsley House. Here he corrected some of his previous faux pas with one of the great rooms of the era - The Waterloo Gallery.

a Curiously, The Londonderry Mss, Durham Co. Record Office, no. D/Lo Acc.451 (d) file 15 (catalogue) includes a "Throne Room" amongst the apartments on the first floor.

b It is clear from figure 215, that the room is a remodelling of an existing space or the combination of two or more rooms. The rear right corner of the Banqueting Hall, shows a painful juxtaposition of arches and rectangular-framed doors, virtually truncating door-frame and over-door decorations. The photos were taken in 1962, when the room had been painted over in gloss white. During the Second World War, Hermione Hobhouse explains that the house was used as an LCC depot, when in addition to the Banqueting Hall, some of Stuart's decorations were also whitewashed. The house was demolished in 1964. Hobhouse, H., Lost London, MacMillan (London-1971)p.48.
Apsley House - Second Programme

On June 17, 1825, the year of her death, Elizabeth, Duchess of Rutland, laid the cornerstone of one of London's great palaces. Known briefly as York House, it would prove to be Wyatt's masterpiece. The mansion occupies a corner site adjacent to St. James's Palace, bordering The Mall to the west, Green Park to the north, and is within a stone's throw of Buckingham Palace. The duke of York was heir to the throne at the time of Wyatt's commission (George IV's only child, Princess Charlotte, having died in 1817), and it was decided in or about 1820, that he should have a London address appropriate to his status. York selected the pedantic Robert Smirke, who with Soane and Nash, was one of the official architects to the Office of Works. Smirke had constructed the footprint of a structure that looked like a giant horseshoe devouring a Greek temple, when George IV finally viewed the drawings and called a halt to the proceedings. The duchess of Rutland and Sir Frederick Trench, were consulted with the result being Smirke's dismissal, followed by an invitation for Wyatt to submit a new scheme. His designs delighted everyone concerned,

a Most writers refer to the location as the stable yard of St. James's Palace, which the site in fact borders. Arthur Dasent traces a dwelling here as early as the reign of James II, with a 33-year lease dated December 12, 1685, being granted to Lady Oglethorpe. York was living in Oglethorpe House, now known as Godolphin House, when in 1825 the structure was pulled down to make way for the Smirke design. Dasent quotes The Times, May 16, 1825 as reporting "...the house is nearly levelled with the surrounding garden...". The duchess of Rutland laid the corner stone of Wyatt's design precisely one month later, which would have given Smirke precious little time to expend the £1,200 for foundations. Colvin, "The Architects of Stafford House", p.22; Dasent, A.I., The Story of Stafford House, now The London Museum, John Murray (London-1921)pp.23, 32-4; Laxton, P./Wisdom, J., The A to Z of Regency London, London Topographical Society publ.No. 131 (London-1985)p.22.

b Col. Trench (whose portrait in Elizabethan dress was painted by M.C. Wyatt in the Elizabeth Saloon ceiling) was a confidant of the duke and duchess of Rutland in their most notable projects. In his publication A Collection of Papers relating to the Thames Quay with Hints for some further improvements in the Metropolis (1827), he illustrates a plan by Philip Wyatt for a proposed palace in Hyde Park (which George IV admired, but doubted the government would approve). Here also Trench states that the duchess of Rutland was involved with the plans for York House "...even to the most minute particulars...". Sutton, D., "Apsley House, The Wellington Museum", Apollo, Vol.XCVIII, no. 139, Sept, 1973, reprint, Hardy, J., p.14; Hussey, C., "Belvoir Castle, The Seat of the Duke of Rutland I, Country Life, Dec.6, 1956, vol. CXX, p.1459; Colvin, H., "The Architects of Stafford House", p.22; Robinson, J.M. The Wyatts, An Architectural Dynasty, p. 110.

c Smirke did not take this lying down. His dismissal was followed by an attack on Wyatt, instigated by himself and other members of the Architects' Club. (Founded 23 January 1794, this largely social organization, whose original members included Chambers, Adam, Holland and Soane, eventually became known as the Royal Institute of British Architects.) Accused of chicanery (continued)
to the effect that George exclaimed "It is my command that you [York] have it". Work continued largely on Smirke's foundations, to a significantly improved architectural concept. Two years after its dedication, when the building's shell was nearly finished, York died (January, 1827) heavily in debt. At this time the government (Commissioners of Woods and Forests), being the prime mortgagee of an £80,000 obligation, was forced to assume what had become an instantaneous white elephant and look for a new tenant to buy the ninety-nine year lease. By the end of the year, the second marquess of Stafford, one of the wealthiest men in Britain, made an acceptable offer of £72,000, and work was begun again, with Wyatt (continued) in succeeding Smirke, Wyatt subsequently resigned from the Architects' Club and authored a newspaper article - which included a supporting statement by the duke of York - disavowing any unprofessional conduct. Smirke does not seem to have suffered an ethical quandary in replacing Wyatt on an 1832 commission for Lord Sefton's Arlington Street residence. One can only speculate that the smallness of his character forced him to overlook his real nemesis in a self-serving rivalry with smaller fry. The man really responsible for his embarrassments (aside from Smirke himself) was George IV. The king was effectively responsible for his dismissal at York House, discarded his submission for the Windsor Castle project in favour of Benjamin Wyatt's cousin, Jeffry Wyatville, and rejected his proposals for Buckingham Palace in favour of Nash, whose active dislike of Smirke is documented. Trencham Papers, Staffordshire Record Office, D593/E/7/19 (no pg.nos., counting pp.24-6; Peacocke, M.D., p.19; Fulford, R., p.283, Colvin, H.M. (Royal Buildings) p.15, (Biographical Dictionary) p.737, (Journal, Architectural Historians) pp.22-3; Davis, T., John Nash, The Prince Regent's Architect, Country Life Ltd. (London-1966)p.93; Lees Milne, J., The Age of Adam, p.40; Stafford Record Office, Wyatt to Duke of Sutherland, March 1834, D593/E/7/19, p.26 (counting); Grieg, j., ed., The Farington Diary, vol.1, p.79n.

Edwin Beresford Chancellor, who is not always accurate (crediting, for instance, "Sir Geoffrey Wyatville" with the Wellington Gallery, etc. at Apsley House), refers to the duke of Buckingham's Memoirs of the Court of George IV, in his suggestion that York borrowed £60,000 from the marquis of Stafford (created duke of Sutherland in 1833), to build York House. Chancellor, The Private Palaces of London, pp.172, 349.

Winslow Ames refers to the duke of Sutherland's 1957 book Looking Back, where Disraeli is quoted as saying the marquess of Stafford had lent York "...£60,000 towards the building costs and never saw his loan redeemed!" The duke also stated that the lease, which expired in 1941, was for 99 years, refuting Summerson's notion of 999 years [typo?]. Dasent fixes the date of the lease at July 5, 1841, indicating that its expiration was 1940. Charlton, J., Lancaster House, St. James's booklet, Her Majesty's Stationery Office (London-1961 ed.)p.8; Summerson, Georgian London, Barrie & Jenkins (London-1988 ed.)p.243; Ames, W., "The Completion of Stafford House", (continued)
reinstated as the architect. At this time, Crockford’s clubhouse and Londonderry House were in progress, and if York House (now Stafford House) added to his plate were not enough, the fifty-two year old architect was called back to Apsley House for what was to be a substantial transformation of the Adam structure.

Even with Wyatt’s dining room addition, Apsley House remained a modest residence not capable of entertaining on a scale appropriate to the status of England’s great military and political leader. This factor alone could have induced Wellington to enlarge his London residence, but an amassed collection of some 130 paintings ensured it. In his plans for York House, Wyatt had conceived a great gallery (125 by an average 30 feet) running the entire length of the north elevation. Apsley House now provided him with an opportunity to complete in advance, another great gallery nearly as large (90 by approximately. 25 feet), and correct the awkward top-lighting detail he had designed for Londonderry House. During the next three years (1828-30) the gallery was added, but the project at Apsley was more extensive than a simple addition. The gallery enlarged Apsley by two bays (whose windows are false on the front elevation) facing south to Piccadilly, and comprised seven bays, extending the structure by two - for the width of the gallery only - on the west overlooking Hyde Park. Adam’s plain brick walls were...
sheathed in Bath stone, and a pedimented Corinthian portico on a rusticated base was added to the Piccadilly entrance. This feature was not unlike that in Wyatt’s 1825 proposal for the south and west façades of York House excepting that the columns there are the height of the principal floor only.

Dubbed the Waterloo Gallery, this splendid room represents a giant leap in the artistic development of its architect, and stands as evidence in name as well as decoration, of the halcyon years that followed Napoleon’s defeat. All the major rooms by Adam were altered in deference to this space, which is the culminating Valhalla of a spatial progression that begins with the heroic statue of Napoleon at the stairway leading to the principal floor (refer figure 162).

In Adam’s layout, this floor comprised an “Etruscan” Dressing Room, Bed Room and three Drawing Rooms. The Bed and Dressing rooms which overlooked the garden, were combined by Wyatt into a single space, titled the Striped Drawing Room after its wall hangings and upholstery. Using a heightened version of Adam’s original doorcase to the stair, Wyatt provided an enfilade of these leading from his earlier Dining Room, through the Striped Drawing Room and Adam’s old Drawing Room to the west and into the Gallery addition. The two Drawing Rooms are decorated in a restrained Regency style, similar to that of the Dining Room. However, very little architectural alteration was done to Adam’s Drawing Rooms to the south. They are identified in figure 202 as the Piccadilly Drawing Room and the Portico Drawing Room - the latter so named because it’s southern windows are contained within Wyatt’s new porticoed entrance. (the room’s westerly windows were blocked by the Gallery addition.)

The drawing for Adam’s original ceiling for the Portico Drawing Room is preserved in the Soane Museum, Lincoln’s Inn Fields, and shows an intricate scheme in subtle shades of green. Too much a Neo-Classical contrast
for the Gallery to which it leads, all the grisaille panels and medallions were painted out, with the sculptural elements being gilded. The resulting white and gold colour scheme is evocative of the stereotypical French approach, and so provides a comfortable ante-room to the Gallery. Wyatt removed the screen from the apsidal end of the Piccadilly Drawing-Room, but otherwise respected Adam’s decorations there as well. The room’s original colour scheme is unknown, although it could be discovered under the present white and gold overlay Wyatt provided to correspond with the Portico Room. (Adam himself was not averse to the French nuance - evident at Syon.)
The Waterloo Gallery is the focus of all these spaces. Disregarding the advice of his friend, Mrs. Arbuthnot and Wyatt himself, the duke chose a lemon figured satin damask as background to his paintings. Although the second duke changed the wall covering to red damask (thought to be a better background for the pictures) it does not provide the same architectural unity seen in Joseph Nash's, perhaps overly golden watercolour of 1852.
The Gallery’s ceiling is unique to English decoration - in fact unique to any established decorative concept. It is supported by a garlanded frieze and nearly vertical cove, which as seen in Chesterfield House, are perhaps too close in dimension and character to avoid a visual unity. The problem of coordinating the addition to a building whose existing fabric would strongly affect its dimensions, and the gallery requirement, which would specify top lighting to be as close to the paintings as possible, are probably the two factors determining this aspect of the design. Regardless, one might have hoped for a denser cove decoration relating more to the ceiling than to the frieze. Be that as it may, there are decorative elements employed here with such originality as to warrant comment. Cupola aside, the ceiling itself is flat. Wyatt has avoided the garret top lighting seen at Londonderry House with opaque glass supported by grilles (Above this would be placed a pitched, greenhouse-style skylight, as was done by the late nineteenth-early twentieth-century architects Mewès and Davis at Luton Hoo - figure 212.)

The ceiling contains essentially three decorative motifs. Two styles of cartouches,
that appear almost like picture frames, and a diaperwork motif, very similar to the Italian Renaissance design published by Chambers in Treatise. The exact repetition and fine detailing of all these elements betrays their material as being papier-mâché and/or composition, which in expert hands, can imitate fine wood carving. Practically, there is no other justification for such exactitude, because at this great height (approx. 40 feet), the naked eye cannot appreciate it. Here, for his third major London project, Wyatt again employed George Jackson and Sons, certainly by now the finest craftsmen ever to work with this material. The famous Bernasconi family\textsuperscript{a} of decorative plasterers also participated in the Gallery’s decoration.\textsuperscript{182} The cove contains

\textsuperscript{a} The best references to the Bernasconi family are by Geoffrey Beard. He suggests they are probably descendants of stuccoists of the same name from Riva St. Vitale, Italy. From Beard and other sources: the Bernasconi family in England comprises essentially three generations. Bernato (continued)
the much discussed Roman scroll motif, which because of its massiveness, might have been done in situ. The Bernasconis are probably also responsible for the bound-reed borders to be seen here and in figures 213 and 215. This repetitive detail is most likely executed in moulded plaster, the (continued) fl.1770-1820) worked in many country houses, and is referred to by C.R. Cockerell in his 1835 lament to the Parliamentary Committee on Arts and manufactures, as to the lack of qualified craftsmen in England. Barnato’s son Francesco (Francis) is known to have worked at Claydon Park, Buckinghamshire c.1770-80, and also worked for James Wyatt at Westminster Abbey (1803), York Minster (1803-5) and Castle Coole, Fermanagh (Joseph Rose is credited with the plasterwork Castle Coole. Still Francesco’s work must have been extensive, as Wyatt died owing him £2,000.) Both Francesco and probably his son (also Francis) worked under James Wyatt at Carlton House (Gothic Dining-Room, Conservatory restoration, etc. (c.1809-1814). The Francis Bernasconi ("Fras. & Son, Plasterers to the King, 20 Alfred Place, Bedford Sq.") who worked for Benjamin Wyatt at Apsley and Stafford house, Jeffry Wyattville at Windsor, and possibly the earl de Grey at Wreath Park, Bedfordshire, is probably Francesco’s son (although both could have been involved as the father (1762-1841), aged 65-6 could still have been active. Comparing the information given by Beard in three of his books on Georgian craftsmen and stuccowork, there is some confusion as to which Francis is which, and whose father is whom (in Craftsmen in England, Beard injects one Bartholomew (d.1786) as being Francesco’s father. In Georgian Craftsmen Francesco’s father is Bernato (d.1820?). Benjamin Wyatt’s first association with the Bernasconi family seems to have been after his father’s death (1813) when he assumed his surveyorship of Westminster Abbey. His projects there included the restoration of the Henry the Seventh Chapel, the Great Circular Window of the South transept and also the altar screen. Beard, G., Stucco and Decorative Plasterwork in Europe, pp.186-7’ Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England.246; Georgian Craftsmen, pp.162-3; British Parliamentary Papers, vol.V, p.1431; Arch et al, Carlton House, pp.215, 222, 224; Colvin, H.M., Biographical Dictionary, pp.313, 315; Robsons London Commercial Directory 1821, PRO., Carlton House Work/5/103, Linstrum, D., Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the RIBA, The Wyatt Family, p.14. Staffordshire Record Office, D593/N/6/2, D593/E/7/19; Houfe, S., "Wrest Park, Bedfordshire - II, Country Life, vol.CXLVIII, July 2, 1970, p.20; PRO, "Carlton House" Work/5/98 & 103; Stafford Record Office “Document of Common Plead" D593/E/7/19.
segments of which were joined by the same technique used in carved wood repetitive detailing.

Garlands as illustrated above, are not unusual as frieze embellishments, but they are certainly unique as executed here. Like the ceiling details, these elements are rendered with a precision that could not possibly be appreciated with the naked eye. Not formed identically, but with identical components, the garlands illustrate a decorative technique normally found in picture (or mirror) frames and elaborate, decorative furniture, such as stands and console tables. In the Gallery detail, the composition (or papier-mâché) flowers and fruits are arranged on a wire reinforcement hung from gilded metal bows and buttons.
The garlands are arranged between paired lion-headed consoles with paw feet, and in each corner of the ceiling are octagonal panels featuring rosettes and the "George" badge of the Order of the Garter. The duke's crest is displayed in the spandrel panels at the base of the cupola, and his coat of arms appears in typical French arrangement in the corners and, flanked by the cove's giant Roman scrolls, mid-way along the room's length. The Saint George appears to have been applied directly over the panel decorations, and the corner coat's of arms are free-standing from the cove. All of these elements are exactly repetitive and highly sculptural, suggesting they too are executed in papier-mâché.

John Summerson speculates, "Did Wyatt really turn his hand to the mastery of a forgotten (and exceedingly difficult) technique of decoration; or was, perhaps, some French designer found to bring his skill across the Channel and remain the nameless author?" With the possible exception of the Banqueting Hall, Wyatt's Waterloo Gallery is without doubt decorated with far more sophistication than anything to be found at Londonderry House. Mrs. Arbuthnot recorded in her Journal that it was she who assisted Wyatt; and her exclusion of another source would seem to turn Summerson's comment against its meaning, into quite an accolade. Arbuthnot, whilst appearing to be somewhat of a judge in architectural matters, could hardly have made a significant design contribution other than to advise on the acceptability of certain details. As implied in Summerson's remarks, it is the execution of the details which is the real focus of most favourable observations. If artistic credit cannot be given entirely to Wyatt, it certainly can be given to his collaboration with Jackson and Son (refer pages 148-166) and the Bernasconi family. These craftsmen would subsequently be employed by him again at Stafford House.

Whilst Arbuthnot would suggest she had something to do with nearly every aspect of the Gallery's decoration, it

* John Robinson refers to The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot (Publ.1950) pp.355-6, relates that "Mrs Arbuthnot, who was largely responsible for the extravagance of the scheme, joined the Duke in self-righteous indignation [at the ultimate cost of the works]" Denys Sutton records (continued)
would seem that her efforts were mainly concerned with the window frames and shutters, the dado detail, and the two lavishly ornamented entrance doors. The window and door frames are stylistically an amalgam of the three Louis and Chinese aesthetic, which is more in the character of George IV's Marine Pavilion, than traditional French design. As seen in figure 225 a great amount of the embellishments are detached from the frames, with the wall fabric continuing behind. This is the traditional approach by which fillets mask the pinning of stretched wall fabric, as seen in the Gallery's detail, figure 226. Like the fillet, the door frame detailing is executed in composition, mounted on thin flat wood profiles. A decorator's standard detail, fillets in papier-mâché and composition-on-wood exist in England from early Georgian times. Chippendale shows them in his plates CXCIV and CXCV, and examples can be seen in the Red Velvet Drawing Room at Saltram, Plymouth (figure 228), the galleries at Woburn and Corsham, and at Osterley, Kedleston, and numerous other country houses.185 It is not the use of these methods and materials in Wyatt's work and in that of many architects before and since that is of significance, but the profuseness in which one observes it here. In a letter written to the second duke of Sutherland, Wyatt outlines his design approach.

I beg to explain to your Grace that there are three very distinct modes in which this rich style of French Decorations, described in these Drawings, can be accomplished: - One is by the purchase of original Boiserie in France, or in England, having been imported from France, and by altering and adding to the same, so as to adjust it to its new situation; - another is - (continued) that she stepped in to work with Wyatt in 1828, because the duke was too busy to supervise the work himself. He quotes in reference to the doors and windows: "I thought Mr. Wyatt had proposed in a shape and design that was frightful. I made the drawings for the skirting board and altered the ceiling, etc." Denys Sutton, ed., "Apsley House...", p.14; Robinson, J.M., The Wyatts..., p.105.
to carve all the enrichments in wood, in this country; - and the third, to forme all the straight mouldings, as ordinary joiner's work, in wood, and to attach to them the enrichments, cast in what is called "Paste Compositions".

The great, and, in most cases, the insurmountable objection to the first mode is the enormous expense of it; for such specimens of the French Boiserie, as would be fit for your Grace's house, now that the French know that there is a Market for such things in England, are only to be purchased at an immoderate price, whilst the labour attendant [in] afterwards adapting them to Rooms in this country entails a further prodigiously heavy charge. The Duke of Rutland could, I think, confirm to your Grace my statement upon this subject; for I believe that His Grace paid not less than from 10 to 15 thousand pounds for fitting up, in this way, with old French Boiserie, one Drawing Room, in Belvoir Castle, the size of which is not more than 40 feet long & 24 or 25 feet wide.

The objection to the second made is very similar to that of the first; with this addition that there are so few expert Carvers in wood in this country, that a large work of this nature, to be executed in wood would be both slow in its progress, and very uncertain as to the time of it's [sic] completion.

With respect to the third mode - namely the composition, it is not only free from the objections of the other two, but it has, in my opinion, a most decided advantage, in being much tougher, and less liable to injury from the operations of sweeping and cleaning, than carved wood ornaments of this description.

There has now been so much of this work in composition done, that I can safely answer for it as regards comparative cheapness; - Promptness of time required for its execution, and superior strength & durability, without any difference whatever in its appearance, when gilt. I could, at any time, if your Grace felt disposed to look at them, show to your ...[not legible] of this sort of decoration, in the Gallery at Apsley House, which would, at once prove, that the composition can be worked just as ...[not legible], and to look as delicate as any carving in wood; and for a quantity which was estimated at nearly £2,000, as carved in England, in
wood, for the gallery above referred to, the actual cost in composition was not above £400! - making a difference of expense, between the one & the other, of almost £1600; whilst it would be difficult to guess what might have been the exceeding, above £2,000 had original French Boiserie been adopted for the same purpose. 186

Wyatt’s comparison of Composition to carved wood at one fifth the cost, is consistent with two bills by Chippendale. At Harewood, Chippendale provided one room with a carved and gilt fillet at a cost of £5/- a yard. In 1767, he supplied a painted fillet in papier-mâché for 6d a yard, that would have come to 9d or £1/- had it been gilded. 187 It is the relative cheapness of papier-mâché and composition (and moulded plaster) ornamentation that contributed to the popularity of the Louis Quatorze Style and Wyatt’s successful career, probably more than any other single factor. Without this essential economy, few would or could have stood the expense. Described by Charles Greville as a “Leviathan of wealth”, the second marquess of Stafford could certainly have afforded French carvers to decorate his London palace; assuming that at this juncture, carvers of any nationality were of a calibre to do the work. None existed in England. For a generation the techniques for carving traditional boiseries had been hardly a demand craft in post-Revolutionary France, where the Royal Academies of Architecture, Sculpture and Painting had been abolished. 188 Contemporary workmanship of palace quality would have been indeed a rarity anywhere. The Restoration style in France under Louis XVIII (1814-24) and Charles X (comte d’Artois of Bagalèlle fame - 1824-30) was largely a continuation of the style Empire. Louis-Philippe (son of Philippe Égalité) reigned briefly between 1830-48; and gave his name to what was largely a continuation of the Restoration style, but recalled with a bourgeois, gaudy heaviness, suggestions of Louis XIV and XV styles, and forcasted the overblown Second Empire style of Napoleon III. 189 In short, the old craftsmen were gone; and the new followed, if it can be so called during this period, the

* In his ...Journal of the Reigns of George IV and William IV, Greville writes of the death of the [now] duke of Sutherland in his July 25th-26th, 1833 entry: “The Duke of Sutherland is dead, a leviathan of wealth. I believe he is the richest individual who ever died, and I should like to know what his property amounts to...” George Granville Leveson-Gower possessed the greater part of Sutherlandshire through his wife, countess of Sutherland, inherited the Bridgewater estates from his great-uncle, the last duke of Bridgewater, which included collieries and a vast network of roads and canals. From his father, he inherited the estates of Stittenham (Yorkshire), the original barony of his family, Trentham (Staffordshire), Wolverhampton and Lilleshall (Shropshire). Reeve, H.,ed., The Greville Memoirs, Vol.II, p.186; Wilson, P.W., ed., The Greville Diary, vol.II, p.171; The Concise Dictionary of National Biography, vol.III, Oxford University Press (Oxford-1992) p.1778.
enduring French avant-garde.* If anyone of the day could be cited as an expert practitioner in the historical French vernacular, capable of the toute ensemble,190 it was indeed Benjamin Dean Wyatt. His magnificent work for the first two dukes of Sutherland should convince the reader, as it did most certainly Wyatt's contemporaries. Of the three alternatives Wyatt outlined to the first duke (marquis of Stafford), it can be readily seen that economically or otherwise, the only possible decorative approach to a project the magnitude of Stafford House, was the third.

Some technical aspects

Many, if not most of the great English decoration firms flourishing in the nineteenth century - and much of the twentieth - began as did the great industrial concerns, during the reign of George III. The wealth following the French Wars promoted a flurry of building activity, which itself gave rise to an entirely new class of decorator and house furnisher. They grew in both size and proliferation, on a scale unprecedented for its time, and unknown today. Much of the magnificence evidencing the wealth of empire, would not have occurred without them and the technical ingenuity they brought to traditional crafts, and to those of entirely new invention. The list of building-oriented patented materials and procedures - dutifully described in The Builder from 1842 - eventually numbered in the thousands. The passing of "The Rule of Taste"191 and the intimacy of hands-on craftsmanship, so fervently mourned by traditionalists, was replaced by a technical excellence that reproduced all the aspects of craft - with a speed that would have, by conventional means, taken thousands to accomplish, decades longer to complete - and at a far greater expense. Factory-made details could be shipped piecemeal anywhere, with an assurance of quality that largely did not exist in areas outside London. Just as the serif necessarily results from the shape and stroke of a carver's chisel, interior decoration was responding to the tools of modern production methods and became in a very real sense the child of a new technology. As architects, like Benjamin Wyatt, began to conceptualize their designs accordingly, decorators became an essential


b Thomas Hopper's evidence supporting Wyatt in Wyatt vs. the Duke of Sutherland, 23 December, 1841, contained this remark: "I have seen three works, The Crockfords, [sic] Club House, the Duke of York's and the Marquis of Tavistock's and I have seen the most brilliant house of the day, the Duke of Sutherland's and judging from those I should say they place Mr. Wyatt's talents not upon an equality with any other but a step above any man I know at the present day." Stafford Record Office, D.593/E/7/19, no.9, p.3.

c The 2nd marquess of Stafford was created 1st duke of Sutherland in 1833, the year in which he died, aged 75.
part of the design process; to the extent that by mid-nineteenth century, most architects had all but relinquished their role as interior designers to an industry - which in many instances was more knowledgeable about historical styles than they were (Exhibit I). Such was the case, that craftsmen and manufacturers alike often published their technical literature and catalogues with a reasonably scholastic retrospective, and in the case of George Jackson and Sons, provided their workers with a detailed chronology of decorative styles, their leading protagonists and exemplary works dating from William the Conqueror (Exhibit II).

Any review of nineteenth- and twentieth-century English interior decoration, is incomplete without acknowledging the contributions of Jackson & Sons. (Certainly no discussion of French-inspired interiors in England can avoid their mention.) Their work, in every imaginable style of the Late Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian periods, was evident in virtually every building type of architectural merit (including some of the great trans-Atlantic liners) (Exhibit III) with a profusion straining belief that, given even the technology of the day, any one firm could have produced it all - and could have produced it with such excellence. In spite of increasing competition from other decorators, Jacksons stood in a class by themselves, and continuing today, retains the product standards by which others involved in historic conservation and reproduction must ultimately be compared.

* This was true of even small firms, whose work may be in evidence in countless instances, but are accorded no historical commentary. One such was Battiscomb and Harris of Great Marylebone Street, Portland Place (by 1915, 47 Cavendish Street), who would not be remembered except for a scavenger's quick eye. What remained of their records was discovered in the late 1980s in a Pimlico builder's skip, and subsequently sold by Sotheby's to the Westminster Library, 27 April 1989. The firm had been established in 1847 and flourished for nearly 100 years until finally closing its doors in 1925. What can be gleaned from the concise company history at the PRO, and their highly detailed renderings of mouldings, cornices, columns and capitals, etc. at Westminster, shows commissions for Harrods, the art dealer and patron, Baron Joseph Duveen (see pgs. 103a,335, 400a,420a,427a), and subcontracted work for some of the great architects and decorators of the day, including Mewès & Davis (at Luton Hoo, see pgs. 469+), Detmar Blow and Fernand Billery (at 34 Queen Anne's Gate, London, see pg.504, figs.1198-9) and Waring & Gillow (see pgs.111,407b,451). Battiscomb & Harris archives, Westminster Library (Victoria), PRO B.T. 31, Company No. 142126, The Concise Dictionary of National Biography, Vol.1, pg.870; Kelley's PO Directory 1886, "Classified List of the Furniture, Upholstery and Allied Trades", p.180.


c Historically, the most important ships Jacksons decorated were Brunel's "Great Western" (1838) and "Great Britain" (1845), the latter being the largest and fastest ship afloat at the time, and the first to be partly powered by screw-propeller. These vessels were also the first steamships to make regular trans-Atlantic voyages from England to New York. Jacksons decorated the Liverpool headquarters of the Cunard Line under the architects Mewès & Davis, as well as many of Cunard's liners. These (continued)
The original George Jackson was a carver whose good fortune it was to have been associated with Robert Adam during his heyday. Adam's delicate, low-relief "Snippets of embroidery" - the panels, festoons, griffins, etc. - were often repeated several times within a single decorative scheme, embellishing not only walls and ceilings, but also doors and architraves, chimney-pieces and furniture. These decorations were often produced by carving or in-situ plastering, but in either case, the procedure was time consuming and expensive. The centuries-old technique of cast plaster was limited largely to walls and ceilings, and required the various architectural elements to be of considerable sectional thickness for strength.

Plaster decorations on chimney-pieces and movable furnishings were simply too fragile. Moulded composition (specifically "paste-compo") however, could achieve a very fine, "carved" edge, and was durable even when thinly cast - making it an ideal substance for decorative elements in all applications. Further, it could be painted, bronzed or gilded to appear


a Some writers fix the date of the Adam / Jackson association as c.1765. DeVoe, p.30; Toller, J., Papier-Mâché in Great Britain and America (1780-1870), Ball & Sons (London-1962)p.16; although this seems hardly likely as Jackson (1756-1830) would have been only nine years old. Jackson Chronology, courtesy of George Jackson & Sons, Mr. Michael Hooper. A cast-iron plaque from the Hammersmith works, displays Jackson's profile, and gives his dates as 1766 - 1840 (which would synchronize with PO directory information). This would make the 1765 Adam connection even more unlikely. Thanks to Jackson's Mr. T. Howell.
integral to any surface upon which it might be fixed.

Although Adam is often credited with introducing composition for architectural ornaments to English manufacture, it is more the case of his popularising its use. Sir Lawrence Weaver, in his 1928 monograph of George Jackson & Sons, recalled that John Stalker had published a recipe for “compo” in 1688, and five years later, messrs. Marshall Smith and Thomas Puckle patented a composition formulated to run liquid into moulds, which they named ‘artificial wood’. But from most accounts it would appear that what was advertised in 1776 as “Adams’s [sic] New Invented Patent Stucco” was innovative enough as a material to assure the brothers a practical monopoly on the market. As one might expect, other decorators eventually formulated their own composition recipes. Although all the various concoctions of animal glue, resin, linseed oil and whiting, with varying additives, were proprietary secrets then as they are today, William Millar had no reservations in publishing a number of them in his late nineteenth-century bible on decorative technique, Plastering Plain and Decorative. What he described as an “old recipe mostly used in London Shops”, is reproduced here.

London Composition.-- The following quantities will make a 16 lb. batch. ... Dissolve 16 lbs. of town glue and 5 pints of water in one pot, and dissolve 9 lbs. of ground resin and 3½ pints of linseed oil in another pot.

* Geoffrey Beard writes that about forty cements and mastics were patented in the period 1760-1840; and of these Dennis McCarthy’s composition or cement, which he called “Pietra Cotta” (Patent 841, 6 March 1766), and Isaac Narbill’s “Egyptian Mastic” (Patent 11225, 26 May 1779) are some of the earliest. William Millar, in the finest and most complete description of decorative plasters and their production, credits a Swiss Clergyman named “Lia dort” as the original inventor of composition. Lia dort has been confused with “John Liardet of Great Suffolk Street in the Parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, Westminster” (Beard), who was probably no relation, as Liardot lived in or before the time of Louis XIV, when as Millar states, composition was used in France to embellish architectural details as well as mirror and picture frames. In 1776, Adam, then a member of Parliament, secured Liardet’s formula via private patent (patent 1040, 3 April 1773) which was apparently not originally intended for decorations, as it is described as a “cement for building purposes; grease for frictions, for perserving steel and iron and for other uses”. This was the second patent Adam acquired - the first being by one Dr. David Wark, of Haddington in Scotland. Wark’s patent is dated 1765; and although it is not clear exactly when Adam purchased the rights to Wark’s patent, it is possible that the famous firm of Joseph Rose and Co. (who worked extensively for Adam) provided the original embellishments at Apsley House, and that Jackson’s involvement under Benjamin Wyatt, was not the first incidence of composition detailing to be supplied there. Beard, Georgian Craftsmen, pp.72-3, 280 & Stucco and Decorative Plasterwork in Europe, p.175; Woodbridge / Kelley, The Alphabetical Index of Paten tees of Inventions (1617-1852).
When both are dissolved, pour the glue into the resin-pot, and stir well with a stout stick. Sprinkle in sifted whiting until the consistency of thin dough, then turn the mass out on a slab, and knead it well, adding whiting as required.

The batches of composition are, as Millar instructs, kneaded like bread, and then formed into loaves to be stored for future use. The present composition shop at Jacksons, although somewhat smaller in area, (figures 234-237) has changed little from the original nineteenth-century arrangement, at Jacksons' Rathbone

233 - Jackson & Sons “View of a Workshop for Making and Mounting Carton-Pierre and Composition Ornaments on to Wood or Plaster”, historical photograph, NMR.

234 - Jackson & Sons whiting table, Composition Shop. 235- mixing pots, writer's photos.

236 - Jackson & Sons mixing pots, Composition Shop. 237 - loaves of composition, writer's photos.
Place works in London,* and the firm's description of its own manufacture is similar to Millar's account. As many of the moulds (which may be two hundred years old) are still in use, it should come as no surprise that they do not lend themselves to modern production techniques.

The composition "loaves" are selected and divided according to batch requirements and the material is re-heated to restore its original plasticity. Then it is typically

hand-pressed (or mechanically pressured) into the various moulds selected, which have been oiled to facilitate release of the formed design. The moulds themselves, were typically carved from boxwood, which was preferred as it has no commanding grain to interfere with the carver's tools, and is strong enough to produce high quality results over repeated impressions.\(^b\) For standard details in general

\(^a\) G. Jackson & Sons are today a division of Clark & Fenn Ltd., Mitcham, Surrey.

\(^b\) The writer is grateful to Master Carver Dick Reid of York, for the information concerning boxwood. In addition, less popular woods included yew-wood, pear-wood and various close-grained hardwoods were also used. Moulds were also produced from soft blackstone, iron, bronze, copper and even pewter. For less repetitive work, they were often produced in less durable materials such as gesso (gypsum and size), wax, gelatine and sulphur. Visit to York's atelier, York, England, 1990, George Jackson & Sons, Mitcham; Beard, Stucco and Decorative Plaster work in Europe, p.13; Millar, pp.398-402.

---

* For standard details in general

\(^a\) G. Jackson & Sons are today a division of Clark & Fenn Ltd., Mitcham, Surrey.

\(^b\) The writer is grateful to Master Carver Dick Reid of York, for the information concerning boxwood. In addition, less popular woods included yew-wood, pear-wood and various close-grained hardwoods were also used. Moulds were also produced from soft blackstone, iron, bronze, copper and even pewter. For less repetitive work, they were often produced in less durable materials such as gesso (gypsum and size), wax, gelatine and sulphur. Visit to York's atelier, York, England, 1990, George Jackson & Sons, Mitcham; Beard, Stucco and Decorative Plaster work in Europe, p.13; Millar, pp.398-402.
demand (the "bread-and-butter" jobs, such as strips of egg-and-dart), moulds would be devised in metal, or were metal lined, such as the bronze lined examples illustrated (figures 240 and 241). Today, Jacksons’ inventory of moulds numbers in the thousands and covers the myriad of design styles, which, as promoted in their various catalogues (the first being in 1836), largely chronicle the multifaceted taste of the day. Only a fraction of these can be seen in figure 242, but an impression of their number can be gathered from the detail boards illustrated, where even these do not contain the entire collection.

Plainly the moulded work could be of no greater quality than the form from which it was produced; and to this end, one must be convinced of the carving expertise of craftsmen, who produced many of these designs in reverse! Remarkable understates the delicate and often ingenious workmanship apparent in the


242 - Jackson & Sons part of Jacksons’ collection of boxwood, etc. moulds, writer’s photo.

243 - Jackson & Sons part of Jacksons’ collection of small details, © G. Jackson & Sons, brochure c1870, X/7, c.1990.

244 - Jackson & Sons “Studio for Wood Carving” historical photograph, NMR.
two illustrated panels of flowers and laurel. These are persuasive evidence that plates of intricate French detailing promoted in Jacksons' 1836 catalogue, were not exaggerations, but truly represented the firm's capabilities.

* All the elements of figure 248 also demonstrate the technique of straight-moulding embellishment, and figure 247 illustrates two cove or frieze designs similar to that of the Banqueting Hall, Londonderry House, fig.198.
But to return to the composition material itself, clearly Adam’s formula possessed some property setting it apart from the other cements and mastics available. All the decorative mastics hardened to a wood-like state, and most could be chiselled, drilled and nailed like wood. But modern compositions have at least two properties shared with Adam’s composition, which in the late eighteenth century, may have amounted to a significant competitive edge: They can be reheated in the shop or on site, and becoming plastic once again, can be formed to architectural angles and curves. Having animal glue as a major ingredient, if the heating is combined with a limited amount of water, the elements become their own adhesive, and in many instances, require little or no additional fixing. In very fine work, both of these features can be appreciated as advantageous if not essential. The American firm of J. P. Weaver Co. demonstrates their initial pliability in a modern advertisement where three details are draped over a clear glass tube; and Jacksons exhibit both the flexibility and the self-adhesion properties, in the delicate convex detailing of a chaste Neo-Classical chimney-piece - one of their present products in general demand.

I am thankful to Mr. Ron Wood of Jackson and Sons for his demonstration, April, 1990. As a technical note, it should be pointed out that composition, unlike papier-mâché, has no self-binding material. Consequently, it is dependent for its integrity on the material to which it is fixed. Whilst inherently stronger than plaster (generally a crack in plaster will not damage the composition), and stronger than most woods, the (continued)
Traditionally, 1780 is acknowledged as the year George Jackson founded his composition works in Rathbone Place, London; yet for reasons unclear, the firm does not appear in the London Post Office directories until forty years later, when major commissions were about to consolidate a market position which has endured for two hundred years. In 1820, composition ornament was the firm’s only advertised product. Sixteen years later (and five years after their Apsley House work had been completed) Jacksons announced "papier-mâché" in their advertisements and illustrated many decorative samples in their inaugural catalogue of the same year. By "papier-mâché", they meant the “Improved” version of a material which dates from the ancient Egyptians, Persians, Indians and Chinese, and was introduced into Europe probably via the fifteenth-century Venetian trade with the Orient. By the sixteenth century it could be found in many French buildings including the Italian Renaissance-influenced decorations of Pierre Lescot’s wing of the Louvre (1546-78), and de L’Orme’s St. Germain-en-Laye, Château-Neuf (1557+). A superb example of early papier-mâché decoration (c.1529) in England is preserved in Wolsey’s Closet at Hampton Court Palace. Based on a design by Peruzzi, the polychrome and gilt ceiling and frieze feature Renaissance and English Heraldic motifs, below which is repeated Wolsey’s motto, Dominus Michi Adjutor (figure 252). (continued)

.Material is inert and is affected by the movement in woods onto which it may be fixed. If compo is applied across a fixing joint, for instance, and the joint expands - or the wood itself develops a crack - the compo will either partially lift from the foundation material, or crack itself - but never in the same manner as the original or causal crack.

a William Millar wrote that Jackson began in a small shop in Goodge Street where his production was “in the form of balls strung on threads, and...small ornaments, &c.” (Millar credits Jackson himself with the discovery of a composition, the formula for which, he writes, was a closely held secret amongst Italian decorators working in London. This theory flies in the face of popular belief concerning Adam’s patents. However, it might indeed indicate, as Jackson’s current (1990) marketing consultant, Michael Hooper suggests, George Jackson was more a glue expert than carver - indicating that it may have been Jackson who was responsible for creating a hybrid formula out of the Liardet and Wark patents.) Goodge Street orients to Tottenham Court Road, and is only a stone’s throw from Rathbone Place. The Post Office directories list one Thomas Jackson, “Composition Ornament Manufacturer” on Tottenham Court Road as early as 1804; and he remains the only Jackson listed until 1820, when George Jackson’s firm appears similarly described, at 50 Rathbone Place. In 1834, Jacksons expanded to include 49 Rathbone Place, and announced themselves as “George Jackson & Sons, Composition Ornament Manufacturers to His Majesty” (their work appears at Windsor Castle, Buckingham Palace, and the Brighton Pavilion). In the same year Thomas Jackson disappeared forever. Could Thomas be a relative, who was absorbed into the firm at the same time as the “Sons” are added? Kent’s PO Directories for the years 1804 through 1834; Millar, p.397.

b Accounts for similar decorations elsewhere in the palace suggest that Wolsey’s Closet is probably the work of one Robert Skyngke, “moulder of the antyk”. Beard, Stucco and Decorative Plasterwork in Europe, p.42; Information noted from posted information, 20 Jan. 1991, Wolsey’s Cabinet, Hampton Court Palace, London.
Two hundred years later, papier-mâché decorations were no longer a novelty; and because of their relative cheapness combined with equal or superior durability, they were beginning to seriously compete with the work of carvers and plasterers alike. In 1751, Lady Luxborough wrote to William Shenstone:

Moore (who has lately been to London) talks to me of a sort of stucco paper, which I have never heard of; and says Lord Foley had done his chapel in Worcestershire with it (the ceiling at least). By his description the paper is stamped so deep as to project considerably, and is very thick and strong and the ornaments are all detached, and put on separately....and then gilt.

A year later, Shenstone finally responded:

... And now I sit down by five in the morning to answer your queries concerning Papier Mâché. It is bought of Mr. Bromwich, at the Golden-Lion, upon Ludgate-Hill. What you will want, will be an ornament in the middle, and four spandrels for the corners. I have taken down the Pine-Apple from the middle of my ceiling, and sent it to you to see, together with some other ornaments which were never fixed up. They will cost (I mean a middle and four corner ornaments) somewhere about eight shillings. ... As for putting them up, I will send you over a very agreeable neighbour of mine... They should be painted flake white and thin starch; but all this he will manage to your entire satisfaction.

Lady Luxborough referred to the church at Witley (also Whitley) Court, which had been designed in the late 1740s by James Gibbs. The second Lord Foley acquired many of the decorative elements for Witley's church from the 1747 demolition sale of Canons House, Middlesex, whose chapel had been decorated some twenty years before by Bagutti and Artari (see page 64a). Figures 253 and 254 illustrate two of

The duke of Chandos' ill-fated great house also contributed the magnificent marble columns (which Chesterfield referred to as "Canonical") and staircase at Chesterfield House. Until John Harris' Architectural Review article of 1980, it was thought that in addition to the (continued)
Canons' ceiling cameos by Antonio Bellucci (1654-1726) and one of its windows by Joshua Price of York. Although some writers suggest Bagutti's and Artari's ceiling was partially relocated to Witley, this is unlikely, but the church's recent restoration revealed Lady Luxborough's information concerning papier-mâché to be correct.

(continued) staircase treads, which were each of a single block of marble, the Rococo balustrade had also come from Canons, having been altered to include a "C" monogram. From Canons' demolition sale catalogues, Harris correctly interprets the balustrade description as being "...a more geometrically architectonic columned one..."; and credits Chesterfield House's architect, Isaac Ware as being the balustrade designer. It is now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Beard, Architectural Review, March, 1980, pp.131-2; Chancellor, E.B., The Private Palaces of London, p.211; Clinch, G., Mayfair and Belgravia, being an Historical Account of the Parish of St. George, Hanover Square, Truslove & Shirley (London-1892)p.94; Dasent, A History of Grosvenor Square, p.158; Ditchfield, P.H., London's West End, Jonathan Cape (London-1926)p.152.

Beard states "Lord Foley acquired a ceiling stuccoed by Giovanni Bagutti at the Canons sale of 1747 and inserted it in the church". He adds that certain ornaments were "obviously made good...with gilded paper-mâché". John Cornforth, in his Country Life article, refers to Alistair Laing, and writes that the Witley Court church decoration "...was designed by James Gibbs, who seems to have based his design on the original Canons chapel ceiling done by Artari and Bagutti...". (continued)
At Strawberry Hill - Horace Walpole's intimate Gothic fantasy - the house accounts list "stucco paper and Gothic paper" being used as early as 1747,\(^{206}\) and nowhere are they more spectacularly arranged than in the "Holbein Chamber",\(^{207}\) where papier-mâché star and quatrefoil compartments go beyond an aesthetic of "paste-up" embellishments to create an architectural totality.

(continued) The removal and reinstatement of an in-situ ceiling, which Terry Freidman describes as having been executed "...so robustly that some parts required metal armatures." would have dictated an identical architectural envelope (probably impossible to achieve, even if the original had been created in separate panels). Friedman's illustrations of Gibbs's design for Canons' chapel shows a flat ceiling at great variance to Witley's barrel-vaulted canopy (the decorations for which would not suggest unusual reinforcement). He explains the acquisition of Bellucci's three large paintings of the Nativity, Crucifixion and Ascension, were not listed in Canons' sale catalogues, and may have been negotiated with the duke of Chandos' heirs following his death in 1744. In Witley's flanking vaults, Gibbs placed Bellucci's smaller paintings of putti holding emblems of the Passion, which had originally been part of Canons' ceiling design. Friedman's research convinces that although the inclusion of Bellucci's paintings certainly influenced the Witley chapel scheme, Price's windows had to be adapted to larger structural openings - being, as were Chesterfield's columns, a fortuitous afterthought. Friedman, T., James Gibbs, Yale University Press (New Haven & London-1984)pp.53,85; Beard, Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England, p.38; Cornforth, Country Life, Vol.CLXXXVI, No.15, April 9, 1992, p.54; Hind, C., ed., The Rococo in England, A Symposium, Laing, "Foreign Decorators and Plasterers in England", V&A Museum (London-1984)p.43; Croft-Murray, pp.170-1.
The term, "papier-mâché", means literally "chewed paper". Introduced to England from France, the process and product remained French in name; and whilst ingredients for the manufacture of ceramic decorative ornaments seem to have varied somewhat, the many recipes were not unlike Adam's formula for composition, with the major difference being that pulped paper was added as a binder. One particular formula was patented in 1843 by Benedict Albano, an Italian civil engineer working in London. In the following year, Albano's agents argued before the Royal Institute of British Architects, the virtues of a papier-mâché conglomerate - termed "Cannabri Composition" - in which the binder was hemp. (Moderns have found another use for this material.) (see exhibit IV). But any fibrous additive would have given the glutinous mixture an integral structure not to be found in paste-compos; and as a result, many papier-mâché elements, as with the tracery overmantel in Walpole's Holbein Chamber, were able to be assembled without supplemental support.

Due to the pulp additive, the material was inherently stronger than composition, although not necessarily of greater density in its viscous state. Still, in order to assure a complete, fine-edged impression, the designs were most often mechanically pressed into moulds with the assistance of a screw or hydraulic press. For this, a cast metal or metal-lined mould was normally used (although in certain instances Box-wood, sulphur, etc. might suffice); and in

Shirley Spaulding DeVoe relates that a Mr. Twigg, a fruiterer of Covent Garden, gossiped that the elder Mr. Wilton (father of the sculptor Joseph Wilton R.A., see page 9) employed two French women who chewed paper for his London papier-mâché factory. The listener was the wife of sculptor Joseph Nollekens, who replied, "Ridiculous!". DeVoe, pp.3-4; The Art Union, "Visits to British Manufacturies; The Papier-Mâché Work of Mr. C. F. Bielefeld", p.171. Both sources refer to J.T. Smith's biography of Joseph Nollekens (1828).

The long paper fibres were ideal for making the "mâché", but in the 17th century, paper was extremely expensive - especially so in England until the approach of the 18th. Although mashed waste paper might be used as a binder, early English papier-mâché was largely produced with vegetable matter, such as hay, straw, nettles, tree bark, etc. William Millar astutely avoids any mention of the constituents for 18th- and 19th-century papier-mâché ceramic details, other than to say they were composed of paper pulp and resin. The paper was normally unsized cotton or linen rag, but wood pulp (or hemp) could have been substituted as the binder. Various mixtures contained paste and/or animal glue, whiting, fine sand, a drying oil, sugar of lead (waterproofing agent), etc. Toller, p.15; Millar, p.393; DeVoe, pp 25,28; advice from Michael Hooper, Jackson & Sons; Timmins, p.567; Fleming/Honour, p.606; Harris, C.M., p.399; Dizik, p.153; Pegler, p.323.

There seems to have been no hard and fast rules for casting composition, papier-mâché, etc. It would appear that the nature of the design - large or small, simple or complex, low or high relief - would largely determine not only how the mould was made, but by what method (hand- or machine-pressed) the impression was done. As a general rule, however, large pieces were produced in cast moulds with papier-mâché (plain or reinforced), and mechanically pressed; smaller pieces were produced in composition or papier-mâché, pressed either by hand or machine (continued)
this way, the mould-making process differed significantly from the reverse-carved wooden moulds described above, which were themselves the original artwork. In cast-mould design, the artwork, as with a sculptor’s statue, is modelled in relief, with casts, either by primary or secondary process, replacing it. Jackson’s breakaway cast bronze mould for a floral drop (figures 262, 263 and 264) shows the ingenuity required to obtain a delicate design in near-total relief.

By 1847, Jacksons had introduced a third concoction into its repertoire of moulded designs: Carton Pierre (cardboard / stone). This was another French innovation, for William Millar credits a Parisian modeller named Mizière as the inventor. Millar himself, had apprenticed in carton pierre modelling at the Paris atelier of Bénier fils; and gave the following recipes to compare:

(continued) into moulds which had been either cast or carved in reverse. My thanks to Mr. T. Howell, of George Jackson & Sons.
London Carton-Pierre - The following quantities will make a 2-lb. batch: - 1 lb. Scotch glue, ¼ lb. paper, 5 pints of water, and 14 oz. of flour. The paper used for packing oranges is usually employed for the above. It is simply torn to shreds, and mixed and boiled with the other materials. If a small proportion of chloride of zinc is added to the paper pulp, it will render papier-mâché or carton-pierre nearly as tough as leather.

French Carton-Pierre - 2½ lbs. of glue dissolved in 7 pints of water, ¼ lb. of paper reduced to a pulp. The glue is added hot to the hot pulp, and the mass boiled together, adding best French whiting. It is then stiffened with plaster when required for pressing.²¹¹

In spite of possessing nearly double the amount of glue to water, an excessive use of whiting caused the French version to be softer (and therefore less capable of achieving a hard edge) than the work of London-made carton pierre. Although French modellers like Bénier fils, Haber² and Huber frères (see page 283) supplied work for many substantial English commissions during the middle decades of the nineteenth century, they were in a market sense, never a serious threat to English manufacturers.²¹² Indeed, by 1869, Jacksons sported four medals on their letter head - two from the London Exhibitions of 1851 and 1862, and two from the Paris Expositions Universelle of 1855 (Medaille de 1st Classe) and 67.²¹³ Their award-winning exhibit of 1862 appears in figure 266, where several examples of decorative mouldings and two elaborate ceiling roses are displayed. Whereas one might forgive the questionable taste of the chimney-piece as typical of the era’s overblown Second Empire style, it is also a product of the French/English one-upmanship that began in 1851, and produced exhibition pieces of furniture and architectural detail which went well beyond what one might expect to find even in a grand domestic setting. Sculpture and anthropomorphous architectural embellishments were in the main,

² Roughly 100 years after Lord Foley built his church at Witley Court, Haber of Paris is recorded as having contributed substantially to the second first earl of Dudley’s rebuilding of the house on (continued)
(continued) the estate. Now a dismantled shell, it still retains fragments of French decoration. His expenditure, in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a million pounds, obscured all traces of the earlier structure. Dudley, whom Waagen listed as one of England's great art collectors, held a duplicate of the title once that of his predecessor, who had died childless (and insane) in 1833. It was the first first earl's Park Lane residence, that Dudley took over in 1847; and 8 years later - concurrent with Witley Court's renovations - transformed the mansion into a showpiece of French taste. The two most spectacular spaces were Dudley House's Ballroom and the Picture Gallery, both decorated with the carton pietre embellishments of Haber of Paris (and parqueted floors by the Parisian firm of Laurent). The Ballroom, illustrated here, was a gilded Louis XIV-style creation, surmounted, curiously, by a heavily beamed Italian Renaissance-style ceiling. Dudley House was severely damaged by bombing in 1940, with its two magnificent rooms, being the worst casualties. The shells remained, and are today subdivided into offices. Country Life, Aug.7th, 1897, p.126; Waagen, p.57; Chancellor, E.B., The Private Palaces of London, pp.136, 292; Survey of London, Vol XL, pp.277-280.
"the forlorn hope of modern art". The ladies of the overmantel were doubtless produced in the same carton-pierre studio seen in figure 261, where a similar figure appears to cast her blessing upon the scene below. Today, in addition to the details reviewed above, Jacksons warehouses a bewildering display of ceiling roses and decorative plaques and medallions, which might have been produced in either papier-mâché or carton pierre (previous page).

Because their ingredients and applications are somewhat similar, some writers simplify under the first term, their descriptions for papier-mâché, carton pierre and carton pâte* and still others refer to papier-mâché in reference to trays, coach-bodies, etc. The latter material was originally called "paper ware", and also derived from ancient cultures in the Orient and Near East. In England it was largely developed and popularised by Henry Clay of Birmingham, who took out a patent for its production in 1772. An offshoot of Clay's firm was the famous Jennens & Bettridge manufactory (1816-1864), which under Jennens' name, patented the techniques of pressure steaming and coloured glass,

* The third French-derived material known as carton pâte, or pâte coulante. As both terms would indicate, it is a viscous cardboard conglomerate which is poured, rather than pressed into moulds. William Millar describes it as a cheap form of carton pierre, giving its ingredients as equal proportions of plaster and ground whitening, with "as much dissolved glue as will make the whole run freely". He adds that fine paper pulp may be added to the plaster whitening and glue. "When properly made", Millar attests, "it attains considerable hardness". The writer has discovered two instances of Pâte Coulante in French interior work in England which will be discussed. Millar, p.397.
tortoiseshell, mother-of-pearl, ivory, and gem stone inlays, which raised this craft to its highest level. Paper products, such as doors and furniture, did find their way into architectural settings, but the production process of this material known selectively as "fibrous slab" is entirely different from moulded ceramic embellishments; and whilst constructed from layers of paper, there is no mâché. None the less, the trays, etc., garnered the term as common usage, and it is these products which today come first to mind when papier-mâché is mentioned.

Clay's method - the industry standard - was to paste together layers of soft, unsized (blotting) paper in a flat, rectangular (later - formed, and of various configurations) wooden or metal moulds, roughly one quarter of an inch deep. The paste was a mixture of animal glue, flour and boiled water. Each successive layer was trowelled flat to remove the air bubbles and trimmed to fit the mould. The built-up sheet was then drenched with linseed oil to make it waterproof, and then dried at one hundred degrees Fahrenheit. A finished panel was rigid and had all the properties of modern plywood, for which the production approach is not altogether different. After Clay's patent expired, various sophistications, such as those by Jennens were evident in the work of firms who, by 1866, had grown to fifteen in number in Birmingham alone. In addition to finished goods, some firms, such as Small & Son, supplied papier-mâché blanks to the trade, relieving manufacturers from primary procedures to concentrate on various specialties, which ranged from furniture-making to outfitting yachts.

The writer has found no evidence to indicate that George Jackson & Sons were involved with the manufacture of "fibrous slab" papier-mâché per se.

---

\[\text{274 - Jackson & Son organ case, St. Saviour's Church, Southwark, 1849 catalogue.}\]
but it appears in their catalogues as painted wood-grained panelling for the Gothic organ case at St. Saviour’s Church, Southwark (previous page), and also for the enclosure erected in Westminster Abbey for Victoria’s coronation. In the 1840s, Jackson’s were directed by architect Philip Hardwick (1792-1870) in the refurbishment of London’s Ironmongers’ Hall. Illustrations of its Victorian Neo- Caroline/Renaissance-style Banqueting Hall appeared in their catalogue of 1845; and its papier-mâché decorations, in addition to the panelling and chimney-piece, undoubtedly included the sectioned ceiling and cove.

One who did produce his own patented “fibrous slab” happened also to be Jacksons’ greatest competitor for papier-mâché ornaments. A Charles Frederick Bielefeld, whose manufactory was located at 15 Wellington Street, Covent Garden, not only produced an entire village of fibrous slab

a Bielefeld held four patents, two of which concerned the manufacture of papier-mâché articles: No. 11,289, July 14, 1846 (“Making moulds or dies used in the manufacture of articles of papier-mâché, and other matters; moulding articles from certain plastic materials.”) and No. 13, 531, Feb.24, 1851 (Manufacturing sheets of papier-mâché, or other substances in the nature thereof.”), Woodcroft/Kelley.

b In 1840, Bielefeld was Jacksons’ only advertised London competition. Kelley’s POLD lists four papier-mâché manufacturers, the other two being Henry Clay and Jennens & Co., who were not decorators.
for export to Australia, but was responsible for helping to create one of the era's most spectacular spaces: the Reading Room of the British Library / British Museum, London.

Two feet larger in diameter than St. Peter's in Rome, Smirke's gigantic cast iron dome is entirely sheathed with Bielefeld's panels; and the rooms of the adjacent King's Library are embellished with Bielefeld's ceramic papier-mâché decorative elements (following page).

“A Papier-Mâché Village for Australia” appeared in The Illustrated London News, April 6, 1853. The flat-roofed structures were of double-wall construction and included 10 cottages and a nine-room villa, but were not the first to be built of this material. Bielefeld may have been inspired by a papier-mâché church, built c.1793, at Hoop, near Bergen, Norway. The structure survived 37 years before it was demolished. The British Museum’s dome, however, seems to have been a daring first, which was followed on the Continent by Pierre-François-Henri Labrouste’s reading room (right), Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (1858-68), and Polaert’s dome for the Palais de Justice, Brussels (1866-83).
During his thirty-two year career, Bielefeld produced a number of his own catalogues, the two largest of which were published in 1840 & 1850. Both followed identical formats, and were similar in context to Jacksons’ catalogues of 1836, 1849, and 1902, where the various decorations are presented in line-renderings, similar to those illustrated previously and in figure 284.

Bielefeld first advertised his papier-mâché manufactory in 1834. He started in business, however, as a wholesale/retail toyman in a firm which was probably begun by his father. Kent’s POLD for 1800, lists the firm as Bielefeld & Son, 4 Bolsover Street, near Regent’s Park. In 1818 the business moved to St. Martin’s Lane, near Long acre, and was now known as J & C Bielefeld. Presumably the father had died, and his two sons continued until the eldest son’s own son came into the firm in 1831, whereupon the firm was called J. Bielefeld & Son. Although it is possible there was some filial rivalries causing Charles’ departure, it may have been simply his specific interest (toys, especially dolls, were often made of papier-mâché) which induced him to start his own concern. Abstracts of work done at Stafford House show Bielefeld submitted samples of his work in 1828 for the price of £25—. At any rate, by 1833, Bielefeld surfaced in partnership with one Haselden as a composition ornament manufacturer; and a year after that at a new location and partnership (Knapp), advertised as a manufacturer of papier-mâché ornaments. One year later (1835), Bielefeld was on his own, and by 1840, the year his first large catalogue appeared, he was London’s enthusiastic promoter of “Bielefeld’s Improved Papier-Mache” [sic] and was located at 21 Wellington Street, Strand, where he remained until his death in 1866. Apparently Bielefeld left no interested heirs. The year after his death, his firm disappeared from the Post Office directories to reappear five years later, at the same address, as The Papier Mâché Company Ltd. - under the direction of one Charles Henry Parrott. In 1882 its managing director had changed to one Walter F. Clare, who was replaced the next year by Messrs Brunton and Brewster. In 1887, these gentlemen changed the company name to The Papier-Mâché & Plastic Decoration Co. and two years later reversed the titles, putting Plastic Decoration first (by this date, papier-mâché was well on the wane as a decorative substance). By 1905 the firm had closed its doors. Woodcroft / Kelley, Alphabetical Index of Patentees of Inventions; Kent’s POLD, 1800-1829; B.Critchett POLDs, 1830-34; Robson’s POLDs, 1835-40; Kelley’s POLDs, 1865-1905; Stafford PRO, D593/n/6/2.

The writer has chosen this particular plate from Bielefeld’s catalogue of 1840 (following page), as its central medallion illustrates a design, not by Bielefeld’s craftsmen, but by John Flaxman (1755-1826), one of England’s finest Late Neo-Classical sculptors. The artist, in whose honour Thomas Hope dedicated a room in his famous (French Empire-inspired) London house, was well known for his beautiful reliefs. Many of these were commissioned in the late eighteenth century by Josiah Wedgwood for pottery embellishment and chimney-piece medallions. Titled “Mercury Bringing Pandora to Earth”, casts of Bielefeld’s catalogue offering are displayed in (continued)
In addition to his plates, Bielefeld treated the reader to a brief overview of plasterwork in England, and how precast elements came to take precedence over in-situ work. With eloquent salesmanship cloaked in historicism, he explained the attitude taken by traditional artisans, and the corresponding predicament of their clients:

As this work had to be done on the spot, and with much rapidity of execution, in order to prevent the stucco from setting before it had acquired the intended form, the art was somewhat difficult... This circumstance of course tended very much to limit the number of workmen, and their pay became proportionably large.

It was no unnatural consequence that artisans thus circumstanced assumed a consequence that belonged not to their humble rank in life. It is said that they might have been seen coming to their work girt with

283 - Thomas Hope, “The Flaxman Room”, Duchess Street, London (c.1804), Hope, Plt.VII.

(continued) T.L. Donaldson’s newly restored Flaxman Gallery, University College, London,59 and, as it happens, in George Jackson & Sons’ collection (figure 269). As the modelling is not a precise duplicate, most likely Bielefeld’s is a copy, which Jackson’s acquired when Bielefeld’s successors closed their doors in the first decade of the twentieth century. This would not be an unusual circumstance, as with the demise of one manufactury, successful operations would acquire their moulds, either to increase their own offerings or to prevent others from doing so. Hope, T., Household Furniture and Interior Decoration (originally publ. 1807) Dover (London-1971)pp.32-4, plt.VII; Country Life, Vol.CLXXXV, No.47, Nov.21, 1991, “In the Right Setting”, by Michael Hall, pp.98-99; Beard, Craftsmen and Interior Decoration, p.96, Lecky, W., p.163; Jourdain, p.71; Edis, R.W., Decoration and Furniture of Town Houses, Kegan Paul & Co. (London-1881)p.216; Sotheby’s price schedule for antique moulds, courtesy of M. Hooper (Jackson & Sons), 8/1/90.

284 - C. F. Bielefeld five plaques including “Mercury bringing Pandora to Earth”, 1840 catalogue.
swords, and having their wrists adorned with lace ruffles. Ultimately the workers in stucco, laying aside all restraint, combined together to extort from their employers a most inordinate rate of wages. It is sufficient to state that, as might have been anticipated, the total ruin of their art was the final result of these delusive efforts to promote their individual interests.

He ended with instructions "to the Cabinet Maker and Upholsterer" and "to the Builder and House Decorator", itemizing the attributes and comparative advantages of papier-mâché over conventional materials with such assurance, that exaggerations comparing, for instance, its sharpness, lightness and durability with Grinling Gibbons' carvings, are persuasive (if one is not familiar with Gibbons' carvings). Bielefeld's salvos aside, the Industrial Age had clearly arrived to the world of architecture and interior decoration; and with his final great London mansion, Benjamin Dean Wyatt proved to be its foremost champion.

York House - now Stafford House - Second Phase

285 - B. D. Wyatt York House, Principal Floor Plan (1825), Colvin, "The Architects of Stafford House", fig.4(a), pg.21. 286 - Wyatt Stafford House, as built-Ground and Principal Floor Plans, Charlton, back cover.

Wyatt's plans and sections for York House remained largely unaltered for the marquess of Stafford, who may have been attracted not only by its prime city site, but also its French character both inside and out. The marquess had served George III as Ambassador to the French court (1790-2) during the last days of Louis XVI, and had been on familiar terms with the
French royal family. At the time of Stafford’s possession, the building of York House had been a year and a half in progress with the basement domestic offices, the ground floor suite of rooms, and the Staircase Hall all in an advanced state of completion. The ground floor rooms included a State Dining Room (figure 290), a private dining room (figure 288), two ante-rooms and a drawing-room in the south-west corner (figure 289). Whilst displaying some French detailing, the Dining Room largely reflects the understated Regency style seen in Wyatt’s drawing-rooms at Apsley. Its paired console frieze appears again in the corner Drawing-Room to

Stafford’s credentials to Louis XVI became null when the monarchy was abolished Sept. 21, 1792. Stafford’s son, who was only a year older than the dauphin, became his playmate when the royal family was removed from Versailles to the Tuileries. Lecky, p.28; Encyclopædia Britannica, 1942, vol.14, p.420; Gower, Reminiscences, pp.93-4.

About thirty rooms in the attic storey were also nearly finished, indicating that the structure was entirely complete and roofed. Stafford Record Office D593 E/7/19 no.12, pg.20; Pearce, London Mansions, p.196

This room was once called the “Gold Room”. It displayed the famous Elizabethan gold hoard from Cheapside, when Stafford House functioned as the London Museum. On November 14, 1913, First Viscount Lord Leverhulme acquired the remainder of the lease, renamed the mansion “Lancaster House” after the Duchy of Lancaster (his native country) and turned the property over to the nation. The lease expired July 5, 1941. Charlton, J., Lancaster House, St. James’s, pamphlet, Her Majesty’s Stationery Office (London-1981 ed.)p.11; Grant, I., Music Programme notes, Queen Elizabeth II Centre, The Victorian Society (London-1985) no pg. nos.
compliment its refined, intimate Louis XVI interior (in spite of its rococo chimney-piece and panel flourishes). Of note also are the State Dining Room’s chimney pieces, possibly by Sir Richard Westmacott, which display rococo profiles of considerably more voluptuosity than historical models. Figure 290 does not indicate the elegance of this largely white and gold interior with its walls hung in crimson damask. The damask frames feature similar corner details (figure 292) to those seen in the Blue Drawing-Room, Carlton House, and St. James’s Palace (figures 147 & 106).

As with his Londonderry House design, the Entrance and Vestibule are modestly decorated and proportioned to heighten the dramatic impact of the enormous, lantern-lit Staircase Hall. Wyatt’s section (figure 293) reveals that the Hall he had quickly delineated in 1825 for the duke of York, Trench, the duchess of Rutland - and ultimately George IV - was executed with very little alteration to the original design. The great fluted Corinthian columns and balustrade, copied from the

The House records list (1835) Westmacott as having submitted two accounts: one for £730, and another for £500. The duchess’s Boudoir on the principal floor features the most ornate (see fig. 317), and this is certainly that for which the greater sum was charged. The State Dining Room’s chimney-pieces are the only others at Stafford House that would have required the talents of an exceptional sculptor - leading the writer to conclude that those in the State Dining-Room were charged at £250 each. Stafford Record Office, D593/N/6/2.


293 - Wyatt York House, Longitudinal Section (1825) Colvin “Architects...” fig. 4(b), pg 21.
Chapel at Versailles, are executed here in scagliola (see also figure 135). Unlike Londonderry House, there is no structural ambiguity beneath the coved ceiling which, like Londonderry House, features a lantern supported by atlantes. Here they are executed in black scagliola, echoing the opposing pairs which support the Hall's imperial staircase. From the section it is clear that in addition to the first floor balcony, Wyatt had originally intended to provide the Versailles balustrade detail to the staircase itself. This was changed for reasons unknown, to one much lighter in fact and effect. It was executed in cast iron by Bramah & Son - the ironfounders who provided the Rococo flourishes to the staircase at Apsley, (figure 165) and who also supplied the bullet-proof shutters to the Waterloo Gallery windows, after mobs shattered many panes of plate glass during the Reform Bill riots of 1831. Similar patterns for Bramah's balustrade panels can be seen in the
publications of Blondel, Briceux, Cuvilliés and others - but do not warrant scrutiny as to the source of Wyatt’s design, as at this stage in his career, he had certainly demonstrated tremendous originality in composition. The Staircase’s great coved ceiling is another case in point. Although their functions and scales differ, there seems a design sympathy between the decorations of the ceiling here, and the cove of the antechamber to le Chambre du Roi, Versailles - known as the Salon de l’Oeil-de-Boeuf (1701 - figure 300). Substituting a skeletal coffering for the Antechamber’s latticework, Wyatt emphasizes the monumentality of his Staircase, but with a comparable delicacy of detail. The ambience is more one of a latticework motif than the conventional coffering seen at Londonderry House and in the ceiling of the lantern where it appears more as appliqué than embellished structure. Such considerations allow the entire canopy to soar, rather then impose the ponderous weight of a Louis XIV Baroque interior. The Staircase coves feature mid-point circular sections, which appropriately contain similarly configured draped badges of the Garter. As with the Versailles bull’s eye, the circle is insinuated as extending beyond the confines of the architectural frame, which at Stafford House is defined by borders with scrolled hook-bill

297 - J. Bramah & Sons under Wyatt Stafford House, Staircase Hall, ballustrade detail, writer’s photo. 298 - J.B. Blondel “Grand Panneau de Ferrurerie...”, De La Distribution des Maisons..., tome II (1737), dtl. plt.53. 299 - C. E. Briseux “Desseins de Balcons, L’Art de Bâtir des Maisons...(1761), dtl. plt.38.

300 - Hardouin-Mansart / de Cotte Versailles, Salon de l’Oeil-de-boeuf (1701) de Montclos, pg.255.

corners and spiralling floral garlands. These are signature Régence panel details which can also be seen framing the overdoor decorations of the Salon de l’Oeil de Boeuf. The Staircase Hall at Stafford House may feature borrowings of historical French decorative elements, but they were orchestrated within arrangements unusual to their traditional stance. The resulting architectural statement is one of such originality and appropriateness to its setting and artistic purpose, that it was considered splendid beyond comparison in its own day, and surely must be valued as one of the great interiors of the age." It was here, a young Queen Victoria remarked to the duchess of Sutherland, "I have come from my house to your palace".

The marquess of Stafford moved into the completed portions of the ground floor in 1830, and being an old man, decided to leave the largely bare brick rooms on the principal floor to be finished by his son and heir, the future second duke of Sutherland. (The marquess was made a duke, six months before he died in 1833.) The new lord of Stafford House elected to have two architects: Wyatt, for design, and astonishingly enough his old nemesis, Smirke (now Sir Robert), for construction supervision. The second duke of Sutherland’s chief agent, one James Lock (who mistrusted Wyatt) formed the third member of a triumvirate that eventually caused Wyatt, now in his fifties, to nearly die of exhaustion.

Wyatt, his position being compromised by even further meddling by the architect Charles Barry, took his leave in the Spring of 1838, with Smirke, doing likewise shortly after. Barry, who was working at the duke’s seat of Trentham Hall, Staffordshire (1834-40), became the architect of Stafford House by June of that year. He is given credit for the vertical stance of the lanterns in the Great Staircase Hall, and the Great Gallery which replaced Wyatt’s intended (and in the case of the Staircase Hall - already constructed) inclined lights. Barry is also given credit for the placement of the three Veronese copies by Lorenzi at the stair landing, and for the scagliola panelling to the upper Staircase Hall. Although Wyatt’s 1825 section shows boisére-styled panels, these designs (although not their general shapes and distribution) had been discarded in the days of the first duke for the scagliola treatment seen today. In Wyatt vs. Sutherland, the state of the Staircase is described as being far advanced, with the "Corinthian Columns...already worked in the rough Scagliola..."; with nothing remaining for Wyatt to design "...but the plain mouldings of the panels on the Walls on which the rough Scagliola was already far advanced...". Most writers give credit to Charles Barry for the wall treatments of the upper Staircase Hall, and John Cornforth points to a Parker Wyatt & Co. account (March, 1840 to March 1841) for £157.2.3 as evidence. All the architectural scagliola at Stafford House is in the Great Staircase hall, with the cost as of 30 November 1837 being £9,374.3.3. It is difficult for the writer to believe that at the relative pittance of £157, the upper Staircase Hall could have been sheathed. Barry would subsequently work for the 2nd duke at his very French Dunrobin Castle, Golspie (1844-50), his new country estate, Cliveden, Buckinghamshire (1849-50). He would also work for the duke’s younger brother, Lord Francis Egerton, in the celebrated rebuilding of Bridgewater House, London (1841-47). Stafford Record Office D593/E/7/19, no.12, p.21; D593/N/6/2; Charlton, Lancaster House, p.11; Cornforth, English Interiors 1790-1848, p.92; Cook, The English Country House, p.228; Country Life, 13 May 1949, p.1120; Chancellor, The Private Palaces of London, p.191; Colvin, A Biographical Dictionary of English Architects, p.720; Country Life, vol.XXXII, Dec.7, 1912, p.815; Survey of London XXX, p.496.
Over the next five years, largely due to his exclusion from the site works and his clients' incessant waverings, Wyatt produced over five hundred and sixty drawings,²²⁰ (not including sketches), to ensure his designs were properly installed. To accommodate their growing family and staff requirements, the new proprietors required a third floor addition which destroyed the studied Francophile elevations of pediments and balustrades to produce what looked "like a packing case out of which, the nearby Bridgewater House had been taken".²³¹ The duke and particularly the duchess were amateur aesthetes, forever meddling²³² in what, by Wyatt's explanations to them, must have been virtually every detail, no matter how small. His explanatory sketches and letters subsequently became the equivalent of a course in architectural theory and application - a small glimpse of which can be seen in a study, 22 March 1834, for the Great Gallery arched recesses (figure 302). Here Wyatt indicates, by letter designation: "A. facia of archivolt; B. Enrichment standing in a right angle which needs about 4 inches behind the facia A; C. bead on the angle; D. Margin at

301 - B. D. Wyatt with R. Smirke  Stafford House entrance façade, writer's photo.

302 - Wyatt  Stafford House, Great Gallery, centre section, sketch for arched recesses (26 March 1834) Stafford Record Office, D593/p22/1/16, incl. letter 27.
right angles with the face of the wall; and inside the Recess. It is shown here in parallel [sic] perspective, which brings it into ---- (unreadable)". The sketch was accompanied by this explanation:

It has occurred to me that possibly Your Grace may suppose, that, when I stated that the Recess might be formed of not more than 9 inches deep, on the East side of the Gallery, I meant that they would be the same in appearance as those already described in the sections; but that was not what I intended to express: I meant that in depth of 9 inches was the least that I thought would be admissible for the purpose; which would not leave more of the panelled soffit shown in the Sections, than about where the red semicircular line is in the enclosed Drawing;... A & the red line would be about 10 inches; but the whole soffit, as shown in the enclosed sketch, would require at least 16 to 18 inches. The archivolt however, used the Margins D would be sufficient to give to the Recess on the East side, at 9 or 10 inches deep, the effect of corresponding with those on the opposite side. [Such was the minutiæ which occupied the new proprietors.]

The finishing of the Great Staircase Hall and the principal floor apartments are the particulars to which Wyatt directed the bulk of his work, and represent the penultimate statement of the Louis Quatorze style. And it should be noted, that although Wyatt described his designs as being of a "...nature of style of finishing...of the best parts of the Palace of Versailles, and after the date of Louis the 14th" - whilst using Franco-Classical motifs and arrangements, they are entirely of his own invention; and like the balustrade detail illustrated, have few identifiable precedents at Versailles or any other site. William Hopper described Wyatt's skill as an artistry requiring,

...such an exercise of judgement and so much inventive[ness] in the application of it... Every bit of the ornament to be properly applied in order to produce the fullest...effect of the light and shade requires a great deal of study and application of mind..." "It is like painting an elaborate picture." #215

Wyatt's accomplishment was significantly more difficult in producing his interiors than were those of the great French architects and designers. In addition to having no access to the works, he was obliged to instruct and correct his subcontractors, whose manufactures were even more removed from the final product, and whose workmen, "... knew nothing of the Delicacies [sic] of the style", largely had not the competence to execute "these florid enrichments in the degree of perfection" required. The models and moulds of Bernasconi and Jackson were under constant scrutiny, as evidenced by Wyatt's communications and John Jackson's admission to the architect that it was due to his standards that their technical abilities had established a "New Era in their Trade". Gabriel, for instance had the (continued)
The architectural "pictures" are four rooms on the Principal Floor, which are interconnected by ante-rooms of jewel box character. Perhaps the most exquisite of these is the small (about ten by twenty feet) oval "Veronese" room which adjoins the Great Gallery with the Music Room.

The ceiling is a gilded assembly of Classical elements including diaperwork and groteschi decorating a cove which, because of its height, gives the effect of a dome. The flat of the ceiling contains the Veronese painting of Cupid receiving an apple from the three Graces; and it is of course from this work that the room takes its name. The borders and geometries contained Wyatt's favoured bound reeds, coffering and heavy Roman scrolls. The ceiling is not French, but Italian Renaissance in character. Although one might assume Wyatt had designed it in historical sympathy with the Veronese, it will be seen that as with the Waterloo Gallery, Wyatt's ceilings are more Renaissance in design than they are eighteenth-century French. His wall treatments at Stafford House however, largely recall white and gold Régence style boiseries. It should be reiterated, that although historical (continued) great carver Verberckt to carry out his designs at Versailles - certainly under direction, but hardly requiring the tenacious effort Wyatt found necessary to exert. Fleming / Honour, pg.856; Stafford Record Office, D593/E/7/19, no.12, pp.47-50; D593/P/22/1/16, letter 69, 12 Feb. 1836.

Diaper ornament, which also includes trellis- and latticework, is defined by all dictionaries on decorative art, as repeated geometric patterns using a framework that is either left plain or filled by such motifs as lozenges, squares, scales, flowers (or rosettes), leaves, etc. Owen Jones traces diaperwork as far back as the Egyptians, and shows it as a common decorative theme in most cultures up through Italian, English and French Renaissance designs (where he concludes his study). The architectural contexts in which it is found in Wyatt's work - first appearing in his Drury Lane Theatre project of 1812 - are largely derived from Louis XIV & XV style examples, where diapers are typically used as frame infill and cove decoration. His use of Classical diaperwork, such as the Chambers model is noted by case in the text. D. Linstrum, ed., Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the RIBA, p.26; Lewis/Darley, pp.107-8; Pegler, M., The Dictionary of Interior Design, Bonanza Books (New York-1966)p.151; Whiton, S., Elements of Interior Decoration, J.B. Lippincott (New York-1937)p.15; Jones, O., The Grammar of Ornament, pls. IX, X, XIII, LXXVII, LXXXV, etc.

Régence refers to the lighter decorative style (c. 1710-1730) emerging toward the end of Louis XIV's reign and continuing during the actual regency of the duc d'Orléans (1715-23) and into the reign of Louis XV. The Regent, Philippe, duc d'Orléans (Égalité's grandfather, and founder of the fabulous Orléans art collection) patronized the leading designer of the day, Gilles-Marie Opponord (1672-1742). Opponord was a prolific (continued)
models might feature elaborate wall decorations, ceilings of this and the next two periods were, with few exceptions, either sparsely decorated or left plain. In contrast, Wyatt’s Stafford House ceilings were gorgeous Classical congeries - more prototypical of the cross-channel gilded grandiosity to emerge twenty years later under Napoleon III, than eighteenth-century precedents in either England or France.
the spiralling floral motif seen in the coves of the Great Staircase Hall. This detail together with a heavily reeded approach to trumeaux frames, was characteristic of the transitional Régence style, (figures 306-310) - which bridged Mansart's Louis XIV grandeur with the Rococo abstractions of Pineau and Messionier. Wyatt’s

revival of the style at Stafford House indicates discrimination even as it applies to his own unique translation of French decoration. Régence not only compliments the general feel of his Louis XIV-style interiors, but it also anticipates scatterings of the Sutherlands’ Louis XV- and XVI-style furniture, as seen in figure 304.

Triparted panellings of the proportions Wyatt used, are rare in French design. Period boiseries typically feature a large, highly decorated panel, (figure 310) with variations
having an extended frame below, as in Opponord’s salon de compagnie, hôtel d'Évreux (Élysée) (Paris-c.1718 - figure 309). The extension can occur above, as in Aubert’s Cabinet d’angle, Château de Chantilly (1722 - figure 308); or, centrally placed between much smaller frames above and below, as seen juxtaposed in figure 308. Further, Wyatt’s panels are largely devoid of the profuse carvings seen in the models illustrated. Less celebrated certainly, largely unembellished French boiseries of this period were not uncommon in settings where the panels themselves were not intended to be the artistic focus. A requirement for the hanging of paintings, for instance, would provide such a circumstance; and certainly this would have been a consideration for the Great Drawing-Room, given the duke’s renowned art collection. A possible source for Wyatt’s design, may be one published by Briseux in L’Art de Bâtir des Maisons... (1761). Plate 188 represents the first and simplest composition in a series of panelling and trumeaux designs, where the raised section is elaborately contoured, but largely devoid of carving.

The Chambre du dauphin, Versailles, provided the model after which State Dining Room’s chimney-pieces are copied. They feature duplicates of the gilt bronze originals by Caffieri, which were purchased in Paris by the duke. 237

The Drawing-Room’s ceiling surmounts a frieze of garlanded double consoles, and being such a densely arranged extravaganza of gilded elements, gives its warm white background a fleeting...

---

**311 - Boffrand**
Hôtel de Broglie (c.1713)
panelling now in the Carnavalet Museum,
Paris. Montgolfier, pg.75.

**312 - C.-E. Briseux**
Panneaux de Meneuvre, L’Art de Bâtir des maisons...
(1761) plt.188.

**313 - Jacques Caffieri**
Versailles,
Chambre du Dauphin (c.1747)
bronze mounts to chimney-piece,
Van der Kemp, pg.145.
presence at best. This is most certainly Hopper's idea of "an elaborate (architectural) picture": No fewer than seven enriched mouldings separate the various fields of ornament, which include: a cove of vertically arranged palm fronds, alternating at the base with vertical acanthus, and at the top with garlands hung from rosettes. Above the cove, also running the perimeter of the room is a soffit border of spiralling acanthus and above this a pulvinated moulding of bound laurel. The laurel is punctuated in the corners by an elaborate cartouche, as is the next soffit band of heavy Roman scrolls. A simpler laurel band follows as the plane rises again - culminating in another soffit decoration of anthemion motifs. With all this, one still has not arrived at the actual ceiling, which is of octagonal coffering very close in detail, for instance, to a Chambers illustration in Treatise. This detail does not relate to any of the elements below and has essentially no structural integrity when compared to the Dining Room ceiling Benjamin and Matthew had provided at Belvoir. Rather it appears more as a decorative foil - visually sliding over what becomes in effect a highly complex cornice. Similarly, in the Veronese ante-room ceiling (figure 303), Wyatt used coffering in this purely decorative manner.

To the west, The State Dining Room connects via another ante-room with, naturally enough, the West Drawing-Room. Known also as the Green Boudoir for its Genovese velvet hangings, this space was the singularly feminine domain at Stafford House, and overlooking Green Park as well as the Mall, it also has the best views. The Boudoir was the scene of a grand faux pas when a visiting Giuseppe Garibaldi smoked a cigar here.*

* In 1864 a grand reception was given for the great Italian liberator at Stafford House. The Ante-room connecting the two dining rooms on the ground floor was subsequently named "The Garibaldi Room". Cornforth, J., English Interiors 1790--1848, p.92; Dasent, A.I., The Story of Stafford House, p.43; Charlton, p.10.
Social délicatesse was understandably not a strong suit for the great Italian patriot, who could also be excused from having a great appreciation of this room’s unique approach to French décor. The Boudoir’s green and gold scheme brings to mind the gilded green Vernis Martin panels of the Salon Vert, Hôtel Rohan, Paris (c.1740), the noble character of which is translated here with a délicieusement apropos a great hostess. The room’s focal point is Westmacott’s sculpturesque Rococo

316 - Wyatt Stafford House, The Green Boudoir (West Drawing Room), Bedford Lemere #3333, 29 July-1 Aug., 1895, NMR.


chimney-piece - a clever allegorical arrangement of summer and winter heralded by a garlanded swan. As with the State Dining Room’s chimney-pieces, this design is more in the vein of fine art, than functional form embellished, and heralds the ornate extravaganzas which would typify Second Empire and High Victorian designs.
Not unique to Wyatt’s work, but certainly to English (and French) interior decoration are the Boudoir’s 'boiseries'. As observed in the Waterloo Gallery, where the overdoors are superimposed over the wall hangings in the manner of a fillet, the Boudoir’s Régence wall decorations, excepting the dado and pilaster panels, are arranged in their entirety in this manner. There are in fact no boiseries here at all, but simply their suggestion with “floating” frames of floral spirals - augmented with delicate leafy sprays, and others of an elaborate cattail and reed embellishment. A garlanded sub-frieze as it were, “floats” beneath the actual frieze of spiralling acanthus scrolls which is visually supported by the pilaster panels. The panels themselves are embellished with Louis XVI-style ivy wreath chains, probably from the same moulds which produced the pilaster decorations in the first duke’s State Dining Room (figure 288).

The cool, exquisite quality of the decorations is crowned by a celestial painting of Apollo encircled by pagan deities. The work of RA gold medalist, Henry Howard (1769-1847), it has great affinities to Lafosse’s ceiling, salon d’Apollon in both name and character. The spandrel paintings represent four of the signs of the Zodiac241 - all arranged in the time-tested theme of a circle in a square. Being of
oblong dimension, the ceiling required the standard oblong borders (as seen with Adam and Holland, for instance) flanking the square in order to complete the design. These are decorated with Wyatt’s favoured Roman acanthus scrolls, framed with enriched borders of three different designs. They define the rooms curved (or coved) corners and ceiling cove which, at the corners, is asymmetrically flaired. Edward Croft-Murray, in a brief discussion of Howard’s work, gives the installation of the ceiling paintings as c.1841? [sic], three years after Wyatt had withdrawn from the duke’s service. He mentions Robert Smirke as possibly being the architect, but it is clear that Smirke had left the project by 1841 as well - being replaced by Charles Barry. Whether the ceiling was largely in place when Wyatt left is unknown; but in any case, this interior is one of the few that illustrate an instance where the architecture has been modified to accommodate the geometries of the ceiling.

Wyatt had demonstrated an early appreciation of the French predilection for cove-cornered rooms, and the decorative exactitude required in their design. This he had displayed in his Dining Room for the duke of Wellington at Apsley House; and the Boudoir aside, enriched Stafford House with a splendid example of this form - the Music Room. Eight years after her much quoted “Palace” remark, Victoria was entertained by the great Chopin in this, one of Wyatt’s most beautifully

322 - Wyatt Stafford House, Music Room, Pearce, fig. 153, pg. 199.

* May 15th, 1848, the year of Chopin’s death, a concert was given to celebrate the christening of a new Sutherland arrival. Chopin was impressed by “a few gracious words” from the Queen, who subsequently wrote (continued)
proportioned rooms. Appropriately, it is the main attraction to which the Great Staircase ascends - and is very much an extension of its decorative emphasis. As with the Staircase and his Londonderry House Ballroom, Wyatt employed the Corinthian Order in both the fluted columns and the doorcases.

The walls feature dado and frames suggestive of, again, the Régence style - as do the chimney-pieces, which feature French-made embellishments applied to a slightly more Rococo profile than their counterparts in the State Dining Room.* The formality of the design is emphasized with a full entablature surmounted by a diapeded cove - punctuated at mid-points

(continued) in her diary: "There was some pretty music, good Lablache, Mario and Tamburini singing, and some pianists playing." Zamoyski, A., Chopin, Doubleday & Co. (New York-1980)p.292.

* No house accounts or correspondence indicates the provenance of these two chimney-pieces. It is likely, as with the State Drawing-Room chimney-pieces, they were executed in England by The Marble Company, and fitted with Paris-bought gilt Bronze mounts and fenders.
with robust Roman scrolls framing the ducal coat of arms (figure 323, see also figure 224). The ceiling features another circle-in-square motif, and most appropriate to its Italian Renaissance sources, culminates with a coved dome. (Given a significantly increased budget, this is a great sophistication on the Drawing-Room ceiling design Wyatt and his brother Philip provided for their 1827-8 Oriental Club project.\(^a\)) Flanking the square on all sides, one sees bordered diaperwork of a similar detail to that of the Waterloo Gallery ceiling - in geometries, as with the Green Boudoir, that determine the flairs of the corner coves.

In addition to descriptions of the Great Staircase Hall, observers have referred most often to the Great Gallery. Over one hundred and twenty feet in length, it was largest private art gallery in England, and for a time contained the finest pictures of the celebrated Orléans Collection. Beyond this, it falls well below the architectural standard seen in virtually every other major space at Stafford House - a particular most likely overlooked because of the reasons given above, and the fact that a new generation, giddy with industrial wealth, simply did not value the architectural correctness marking the quieter standards of those who had made it. Wyatt’s Londonderry House and Apsley House galleries have a spacial cohesiveness and address to the lighting requirements for displaying pictures which major sections of the Great Gallery all but disregard. The room is punctuated by a lantern-lit central space - flanked, because of third storey space requirements, by lower and narrower extensions - indifferently decorated in comparison. In the lower sections, the sole

\(^a\) Statements of the Payments made on Account of Stafford House from the Year 1828 to July 1837 show the total amount (including furniture, and presumably the Crown lease) was £215,132.7.9. Stafford Record Office D593/N/6/2.
source of light - coming from windows - would have glared the paintings' surfaces. Architecturally, the enormous length of the gallery insinuates either one gigantic room, or as seen by the furniture layout in figure 330, a triparted arrangement of three spatially linked but separate spaces. Screens of columns, for instance as employed by Adam and many Neo-Classical architects, are a standard (and successful) device by which large areas are spatially divided without destroying a sense of the room's greater volume. This approach also allows sections of the room to be separately identified, should an occasion call for a degree of intimacy. A quasi-separation is provided, seemingly as a decorator's
afterthought, by the placement of huge torchères where an architectural solution is required. However luxuriant, the Gallery has ultimately all the comfort of a public institution, due to Wyatt’s (or the duke’s) indecisiveness or inability to solve the spatial problem.

The Chambers detail seen in the Music Room and the Waterloo Gallery is featured as the dominant ceiling motif in the flanking sections. No white fond here with virtually every element being gilded except the borders of the corner panels. The doors display an elaborate Louis XIV motif within a Corinthian architrave - recalling details, such as the Louis XIII segmental pediments appearing at Fontainebleau and the Hôtel de Sully.\(^a\) The door details (figure 334) reveal a sophistication also seen in the Wellington Gallery. Whereas the French would have carved the door panels, including sub-frames, from a composite panel of wood, Wyatt has superimposed a sub-frame upon the door panel and cleverly overlaid the two with composition embellishments - disguising the subterfuge - to appear very much like French technique.

Although the wall decorations of the flanking sections are largely a competent evocation of historical French

332 - Wyatt Stafford House, The Great Gallery, door detail, writer’s photo. 333 - Ambrose Dubois Cabinet de Théagène or Salon Oval, Fontainebleau, Style Henry IV, (before 1601) Strange, p.5

\(^a\) The four doorways featured in the Cabinet de Théagène (fig. 333) were not part of the original decoration by the Fleming, Ambroise Dubois (1543-1614), who also decorated the Galerie de Diane at Fontainebleau. They were added during the reign of Louis XV, but in a style commensurate with the room’s decoration, and coincidentally, also with Pompadour’s new Classicism.

arrangement, it is the central section upon which a great deal of attention was lavished by both architect, client and the public. Figure 335 depicts a scene, however grand, of quiet domesticity - offering no hint of the spatial bleed to the flanking galleries. Here are seen the west wall round-headed arched recesses, which were scrutinized in Wyatt’s detailed explanation mentioned above (figure 302). Wyatt had intended to balance the arches with a similar arrangement on the east wall opposite, but this was unfortunately eliminated (and the balance destroyed) by the duke, presumably to gain additional clear space for pictures.\textsuperscript{343} The central recess features an elaborate French-made*

* Chancellor describes the Gallery as having "...been properly termed 'the most magnificent room in London'; and rightly so, for there is nothing comparable to it; even the splendour of Dorchester House has nothing to equal its immense size, or its bewilderingly superb decorations." Chancellor, The Private Palaces of London, p.356.

---


336 - French Chimney-piece and Clock Stafford House, The Great Gallery, central section, writer’s photo.
chimney-piece surmounted by a clock with supporting bronze figures of Michelangelo’s “Night” and “Day”. With this location in mind, both Chimney-piece and clock were acquired in Paris by the second duke.244 Overhead and filling the remainder of the recess is a trumeau, which reflects the paintings hung on the opposite wall. Today the glass is gone, as are the Murillos 245 for which the flanking recesses were designed. Even without a sense of the original arrangement, one clearly apprehends an incompleteness about the scheme. Otherwise the decorations remain a superb reminder of what was nearly a magnificent central space.

Sometimes described as "Italian",246 (possibly due to the lantern the very Italianate Charles Barry altered after Wyatt’s departure) the Gallery is predominantly Louis XIV in character, and consistent with Wyatt’s approach to the general decorative theme of Stafford House.247

The Italian heritage of seventeenth-century French architecture and decoration is well documented, as are the necessary adaptations developed to suit French temperament and climate. There are many examples of Italian influence at Versailles itself, but it is perhaps instructive to illustrate two examples of early Louis XIV-style interiors to find a more direct inspiration for Wyatt’s Great Gallery decorations. Jean Berain’s (1637-1711) work at the Parisian Hôtel de Mailly illustrates not only an early French

*a As with the Great Staircase Hall lantern, Wyatt designed that of the Gallery with sloping sides. In both cases Barry made them vertical, but as evidenced by Wyatt’s letters to the Duke, the decorations would appear to be his. The Duke was convinced that vertical sides were preferred because sloping lights would admit insufficient light. In the end, Barry’s glazing had to be etched and figured (by Wyatt) in order to diminish what was deemed too much light. Stafford Record Office, D593/P/22/1/16 Letters 39, 41, 43; June 26, 28, July 7, 1834, respectively; letters 111, 114; Nov. 1 & 10, 1837 respectively. Letter March 3, 1838; and by June of that year the lantern design had been passed to Barry, and Wyatt took his leave of the project (Letter, June 16, 1838); SRO D593/E/7/19, Document of Common Pleas, pp.68-9.
acceptance of the grotesque, revived at Bagatelle, etc., but features these decorations within an architectural context similar to Wyatt’s arch recesses in the central space. Figure 339 also illustrates a typical Louis XIV wall arrangement, with similar frieze panels positioned by Wyatt in the flanking gallery sections. The employment of coffering in the arch returns is an ancient decorative device, but, utilized by Le Brun at Vaux le Vicomte (compl.1661), the detail has an historical French translation.

The lantern could possibly be described as Italian. Its ceiling features a Classically framed Guercino’s *St. Grisogonus borne to Heaven by Angels,* formerly in a Trastevere church dedicated to that Saint. The whole is supported by a grove of Palm columns (which also serve as ventilation ducts). The palm motif (conspicuously featured in Chambers’s Royal State Coach of 1761) is certainly most
celebrated in English architecture by Vardy’s room by that name in Spencer House, London. Nash employed a palm motif for the cast iron columns of both the Banqueting Room Gallery and the Great Kitchen at the Royal Pavilion, Brighton (c.1816). Although the motif has been used decoratively since the ancient Egyptians, its modern connotation as seen with the Royal Pavilion, is most associated with oriental exoticism. This was brought mainstream into Europe with chinoiserie and the Rococo - most conspicuously in Frederick the Great’s Chinese tea house of Sans Souci. Admittedly stretching the point, the standard acanthus leaves were replaced by palm fronds for the column capitals in the Galerie des Glaces, Versailles. Although not at all like Wyatt’s (Barry’s?) design, there would still be a tenuous Louis XIV association with the detail.

Wyatt took his leave of the duke and duchess of Sutherland by the summer of 1838. When he presented his final accounting for £1,972.14.11, based on a fee of five guineas-per-day, the duke felt he should be satisfied with his own summation of roughly one third that amount. In spite of all the written diplomacy that followed, the controversy ended in an acrimonious legal confrontation, the minutes of which reveal along with evidence of Wyatt’s time and trouble, the great respect he enjoyed by various members of the architectural profession. Wyatt won his suit but lost his career. Within a few months of leaving Stafford House, his creditors put him in the King’s Bench prison, and he died in obscurity about the year 1850. The Louis Quatorze style continued in the hands of lesser artists, one of whom had been in Wyatt’s employ at Stafford House: Robert Louis Roumieu.

Roumieu (1814-1877), eventually Sir Robert, was a typical if somewhat idiosyncratic architect, designing in many of the revivalist styles that marked the Victorian era. From
his association with Wyatt, one might assume he had absorbed some of his employer’s perfectionist approach, but in the body of a considerable practice, Roumieu proved his French work to be no more exacting than the average copyist. Still it is instructive to illustrate a few examples, which demonstrate in their comparative mediocrity, why Wyatt’s work was considered to be the finest expression of the mode. In the hearing, Wyatt vs the Duke of Sutherland, Roumieu’s then partner Alexander Dick Gough described (8 December 1841)\textsuperscript{251} the Louis Quatorze decorations they had recently done for an unnamed client in Whitehall Gardens, London. Of the interiors illustrated in the Survey of London,\textsuperscript{252} two can be seen to be very similar in character. Figures 345 and 344 - Decorator Unrecorded No. 5, Whitehall Gardens, Drawing-Room (photo c.1912). Survey of London XIII, pl.93. 345 - Gough & Roumieu? No. 2, Whitehall Gardens, First Floor Back Room (photo c.1912). Survey of London, Vol. XIII, fig.96. 346 - Survey of London, Vol. XIII, pl.t95.
346 illustrate Number 2 - occupied by the family of the dukes of Northumberland from 1820 until 1873. (Benjamin Disraeli lived here for three years from 1875.) The ceiling design has affinities with Paine’s Dining Room at Nostel Priory, done during the 1740s where straight perimeter mouldings suggest the cove. The Rococo wall panels were painted with vases of trailing flowers, putti, and Watteau-esque pastoral scenes, some of which are signed E. T. Parris, pinx. 1841 - a date which coincides with Gough’s evidence. The painted panels appear in frames more reminiscent of English and Bavarian Rococo decorations than traditional French detailing.

347 - James Paine Nostel Priory, Dining Room (c.1740), The National Trust, 1978.

348 - Cuvillies, F., & Zimmermann, J.B. Palace of Nymphenburg, Great Hall (1756-7), Montgomery-Massingherd, plt 69, pg 85. 349 - James Paine Felbrigg Hall, Norfolk (1752), The Cabinet, Beard, Georgian Craftsmen..., fig. 75, pg. 136.

* Edmund Thomas Parris (1793-1873) was born in London. He is thought to have been a product of the R.A. Schools, and exhibited there from 1816 onwards. A small unofficial portrait of Queen Victoria, in the collection of H.M. Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, was accomplished by sketching the monarch as she attended the Drury Lane theatre. He was appointed historical painter to Queen Adelaide in 1838. His other known decorative works are to the overdoors of the Ante-Room-Loggia to the Library, Bowood (1737-8) and a large oval painting to the Ceiling of Gunnersbury Park’s Drawing Room (thought to be c.1836, but may have been later - see fig.512, pg.264). Croft-Murray, p.252.
Prophetically, the dreary design, so feared by Cockerell and Morant in their testimonies before the Parliamentary Committee on Arts and Manufactures, 1835-6,\(^2\) marks the early Victorian period with, according to Yvonne French's monograph on the 1851 Great Exhibition, "examples of the hideous and debased ... of a bastardization of taste without parallel in the whole recorded history of aesthetics." \(^3\)

Roumieu shows a geometric discipline in his sketch for a Rococo ceiling rose that could have easily adorned his Ladies perfume shop for Mr. Breidenbach, and was the typical ceiling detail for fashionable drawing-rooms such as that illustrated in figure 352. Described as Italianate,

\(^{a}\) French was referring largely to the many articles of manufacture displayed in the Crystal Palace; many of which were illustrated in the catalogue. Except for Pugin's Medieval Court, the decorative arts were equally as grotesque.
Breidenbach’s shop is one of many settings where de rigueur French detailing was applied to an otherwise un-French interior. Roumieu designed a house for one Richard Darsh, whose central staircase shows a balustrade of Louis XIV derivation in an space resembling a skeletal Roman basilica (figure 353).

Sir Jeffry Wyatville at Windsor Castle
Serendipitous French detailing abounds at Windsor Castle, as seen for instance in the decorations of the Green Drawing Room. Featured here are a richly decorated Louis XIV-style ceiling cove, Edward Wyatt door carvings from Carlton House and although interspaced, frames of figured damask similar to Benjamin Dean Wyatt’s detail

for the State Dining Room at Stafford House (figures 290 & 292). Figure 355 illustrates one of three private sitting rooms, hung similarly in red damask and featuring pilaster panels punctuated with Régence-style decorations. Although Wyatville rightly considered French decoration inappropriate for Gothic architecture, he bowed to George IV’s taste and decorative sensibilities of form following function according to George. Still, French as some interiors became, they could not avoid a view through Gothic fenestration. The King died the year the first duke of Sutherland moved into the unfinished Stafford House, and presumably would have had no idea of the splendid work that was to follow there. William IV, having no taste whatsoever, gave Wyatville a relatively free hand (with a somewhat tighter

purse) to complete his project largely as George had envisioned it.

Windsor Castle records mention one Crouzet, carver, as being the only known French artist to work under Wyatville for the remodellings. Both he and Edward Wyatt, whose accounts were considerable (totalling £217.5.--, and £173.10.6 respectively) are listed in the records as “Picture Frame Makers”. Whether their work extended to architectural detailing is not recorded. The only other Frenchman listed in the Castle accounts is one J. Delahaute (or Delahante) who may have been a supplier. Evidence of his involvement is in the form of two billings for Models, Drawings, &c. (£108.12.5), and for a Carved Wood Chimney Piece (£500.0.0). Whilst the decorations associated with Delahaute’s models and drawings are undocumented, an educated guess can be gamed as to what and where they might be.

Certainly, English decorators at this juncture, were developing extensive stocks of moulds for Classical designs; and in a response to the growing Louis Quatorze market, could also have been expected to have some standard French motifs - specifically as seen - Rococo panel flourishes and elaborate ceiling roses. Some Windsor details differ greatly from what would be local stock-in-trade, and of these it would not be inappropriate to assume they were of foreign design and/or manufacture. They might also include elements of a heavily ornamented, compartmentalized ceiling - not commonly associated with French decoration after Louis XIV.

---

357 - F.-J., Bélanger, study for the Dining-Room ceiling, Bogatelle (c.1777) Myers, pg. xxv. 358 - F.-J., Bélanger, study, Ceiling for the Salon, Hôtel de Mazarin, Paris (c.1780), Myers, pg. xxvii.

* This did not prevent the new Queen Adelaide from tearing down all of Nash’s work at the Royal Lodge, Windsor Park, in “a fit of vandalistic piety” because she imagined wicked goings on between the late king and Lady Conyngham. The only section of this once extensive structure (continued)
F.-J. Bélanger, in his continuing debt to the English Neo-Classicists had offered such a ceiling design for the Dining-Room at Bagatelle, and had designed others of similar character for a salon in Hôtel de Mazarin (the present site of the École des Beaux Arts (previous page)) and another dining room ceiling in the home of Mlle. Dervieux, Rue Chantereine, Paris. Ahead of their time, none of these designs were executed; but a tradition for this approach was nonetheless established, as evidenced in Pierre-Luc-Charles Ciceri’s (Bélanger’s pupil\textsuperscript{257}) Ballroom ceiling (c.1825) for a Rothschild hôtel in Paris. After the Restoration of Louis XVIII, French designers, whilst continuing with an Empire palate, turned once again to ancien régime aesthetics. As in England, the artistic thrust was not tempered with an old aristocratic sensitivity; and with the reign of Louis-Philippe (1830-48) the French were producing an equally debased genre, with the attributes Yvonne French so clearly described.\textsuperscript{258} But the public standard of taste can never be associated with George IV, and under his guidelines, Windsor Castle was to gain one “French” room that would be a superb example of architectural balance and decorative proportion. It is not the State Reception Room, which most observers have either praised or misprized, but the Crimson Drawing Room. Probably here, Delahauete’s decorations and designs were most in evidence (Figure 361). Relocated Edward Wyatt

\textsuperscript{(continued) to remain is Wyattville’s then unfinished Dining Room, now the Drawing-Room. Fulford, R., \textit{George The Fourth}, G. P. Putnam’s Sons (New York-1935)p.274; Linstrom, Sir Jeffry Wyattville, Architect to the King, p.164.
F.-J. Bélanger, in his continuing debt to the English Neo-Classicists had offered such a ceiling design for the Dining-Room at Bagatelle, and had designed others of similar character for a salon in Hôtel de Mazarin (the present site of the École des Beaux Arts (previous page)) and another dining room ceiling in the home of Mlle. Dervieux, Rue Chantereine, Paris. Ahead of their time, none of these designs were executed; but a tradition for this approach was none-the-less established, as evidenced in Pierre-Luc-Charles Ciceri’s (Bélanger’s pupil) Ballroom ceiling (c.1825) for a Rothschild hôtel in Paris. After the Restoration of Louis XVIII, French designers, whilst continuing with an Empire palate, turned once again to ancien régime aesthetics. As in England, the artistic thrust was not tempered with an old aristocratic sensitivity; and with the reign of Louis-Philippe (1830-48) the French were producing an equally debased genre, with the attributes Yvonne French so clearly described. But the public standard of taste can never be associated with George IV, and under his guidelines, Windsor Castle was to gain one “French” room that would be a superb example of architectural balance and decorative proportion. It is not the State Reception Room, which most observers have either praised or misprized, but the Crimson Drawing Room. Probably here, Delahaute’s decorations and designs were most in evidence (Figure 361).  

(continued) to remain is Wyatville’s then unfinished Dining Room, now the Drawing-Room. Fulford, R., George The Fourth, G. P. Putnam’s Sons (New York-1935)p.274; Linstrum, Sir Jeffry Wyatville, Architect to the King, p.164.
F.-J. Bélanger, in his continuing debt to the English Neo-Classicists had offered such a ceiling design for the Dining-Room at Bagatelle, and had designed others of similar character for a salon in Hôtel de Mazarin (the present site of the École des Beaux Arts (previous page)) and another dining room ceiling in the home of Mlle. Dervieux, Rue Chantereine, Paris. Ahead of their time, none of these designs were executed; but a tradition for this approach was nonetheless established, as evidenced in Pierre-Luc-Charles Ciceri’s (Bélanger’s pupil) Ballroom ceiling (c.1825) for a Rothschild hôtel in Paris. After the Restoration of Louis XVIII, French designers, whilst continuing with an Empire palate, turned once again to ancien régime aesthetics. As in England, the artistic thrust was not tempered with an old aristocratic sensitivity; and with the reign of Louis-Philippe (1830-48) the French were producing an equally debased genre, with the attributes Yvonne French so clearly described. But the public standard of taste can never be associated with George IV, and under his guidelines, Windsor Castle was to gain one “French” room that would be a superb example of architectural balance and decorative proportion. It is not the State Reception Room, which most observers have either praised or misprized, but the Crimson Drawing Room. Probably here, Delahaute’s decorations and designs were most in evidence (Figure 361). Relocated Edward Wyatt
carvings from Carlton House embellish the doors which connect this space to the Green Drawing Room (refer figure 147). The walls, featuring Régence-style pilaster panels and framed damask in a similar detail to the Green Drawing Room, are not in the Classical proportions outlined earlier; but there seems to have been no artistic intention that an Order determine scale, in spite of the squat capitals - whose connotation is more decorative than structural. (Their absence in the chimney-piece recess, for instance, is of no importance.) The concept is more one of balancing a highly embellished (and compartmentalized) ceiling and cove in white and gold, with the crimson of wall hangings and carpet - the separate realms bridged by the door and pilaster elements.

The capital design itself is a very inventive adaptation of the French Renaissance Composite Order; and certainly too avant garde to be considered an English decorator's inventory item. In spite of his involvements at Carlton House and
Chatsworth, a Wyatville as a decorator, had not the sophistication of his cousin Benjamin Dean, and probably could not have produced the design himself. For its early appearance in an English scheme, the detail was most likely either made in France or designed there for Wyatville's English craftsmen to produce. As late as the middle of the century, capitals of this type, whilst known to the architectural community, as seen in The Builder publications and in situ with Cuthbert Brodrick's very French Grand Hotel, Scarborough (1862-1867), were rare occurrences in England.

Wyatville (Jeffry Wyatt until 1824), was recommended (July, 1795) by his uncle James to replace Henry Holland as architect to Carlton House. At this time it was wrongly rumoured that Holland had been dismissed. Wyatville's involvement there seems to have been more in the role of a carpenter, and when he left James's office four years later (1799), he advertised himself as both carpenter and architect. His earlier apprenticeship with another uncle, Samuel Wyatt seems to have gained him little appreciation of French aesthetic, as the bulk of over 150 major commissions reveals a concentration on Classical and Gothic revival design. Late in his career, Wyatville's architectural work at Chatsworth, (completed c.1832) takes no hint from the somewhat French-inspired library and Ante-Library of the first duke of Devonshire. Although repeating the white-and-gold of these rooms, Wyatville's adjoining addition - the shallow-vaulted Great Dining Room, is a purely Classical statement, which was described by his patron, the sixth duke as "...a great trunk and you expect the lid to open". The definitive work on Wyatville has been published by Derek Linstrum. Both Geoffrey Beard (Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England, p.225), and John Martin Robinson (The Wyatts, An Architectural Dynasty, p.126) make reference to him as their principal source for Wyatville. Aepinall, A., ed., The Correspondence of George, Prince of Wales, Vol.III, Cassell (London-1965)p.81; "Chatsworth", booklet, forward, the 11th Duke of Devonshire, Derbyshire Countryside Ltd., 1990, pp.23-7; Writer's visit to Chatsworth; Linstrum, D., Sir Jeffry Wyatville, passim; Linstrum, D., Catalogue of the Drawings Collection of the RIBA, The Wyatt Family, p.49; Colvin, H., A Biographical Dictionary..., p.736.

Brodrick (1822-1905) was a highly talented architect, whose few but significant buildings are all located in Yorkshire. Born in Hull, he eventually established his practice there in 1844, after a study tour of Gothic cathedrals in England, and Renaissance architecture in both France and Italy. When he was only twenty-nine, his successful design for the Leeds Town Hall competition (1860-63) was recommended by its assessor, Sir Charles Barry. The Town Hall features an imposing Corinthian colonnade reminiscent of the Bourse in Paris, and the Grand Theatre in Bordeaux. Other details reveal a French influence, such as doorways with heavily rusticated and vermiculated voussures, and boldly carved keystones, and the great tower itself, which can be related to the work of Visconti and Lefuel at the New Louvre (1852-7). Concurrent with his Town Hall project, Brodrick won the competition for the Corn Exchange (1860-65), also in Leeds. Elliptical in plan and crowned by an elliptical dome, the Corn Exchange, evoking de Mézière's Paris Corn Exchange (Halle aux Blés, 1763-7), it is one of his most innovative designs. (continued)
The probable source, considering all these factors, was indeed Delahaute, who was also the likely designer (and/or supplier) of the ceiling in its entirety.*

The cove features a highly embellished guilloche, with its lower curves truncated. To the writer’s knowledge, this approach to frieze or cove design does not occur in England before or after the Crimson Drawing Room. As with the Composite capital, and many Classical elements, the guilloche is a target of much playful

(continued)

Towering 160 feet above the sea, Broderick’s 365-room Grand Hotel, Scarborough, crowns a cliff overlooking the South Bay of this once very fashionable resort. The exterior features four distinctive cupolas featuring quartets of atlantes somewhat reminiscent of the Louvre pavilions. Inside, a once regal lobby, detailed to imbue the ambience of a fashionable French spa, is today sprinkled with video games and other paraphernalia that signal a modern clientele of an entirely different character from the Victorian and Edwardian gentry who once mingled there. At age 47 Broderick abruptly abandoned his practice, and spent all but the last seven years of his life in Paris. He died in Jersey, aged 83. Writers visit to all three sites; literature from the Grand Hotel on its history (no author or date); Macmillan Dictionary of Architects (source: Linstrum); Linstrum, D., “Cuthbert Broderick, An Interpretation of a Victorian Architect”, a Boscom Lecture delivered 10 November, 1970, and published, Journal of the Royal Society of Arts (London-1971) passim.

* Windsor Castle accounts list as having been received 17 January 1927, “A Case of Pictures from Calais...” presumably included, because these items directly follow and are indented in the script, were “pieces of Beauvais tapestry to Mr. Morel” (probably for the Great Reception Room seating), “A Book of Drawings to Lord Farnborough” (who purchased the State Reception Room’s Gobelins tapestries), and “Lithographic Prints to Mr. Spearman”. The drawings (which might have been Delahaute’s) and prints are a mystery, but could have been design sources for either the Crimson Drawing Room, the State Reception Room, or both. PRO, Chancery Lane, Windsor Castle folio LC9-362, pg.4.

b There are, however, two other instances of it at Windsor Castle - both done during Wyatville’s remodellings for George IV. The Queen’s Sitting Room, which also features a remarkable French ceiling, well in advance of the current mode in England, and a similar cove detail. (As photographs of this room are not normally published, the writer has only (continued)
interpretation by French artists. Serlio, Neufforge and Chambers, for instance, illustrate it in a variety of Classical applications; but always as band ornament - rarely as the central element of a frieze or cove.* In the Neo-Classical study illustrated in figure 366, Nicolas Pineau’s son, Dominique, takes the guilloche well beyond its text-book context, and presents it in the attitude of a scoop detail. It is possible that this study, or one similar, influenced the Windsor Castle design. A decorative sympathy with the cove is echoed in the ceiling, the layout of which is itself a modified guilloche - where the greater loops appear as elaborately embellished, cornerless rectangles. Clever geometries combined the room’s larger central panel with one of curvilinear shape to address the bay - the whole “floating” on a plain field, in the setting of a traditional guilloche. In the writer’s opinion, the entire arrangement, totally destroyed by the November, 1992, fire was marvellous in every aspect of its composition.

(continued) Joseph Nash’s (c.1843) watercolour to interpret. It would seem that the cove detail might be identical to or a modification of that in the Crimson Drawing Room’s.) Figure 367 illustrates the State (Grand) Reception Room’s window voussure with a truncated guilloche design almost identical to Pineau’s drawing. The voussure is coved in a greater border which reverses the curve to frame Wyatville’s Gothic window. The sophistication of this detail surpasses the room’s other decorations, leading the writer to surmise that the enormous sum of £500 paid to Delahante for a “Carved Wood Chimney Piece” (the whereabouts of which is unknown), might refer to this detail. Were this the case, the French-source argument is strengthened.

PRO Chancery Lane, Estimates Windsor Castle, LC9.366, No.5, pp.60,64.

* Neufforge, in a series of Neo-Classical interiors, illustrates several designs of frieze ornament, such as anthemion, bound ropes of laurel, and of acanthus, vegetal wreaths, etc., and two featuring identical versions of the Classical guilloche of intertwining circular bands framing rosettes. Recueil Élémentaire..., Vol.V., pl.t.5, pg.491, pl.t.3, pg.525.

b Sadly, Wyatville’s prediction that his interior work would be only temporary due to “the fluctuations of taste”, proved true - but to the fluctuations of fortune. Linstrom, Sir Jeffry Wyatville, pp.197 & 200.
Windsor Castle's most conspicuous bow to French design is the Great Reception Room (previous page and below) but as with St. George's Hall, commentaries always mention size before architectural merit. Formerly the King's Guard Chamber, the space is roughly half the Hall's one hundred eighty-five by thirty-foot dimensions, and possibly of greater height. Staged here is a truly elephantine manifesto of ancien regime luxury. Nearly every decorative element is over-scaled to the degree that the Neo-Classical Gobelins tapestries appear as pictures in frames. To grasp the rooms proportions, one need only observe the skirting boards as being at the same level as the chair seats, with the dado reaching the height of a low wainscot - some boiseries are stretched a full two stories high! The slightly Rococo chimney-piece mantel shelves are head-height! Nash's view of this room accurately describes a reception that could easily illustrate a further chapter in Gulliver's Travels. Whilst it is likely George IV intended this room to be the supreme statement of Louis XIV grandeur in England, inflating what are largely Louis XV - XVI decorative elements to this extreme has clearly overtaxed the decorators' efforts to create a facsimile of any historical model. Somewhat comparable, but of date roughly thirty years later

a The six Gobelins tapestries, depicting the story of Jason, are of late 18th-century manufacture. Purchased for George IV in Paris, 1825-6, by Sir Charles Long (later Lord Farnborough), all are of the same dimension - posing a presentation problem for the central pair, which are hung in the room's larger central bays. Clearly Wyatville inherited a space whose door and fireplace openings were already established; and should not be criticized for doing his best to present a balanced interior; but whilst the flanking bays are just adequate to mount the tapestries, the opposing central bays are of substantially greater width. Wyatville filled the surrounding wall surfaces between Rococo-style boiseries to the top and sides, with trellis-work which becomes in effect a frame itself. Normally appearing in all three Louis periods as cove embellishment or infill between sculptural wall decorations (as Benjamin Wyatt provided to the overdoors in the Waterloo Gallery), a frame of trellis-work is totally out of historical context. Additionally, as seen in the Banqueting Hall, Londonderry House, because the decorations are a refurbishment, in order to balance the central bay design, Wyatville was forced to asymmetrically present the chimney-pieces and opposing doors, which the French would never do in a room of this importance. March, W., Official Guide to Windsor..., Oxley & Son (Windsor-c.1934), p.22 (tapestries).
than the State Reception Room is the Second Empire redecoration of the State Reception Rooms in Gabriel’s Ministère de la Marine (1768-74), Place de la Concorde. Reflecting Napoleon III’s unrestrained interpretations of past glory, these rooms display ceilings similar to Wyatville’s, but being also a refurbishment, are constrained to existing architectural proportions - much more sympathetic to human scale.

It is probably more appropriate to consider the State Reception Room less a decorative evocation of French aesthetic than as theatre of Olympian scale, calculated to project George IV’s post Carlton House - post Napoleon - post Restoration persona grandiosa, and that of a British monarchy which, addressing itself to changing times and conditions, has since produced no corresponding central character.

It is not a purpose here to analyse the various decorative elements, except to observe the State Reception Room features little of the imaginative form-making seen in the Crimson Drawing Room. However enlarged, virtually all the details are more or less traditional, and well within an English decorator’s capabilities both in design and execution. As of this writing, only conjecture can substitute for what restorers will know precisely. Windsor Castle accounts for the years 1835-6,261 list amongst the craftsmen one Edward Foster, modeller, and the seemingly ever-present Jackson & Sons as composition makers. Giles Worsley, reporting on the Windsor fire in his Country Life article, January 21, 1993, featured a photograph showing
the damaged lattice-work tapestry surrounds. From the charring, it seems obvious that the lattice-work frame is constructed with doubled rods of gilded wood, with the interspersed rosette infilling not showing similar damage. Composition details, whilst not being fire-proof, are fire-resistant due to their largely incombustible ingredients - leading the writer to assume these are part of Jackson’s work. As an extension of this, it is obvious that much of the adjacent trumeau decorations which are also relatively unscathed, might be composition on wood backing or gilded plaster. It is hoped that once the restoration of Wyatville’s work is completed, a report will be forthcoming which might allow a detailed knowledge, heretofore only sketched by bookkeepers’ records.

Lord Stuart de Rothesay and Highcliffe Castle

Charles Stuart was English Ambassador to the French Court on three separate occasions: Directly after the fall of Napoleon (1814, before and after Wellington’s brief tenure until 1825) and during the final years of George IV (1828 until 1831 when the Tory government fell). As with another Francophile ambassador, Ralph, First Duke of Montagu, he was not respected by the monarch he served. Separated by over a century (and by far the wilier of the two), Montagu, whose unscrupulous behaviour largely reflected the political morality of Charles II’s era, could have lost his head for exposing to Parliament the king’s trafficking with the French Court. Altogether Montagu built three

---


---

a Montagu was ambassador to France in 1666, 1669, 1676, 1677-78. He was created earl in 1689 and duke of Montagu in 1705, four years before his death. It is interesting that the present Lord Montagu is the active in preserving Highcliffe, which has been reduced to a ruin by fire and developers’ greed. The Times, Nov. 16, 1991, p. 15; Worsley, G., Country Life, Vol. CLXXIX, No. 4631, pp. 1431-2; Wheatley, H. B., The Diary of Samuel Pepys, Vol. II, G. Be.. & Sons (London-1923) p. 163, n. 2.

b Charles Greville writes, August 22nd: “Lord Stuart de Rothesay, too, is sent back to Paris, though personally obnoxious to the King and universally disliked”; and again on January 7, 1830: “...Wellington sent Lord Stuart de Rothesay as Ambassador to Paris. By the most unfortunate mischance, the Ambassador was found out smuggling again and the Government are very anxious to get him home again”. Montagu, on the other hand, had to wait for Queen Anne to receive his dukedom. Reeve, H., The Greville Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 119; Wilson, P.W., The Greville Diary, Vol. I, p. 168; Falk, B., The Way of the Montagues, pp. 10, 11, 15, 84, 136, 143, 148.
French-inspired domiciles: Two hôtels in Bloomsbury (the second as a replacement for the first Montagu House which burnt in 1686) and the Versailles-inspired addition to his Country House, Boughton, Kettering (previous page). Although the exteriors of all three buildings reflected contemporary French design, the interiors whilst decorated in part by French painters and carvers, were largely English in attitude. In contrast to Montagu, de Rothesay was known as a philanderer and a smuggler! (footnote b, page 206) In contrast to Montagu’s Boughton House, the French character of Highcliffe, both inside and out, was intended to be a habitable showcase for the Gothic architectural artifacts, Empire and Louis furniture and objets d’art de Rothesay had collected whilst in France.

In 1824 (the year before he was replaced for a time by the future first duke of Sutherland as the French ambassador) de Rothesay and his wife stayed at Windsor Castle. Although the works were in their initial stages, Wyatville familiarized the couple with the project. It is also likely that at that time he recommended to them his former pupil, William J. Donthorne (1799-1859). The sixty-five year old Wyatville, whose own practice was largely built on country house design, was certainly busy enough with his royal commission, to forego the extra work. It is also possible that the king’s personal dislike of the ambassador had rubbed off on his architect as well.

* De Rothesay was also a successful house-hunter. In 1814, with Napoleon’s abdication, he purchased for the British Government Pauline Bonaparte Borghese’s hôtel de Charost and all its contents. Still the British Embassy, the hôtel was built (c.1722) during the Régence by Antoine Mazin, ingénieur et directeur des plans du Roi, for the chef du conseil des Finances, and a governor (1722 & 1730) of the juvenile Louis XV, Armand de Béthune, duc de Chârost. Chârost was the grandson of the corrupt Nicolas Fouquet, who held the same position when in 1661, he entertained the young Louis XIV at his newly built Château, Vaux-le-Vicomte. The 120,000 livre fête was the pivotal incident to doom Fouquet, who then spent the rest of his days in prison. It was Vaux’s architect, Le Vau, painter, Le Brun and landscape designer, Le Nôtre who subsequently rebuilt and expanded Versailles. At Highcliffe, it is interesting to observe very fine Régence panellings in the Drawing-Room (fig. 384). What the writer implies, Hussey states directly “Lord Stuart’s decoration of most of the principal rooms [was a] harvest of his Embassy in Paris…” (and the probable reason for his reputation as a smuggler). Friedman, pp.102-3, Frégnac / Faucheux, pp.209-11; Hussey, CLXCI, No.2364, p.904; Kimball, F., The Creation of the Rococo Decorative Style, pp.150; Durant, W.& A., The Age of Louis XIV, Simon & Schuster (New York-1963)pp.18-20.
Highcliffe Castle was finally begun after de Rothsay’s last term in Paris, and completed about 1834. With a stunning view of the sea, Donthorne’s beautifully articulated French Gothic structure was embellished with de Rothsay’s architectural collection - the prize of which was a magnificent oriel window rescued from the Manoir des Andelys, Normandy. Of the ground floor rooms, four were of architectural merit, and only one reflected the Gothic theme of the exterior. The others were French.

Following his recall, de Rothsay was en route to England when he chanced by Les Andelys when the Mayor’s House was in process of being demolished. He bought on the spot the materials of the entire building, and had them shipped to the beach below Highcliffe. By reputation, the room lit by the oriel window was that in which the founder of the House of Bourbon, the future Henri IV, witnessed in 1562, the death of his father, Antoine de Bourbon. Other materials from Les Andelys were installed at Highcliffe as part of the Entrance Portico on the north front and the eastern tower of the seaward front. Additional fragments came from the Abbey of Jumièges, also in Normandy. Country Life, Vol. XCI, No.2363, May 1, 1942, p.855; Country Life, Vol. CLXXIX, No. 4631, May 22, 1986, p.1429; V&A report SZZ298W/Highcliffe Castle file.

From the plan (figure 304), one might assume that the cruciform library would be a chapel-like space. The room was single storey height, lined with two levels of book shelves. The flat ceiling featured beams and bosses, reminiscent of Gothic architecture, but without its effect. Country Life, Vol. XCI, No. 2364, May 8 1942, fig.10, pg.905.
The Great Hall, hung with Gobelins tapestries which had belonged to Napoleon, is a commanding, almost church-like introduction to Highcliffe's interior. Exalted, as if on an high altar reached by a monumental split staircase, was a copy of Lawrence's coronation portrait of George IV. (The staircase created a grand effect, but in fact lead to a narrow, painfully convoluted corridor which served the first-floor apartments.)

On the ground floor, directly below the King's portrait appeared a pair of Rococo doors leading to the Ante-Room, or Octagon. Incongruous in a Gothic Hall, the doors were however an apt introduction a room lined with excellent Rococo boiseries of gilded oak. These were part of an hoard of top-quality furnishings de Rothesay had been accumulating in Paris, with the help of Lord Yarmouth, future Third Marquis of Hertford.267 To the writer's knowledge, this was with the other two French rooms to be seen, the first instance in England where authentic boiseries appeared in a space scaled specifically for them.

The Octagon's boiseries and chimney-piece are Rococo, which Donthorne set within an Empire context of simply framed arches and marble door architraves to complement furniture

---

* The marquess of Hertford is the third in a succession of four who collected the great French portion of the Wallace Collection. The friendship and collecting zeal of George IV when Prince of Wales, did much to encourage both the first and second marquesses to form this fabulous treasure, which was expanded by the third and fourth. The fourth proved to be the ultimate Francophile, largely responsible for collecting the majority of exquisite pieces of furniture and objets d'art seen today. He made his home in Paris, and was for a time the proprietor (and remodeller) of Bagatelle. Pulford, R., George The Fourth, p.100; Watson, F.J.B., The Wallace Collection, pp.vi-xii.
bought from Marshal Ney's estate. Other furnishings collected by de Rothesay are reputed to have come from Malmaison and may have included the swan-armed chairs seen in figure 380.

The Dining Room and Drawing-Room adjoined the Octagon in a juxtaposition of plan allowing full views of the garden. Here the simply framed oak panelling was more reminiscent of Tudor and Caroline detailing to be thought of as particularly French. (A glorious example of similar panelling can be seen at Tredegar House, Gwent - figure 383). Whilst they represent English work of the late seventeenth century, Tredegar's detailing was certainly French inspired.)


381 - Donthorn, W. Highcliffe Castle, Dining Room entrance doors, Country Life, Vol. CLXCI, No.2364 (5/8/42) fig.9, pg.906. 382 - Donthorn, W.

Michel Ney (1769-1815), Duke of Elchingen, Prince of the Moskowa, Marshal of France, was a cooper's son, whose cross-loyalties at the time of the Bourbon Restoration and Napoleon's return from exile, trapped him to the extent that both sides called for his death. He was executed in the Luxembourg gardens, December 7th. Encyclopædia Britannica, 1942, Vol. 16, pp.404-5.
contrasts to those of the Drawing-Room where there was already gilding aplenty. Perhaps to further emphasize the plaques, the added decorations were stained to match the oak panels to which they are applied. Similarly finished embellishments can be seen in the early nineteenth-century mansion of the American millionaire, Paris Singer, where time has faded the staining to reveal the craftsman’s subterfuge.

Highcliffe Castle was photographed by Country Life in May, 1942, shortly before the house passed from private hands. In 1953 it became the property of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, whose Claretian Fathers, after a disastrous fire fourteen years later (1967), sold the property to developers. Apparently the costs for transforming Highcliffe into a beach resort were such that another fire mysteriously broke out a year later. Subsequent demolitions, for reasons of safety, and continuous pillaging of interior features, have left the House in its present ruinous state.269

The Earl de Grey and Wrest Park

Thomas Philip, Earl de Grey (1781-1859), succeeded his father as third baron Grantham at the age of five, inheriting the family seat of Newby Hall, Yorkshire. Upon the death of his maternal Aunt, Amabel, Countess de Grey, he inherited Wrest Park, Bedfordshire, together with the titles of earl de Grey and baron Lucas.* In Wrest, the earl’s bequest included an estate and mansion, the chapel of which dated from 1320.270 The site featured formal gardens in the French manner, planted by the eleventh earl c.1687, and a Louis XIV “great canal”, probably created out of the moat which had originally surrounded the mansion. The canal, built by the twelfth earl in the first decade of the eighteenth century, stretched from the house to an elegant Baroque pavilion (1711-12) designed

* The writer is indebted to the earl’s descendant, Lady Lucas, for her permission to obtain many of the illustrations presented, and for her advice concerning the architect/site clerk, James Clephane. Letter from Lady Lucas, September 25, 1991.
by Thomas Archer. a 271

Although de Grey held important offices under the Crown, including the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, his interests were not in the political sphere, b but were directed rather to the arts and sciences, and societies whose members shared a similar erudition. Although technically he was not an architect, his advocacy of the profession, artistic talent, and personal influence with Queen Victoria, helped to transform the forty-four-year-old Architects' Club of Adam, Holland and Soane into The Royal Institute of British Architects. c 272 De Grey's tenure as president of that society from its founding in 1835 until his death in 1859 d (not to be approached by any succeeding executive) is an honour that speaks for itself.

a Archer (1668-1743) was a pupil of Vanbrugh and one of the few English architects of his day to have trained on the Continent. Although he is reputed to have built Chicheley Hall, Cheshire (1719-23) on the basis of designs for country houses now gone, Archer is best known for St. John's Church, Smith Square, Westminster (1714-28) and the Cathedral of St. Philip, Birmingham (1709-25), the cupola of which is remarkably similar to that of Wren's pavilion. Both have affinities with Carlo Rainaldi's twin churches in Piazza del Popolo, Rome. Archer's best known domestic work is Chatsworth's western Bow-front (compl.1704-5). Combined with William Talman's adjacent south front (1686-96), both Chatsworth façades are not without their comparisons to Versailles, and to underscore the point, are distinguished with a Louis XIV great canal, dug in 1702 during Archer's tenure. Chatsworth's canal predates Wren's by less than a decade.

b A contingent influenced by the fact that his younger brother by one year, Frederick John Robinson, Viscount "Goody" Giderich, (pg.2, ftnt.a), described by George IV as a "blubbing fool", had been Tory prime minister for less than six months from the death of Canning, August, 1827 until he resigned, January, 1828. (Giderich's daughter, Eleanor, had died aged 11, in 1826. From that time, he felt his duty was more to keep his wife company than to serve in the House of Lords - provoking princess de Lieven to observe: "the great events of Europe [are] at the mercy of Lady Giderich's headaches"). Wellington succeeded him. Longford, E., pp.144-5; Macmillan Encyclopedia, Market House Books Ltd. (Aylesbury-1986) p.511; Leslie, S., pp.155-5, 188-9; Houfe, S., Country Life, Vol. CXLVII, June 25, 1970, p.1251.

c Although 1835 is the official date, in his introduction to Great Drawings from the Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects, John Harris fixes it as 1834. Although most historians and authors refer to happenings at the RIBA before 1866, it did not become "Royal" until that date. Harris, p.7; Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. 2 (1942), p.273; D. Linsenstrum.

d De Grey was also a fellow of the Royal Society and the Society of Antiquaries. His judgement in architectural matters was highly respected, as evidenced of his 1846 commission, by Queen Victoria, (continued)
The old Wrest House comprised some fifty rooms. The whole, having been added to over the years, consisted of a centre and two wings - all low in appearance, with a simple Classical portico marking the entrance. At the time of the Earl’s possession, sections of the building were dilapidated. His description overlooks this:

It was very old, but it had neither antiquarian or architectural value. It was not essentially out of repair, but it was of very bad construction (much of it nothing but lath and plaster); very extensive without a possibility of concentration; utterly impossible to warm; and with no suite of apartments on any floor.

The new Wrest House, as with the old, was placed on the canal axis, but further away and on higher ground, to avoid the damp and swarms of gnats that annoyed former proprietors. It was to be much more substantial and cohesive a design, and very much a response to the French garden and its features.

De Grey’s first visit to Paris was in 1815, following the final defeat of Napoleon. He returned again in 1822, and by his third visit three years later, had developed an avid interest in “Old French style” architecture - specifically the Rococo. Although he gave credit to Mansard, Le Pautre and Blondel for his inspiration, the French design (continued) to form an oversight committee for the anticipated additions and improvements for Buckingham Palace. The earl thought the builder Thomas Cubitt of Belgravia highly competent, and installed Robert Oliver, his clerk of works for Wrest, under the architect, Sir Edward Blore. He thought Blore “a very inefficient man”, and history has confirmed his opinion certainly in view of the architect’s work at Buckingham Palace. Blore enclosed Nash’s courtyard with an ornate three-storey East Front wing, which he sheathed in Caen stone. Enduring for centuries in France, Caen stone proved friable in the English climate, and Blore’s addition began to crumble almost immediately. In 1913, the East Front was resurfaced in Portland Stone, by Sir Aston Webb. The design is completely different from Blore’s; and no mean accomplishment considering Webb had to work with existing interior arrangements and fenestration. His somewhat French-inspired façade is not without comparison to Gabriel’s Place Louis XV (de la Concorde) project of which the Ministère de la Marine is a part. Buckingham Palace’s principal interiors contain a great deal of white and gold decoration, which can be superficially compared to French luxe. But in the main Nash’s designs are uniquely his own, with the singular exception of the Grand Staircase (and embellishments done to the White Drawing-Room by Blore). Largely, the French embellishments of the palace date from the Edwardian period, and will be discussed within that context. In 1826, shortly before Carlton House was to be pulled down, de Grey was appointed to the building committee for Nash’s new United Services Club at 116 Pall Mall. Nash proposed the staircase from Carlton House be reused in the new club, but the offer was rejected on grounds that it was “...circular and much too small”. De Grey produced a sketch which Nash was to deliver to the then prince regent, but nothing seems to have come of it. The final design for the staircase, imperial in layout with a spindle balustrade, is of no architectural significance. Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, Vol.59, Miscellanea, BHRS (Bedford-1980)p.65; Memoirs of the Earl de Grey c.1790-1859, Bedford Record Office, CRT 190/45/2, pp.35 (1826), 66 (1846); Summerson, J., John Nash, p.209; Lejeune, A., The Gentlemen’s Clubs of London, pp.279, 282; Nares, G., Royal Homes, pp.9-10; Houfe, S., Country Life, Vol.CXLVII, June 25, 1970, p.1251.
source for Wrest resides overwhelmingly with Blondel. The history of the building and decoration of Wrest Park, aside from house accounts, and various correspondence during its construction, is contained in a letter, written April, 1848, by the earl to his daughter Anne. In response to her request that he record the details of its building, he prepared her for what is not at all a tiresome memoir, with this affectionate warning:

You are little aware of what you must be prepared to encounter; and how many tedious recitals of the various visits to the Mr Whites and Mr Browns who possessed old carvings, and other things you must wade through. However, as you need never read it more than once and as you need not tell anyone whether you were bored or not, here goes!

De Grey recalled his family’s visit to Paris in 1825, when a particular book-buying excursion landed him a three-volume folio on French architecture. Although de Grey mentions one book discovered at the Bibliothèque Royale,
entitled *Architecture Française*, the three-volume folio was most certainly Jacques-François Blondel’s *Maisons de Plaisance, 1737-8.* Wrest’s main elevations and ground floor plan are adaptations of designs illustrated within.

392 - J.-F. Blondel Elevation du Côté de l’Entrée, Maisons de Plaisance, Tome I, Partie II (1737), fig. 20, pg. 111.


Although de Grey described himself as “...in every sense of the word my own architect.”, he had the assistance of London architect James Clephane (f1.1830-50), whose contribution was probably greater than the earl would

a In his Country Life article, Simon Houfe refers to de Grey’s “textbook” as being Blondel’s *Cours d’Architecture (Architecture Française)*, 1771-7, but this was an 8-volume text, six of which were published during Blondel’s lifetime (1705-74), and two after, by the architectural writer, Pierre Patte (1723-1812). In addition to influencing de Grey’s plan and elevations, the Rococo decoration of doors and windows most likely came also from Blondel. Houfe, Vol. CXLVII, June 25, 1970, p. 1252; Blondel, *De la Distribution des Maisons de Plaisance et de la Décoration des Édifices en Général*, Tome Premier, Charles-Antoine Jombert, Librairie du Roy, (Paris-1737) planches 19, 20, 21, 22, pp 110, 111, 115, 118 respectively.
admit.1 Wrest Park’s archives include several letters from the architect, indicating he was involved not only with planning and design aspects, but coordinated down to the smallest detail,2⁰¹ the city suppliers, including Jackson & Sons, and the cabinet-makers and upholsterers, Thomas Dowbiggin & Co.3

The ground floor plan illustrated in figure 393, shows a layout of rooms not dissimilar to those presented by Blondel in Maisons de Plaisance;2⁰² excepting that the functions of his double row of rooms reflects early eighteenth-century arrangement and a time when servants were not necessarily the phantoms of back corridors and stairwells. The centre sections of Blondel’s plans show the alternatives of a full-depth Grand Salon - with a favourite French arrangement placing the staircase aside and perpendicular to the general circulation flow. The second plan shows a split Grand Staircase within the entrance hall, having a doorway directly below the upper landing, and leading to the principal apartments (as in Highcliffe Castle’s arrangement). The addition of an oval Entrance Hall, necessarily compacting the staircase, is the essential variation of de Grey’s plan.

Maisons de Plaisance contains many illustrations of interior detailing which could have been influential. It is clear from the many design studies de Grey produced for Wrest Park, that he was not only an accomplished draughtsman, but had a full appreciation of French aesthetic in its finest expression. Why he would resurrect a century-old, home-grown English interpretation of the Rococo2⁰³ to accomplish his interiors can only be put to nostalgia for

a James Clephane (or Clephan), 18 Warwick Street, Charing Cross, was recommended to the earl by Lord Barrington - another amateur architect, who had used Clephane’s services to rebuild his own country house, Becket Park, Berkshire. I am grateful to Lady Lucas for her suggestion "ld de Grey’s Site clerk, Clephane, was probably responsible for a lot of the work…", Lucas, Winchester, 25.9.91; Miscellanea, BHRS, p.86; House, Country Life, Vol. CXLVII, June 25, 1970, p.1252; Colvin, A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects, p.219.

b Thomas Dowbiggin (1788-1854) & Co., first appeared in the London Post Office Directories in 1816; and seem to have always been located in Mount Street, Grosvenor Square. Very much an upmarket firm, de Grey referred to his French source for the Drawing-Room tapestries, one Salandrouze, as "the Dowbiggin of Paris". Dowbiggins had been suppliers to the duke of Wellington, and provided amongst other items, the controversial yellow damask to the Waterloo Gallery. The firm joined the ranks of royal suppliers (c.1845) with their furnishing of the private apartments at Osborne House. With the death of its founder, Dowbiggins merged (c.1856) with the larger and equally well known firm of Holland and Sons Ltd. Although an invoice for bookcases supplied to Dorchester House, dated May, 1856, is inscribed "Holland late Dowbiggin", both firms maintained their separate identities well into the 1880s. Holland and Sons Ltd. continued until 1963, when the firm ceased to exist. The complete collection of Holland Day Books are housed with the V&A, Elythe Road archives. RTBA archives (Lewis Vuliamy) Vol/15/7/6; Kelley’s POLD, Simkin, Marshall & Co., series; Morley, Regency Design, p.306; Lasdun, S., Victorians at Home, p.76; Country Life, Vol. CXIII, Aug.1, 1952, p.323; “History of Wrest House”, p.78.
the old Wrest Park he was forced to demolish. Perhaps as a reminder, de Grey produced a pen and ink wash rendering of his aunt’s Morning Room, which featured a ceiling reminiscent of work by mid-eighteenth-century Italian stuccatori - such as Hagley Hall’s Drawing-Room by Francesco Vassalli (c.1758)."

Most of the new Wrest Park’s principal apartments recall this style, which for all their gilded flourishes, are intimate and charming - without the crisp elegance of the historical French models de Grey studied. Aesthetics aside, their decoration was also the result of economic considerations and the earl’s desire to employ largely local craftsmen, whose skills would be necessarily limited in the reproduction of French detailing.

Two rooms, recalling in spirit the old Morning-Room’s decoration, are the Library and Drawing-Room. Possibly reusing the double consols seen in de Grey’s wash, are like details in the Library frieze. Here they alternate with escutcheons containing armorial bearings which the earl himself painted. The portrait painter, John Lucas (1807-)

The bulk of old Wrest House was built by the first duke of Kent in the early years of the 18th century. In addition to Thomas Archer, the duke employed c.1715, the Venetian, Giacomo Leoni (c.1686-1746), a Palladian architect, whose English works include Lyme Park, Cheshire (1730-3) and Clandon Park, Surrey (1725-35). Two of Leoni’s favourite decorators were the Italian stuccatori, Giuseppe Artari (1697-1769), in England after c.1720, and Giovanni Bagutti (1681-after 1730 - in England after 1709). Their work is catalogued by Geoffrey Beard in Georgian Craftsmen (1966) and Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England (1981). Although few records exist for the old house, it is possible that one of these men was responsible for the plaster decorations seen in de Grey’s wash. Craftsmen and Interior Decoration, pp.27,242-4; Georgian Craftsmen, pp.27-31,185 Dutton, R., p.111,113; National Register of Archives, #4599, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Quality House, Quality Court, London; Snodin, M., ed., Jackson-Stops, G., “Rococo Architecture and Interiors”, p.192.
1874), was de Grey’s first choice to decorate the ceiling, but as the artist felt incapable of accomplishing the requested “pretty faces and gay colours”, directed the earl to a former fellow student at the Royal Academy - one John Wood (1801-1870). Wood accepted the commission enthusiastically, including the earl himself as Sculpture in one of the Library ceiling panels -

the other allegorical figures being Music, Poetry and Painting.

Wood’s other ceiling is that of the Drawing-Room; where his work was inadvertently complimented by an old lady, attending a ball given to celebrate the room’s completion. In company with all the ladies of the county, the woman was heard to accurately assess “More beauty on the ceiling than on the floor!”

De Grey’s preliminary study for this room’s decoration denotes his intention to rehang here the Gobelins tapestries from his Drawing- (Tapestry) Room at Newby. Fortunately, they proved too small for the space, and have remained as Adam placed them. Still it is worth demonstrating that de Grey’s wash (with a chandelier remarkably similar to those at Newby - figure 401), displays the tapestries in a totally French setting. It shows a ceiling design (as is Hagley
Hall’s) much more in harmony with the hangings than Adam’s Neo-Classical exercise discussed on page 38.

A Billiard Room was envisioned separating the Library from the Drawing-Room and on the central axis. De Grey observed the circulation flows and all internal views would be hindered by a massive table necessarily placed dead centre to both. The Billiard Room notion was discarded and appropriately in its place, an ante-room was created which, according to Blondel’s plan as well, leads directly to the garden terrace. The overflow books collected from both Newby and de Grey’s London residence, 4 St. James’s Square, required that the room serve as an ante-library. (Connecting the library proper with the Dining Room, was a so-called Print Room, which became the third library in a string.) The bookcases in both libraries by name, exhibit a frothy colloquialism reflecting French Rococo detailing with about as much authenticity as did Horace Walpole’s revival of Gothic joinery (following page). Unlike many eighteenth-century English libraries, the French concept is generally one of a small, intimate cabinet (Lieu plus spécialement réservé au travail intellectuel). Page 221 illustrates two Versailles examples

* The mantle-piece (illustrated figure 401) is placed at the end wall, and would have required a chimney projecting through the roof, awkwardly near the pavilion dome. As the earl wished to relocate elements from old Wrest Park into the new structure, it is interesting to notice this particular chimney-piece as being similar to that from the old Morning Room. According to de Grey’s memoirs, the only chimney-piece to be relocated from old Wrest Park, came from the “South Drawing-Room”. The Morning Room was also described as the “French Drawing-Room” and may also be the “South” if one credits the low angle of the sun in figure 394. Lady de Grey’s Sitting-Room is presently closed to visitors. “History of Wrest House” p.80.
where the storage requirement is subordinated to the room’s decorative scheme. Whether the books are masked, as in Gabriel’s 1755 Library of the Dauphin, or behind glass in discernible cabinets, as seen in his last Versailles interior (Louis XVI’s library) the architectural integration of all elements is apparent. This approach is one clearly evolved from Italian Renaissance models, and a time when books were rare and treasured objects to be kept under lock and key. A notable French precedent is illustrated in the library (c.1600) of Le Vau’s Hôtel de Lauzun, where the items in question are stored behind richly decorated panels which give no hint of the room’s function. Langley Morish, Buckinghamshire (c.1620) features a cabinet whose purpose is no more apparent, as the trompe l’oeil open books are painted on
the inside of the panelled doors. Roughly one hundred years later, William Kent designed a cabinet library for Sir Robert Walpole at Houghton. By this time, books had lost the status of hidden treasures, but were expensive enough as a collection to be featured, with their costly bindings, as the decoration itself. Private libraries in eighteenth-century England were by and large located in spaces doubling as sitting-rooms, drawing-rooms or boudoirs. With English proportions, the French idea of a cabinet could hardly be expected to apply. Perhaps the most extreme example of a non-library is Blenheim Palace’s Long Library; which with the organ supplied in 1891 by the American Heiress, Lilian Hammersley (Eighth Duchess of Marlborough), seems more like a Baroque church with scatterings

of soft furniture and floor lamps. On a more modest scale are Brettingham’s White Library at Petworth, where the bookcases flanking the chimney-piece, echo its design, and Holland’s Library at Woburn (also figure 65, page 63) where

A rare occurrence in English interior design, being at a time when according to John Evelyn (1620-1706), the "three nations of Great Britain’ contained fewer books than Paris". At Hardwick, for instance, the 1601 inventory lists only six books. Wharton / Codman, The Decoration of Houses, p.149; Jackson-Stops, The English Country House, p.198.
the bookcases are recessed, but retain their integrity as if they were separate pieces of furniture. (The French word for bookcase is bibliothèque, which might indicate a dilemma in descriptive terms for detached furniture rarely used in pre-modern France.)

William Talman’s* southern Garden Front at Chatsworth features a Long Gallery, transformed by Wyatville into the library seen today. Containing over 17,000 volumes, Wyatville’s remodelling (1815-30) necessarily has its parallels in public (or Club) library models; but the retention of Talman’s Marot-inspired ceiling and also its affinities with de Grey’s aesthetics, could have offered an alternative to the earl, had Wren’s library been intended exclusively for study. Finally, the learned earl of Chesterfield was

* In addition to Chatsworth’s South Front, work of the Dutchman, William Talman (1650-1719), includes the recently burned (August, 1989) Uppark, Sussex (c.1890) and the East Front and Orangery of Dyrham Park, Avon (c.1698). Nothing is known of his education and training, but much of his French-inspired architecture seems to have come from his study of engravings. His Chatsworth success would appear to be the deciding factor in his 1689 appointment as Controller of the King’s Works under William III. Talman’s lower estimate for the decoration of Queen Mary’s apartments at Hampton Court Palace (1699) edged out the competing Christopher Wren; and whilst influenced by the designs of Daniel Marot, he discarded the elaborate Grinling Gibbons-carved chimney-pieces and doorcases originally planned. The names of Wren, Hawksmoor, Talman, Vanbrugh and Archer lead the list of English Baroque architects. Until recently, historians have attributed Uppark to Talman, referring ultimately to J. Dallaway (Western Division of Sussex, I. 1815, pp.158-9, 193). Archtypical of post Restoration brick house design, it resembles a giant doll’s house, and is very much according to the standard format of the day, "followed by country gentlemen all over England". Jackson-Stops associates the architect James Paine with some interiors. "Uppark Bulletin", National Trust, Southern Region, Number 1, May 1990; Country Life, Vol CLXXXVI, No.8, Feb.20, 1992, pp.42-5; writer’s visit to Dyrham Park; Edwards/Ramsey, eds., The Connoisseur’s Complete Period Guides, pp.284-6; Cornforth, J., Country Life, Vol.CLXXXIII, No.37, Sept.14, 1989, p.201; Jackson-Stops, The English Country House, pp.26,28,90,95; Girouard, M., Historic Houses of Britain, William Morrow & Co. (New York-1979) pp.166-7; Harris, J., William Talman, Maverick Architect, George Allen & Unwin (London-1982) p.26.
supplied with a library that would have provided Isaac Ware a Palladian consolation within his greater Rococo fantasy. This room, unlike the examples illustrated, is decidedly a work-space, with its social function being of secondary importance. In contrast to De Grey's interiors the bookcases are the simplest elements in the room, with painted worthies displayed above in elaborate frames. Given the multi-functional room's greater height, the typical English problem of what to do with the surplus wall space is customarily given this treatment. With the exception of the queens Anne and Victoria, de Grey's Library features the owners of Wrest beginning with Henry, the Seventh Earl in the time of James I. 291

The Dining-Room features a chimney-piece relocated from number 4, St. James's Square, 292 and some ornaments salvaged from the dining-room of the old, demolished Wrest House. These include the console brackets framing the alcoves, with the corresponding pilaster and beam decoration bearing a remarkable resemblance to that seen in figure 394. Unlike Benjamin Wyatt's unsuccessful gesture at

414 - Ware Chesterfield House, London, Library (c.1748) Bedford Lemere 6608, 18/Aug./1886.

415 - Scandrett Wrest Park, The Dining Room (watercolour ptd. c.1850), BPRO L33/220.

416 - Giovanni Bagutti? Wrest Park, Dining Room console bracket salvaged from Old Wrest Park.

417 - Smith? Wrest Park, Dining Room, ceiling detail, writer's photos.
Stafford House (figures 330 and 337), the brackets here are effective embellishment to alcoves, partitioning a rectangular interior to create a square central space. (The room’s service entrance is concealed in the alcove to the left of figure 415.)

Although it would be tempting to offer a French precedent for the Dining-Room’s central ceiling design, with its octagonally framed rose and rich corner embellishments (such as the largely Louis XIV ceiling of la chambre de la Reine, Versailles) it is well within traditional English Palladian and Baroque design, and the work of seventeenth-century English and Italian stuccatori. The firm of the virtuoso, Francis Bernasconi, is suggested as having done the plaster-work here, but neither de Grey nor the house accounts record its presence - and would have, had these celebrated craftsmen been involved. In his letter, de Grey remarks: "The bas-reliefs over the doors were done by a man of the name of Smith from rough sketches of mine. After they were put up I found that his ideas of female beauty in point of roundness of form did not

a Perhaps the most celebrated bracketed alcove is in Nash’s Throne Room, Buckingham Palace, where winged victories were meant to glorify a judicial George IV, in a similar setting to that in which Louis XIV conducted business in bed. But not to be contained within convention, Nash designed the entire ceiling cove of the Palace’s Blue Drawing Room as a Piranesian extrusion of this form. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol.3, pg.293; Harris et al, Buckingham Palace and its Treasures, p.54.

b Vassalli’s library ceiling (c.1760-1) for James Stuart at Shugborough, Staffordshire, for instance. Even William Chambers offers a series of options on this design. Beard, G., Georgian Craftsmen, plt.100, pg.150; Chambers, Treatise on Civil Architecture, face-pg.134.

418 - Artist unidentified detail, French bed alcove design (c.1640) Thornton, fig.284, pg.293. 419 - Bernasconi under Nash Buckingham Palace, detail, Throne Room alcove (c.1830) Country Life. CLXXXVII, No.31, p.47. 420 - John Nash Buckingham Palace, Blue Drawing Room ceiling (c.1830) Country Life, CLXXXVII, No.31, pg.45.
correspond with mine, and I was forced to add to all their prominent points. I did some if it myself!" He refers to the most prominent of these overdoors, which depict "Painting" and "Architecture" with brushes and T-square, and the books which bear the names of his sources: "Blondel-Mansard-Le Pautre". With Bernasconi involved, no "Smith" would have been allowed to execute this.

A continuing theme of de Grey's memoirs is his concern for economy over artistic excellence, and so it is not surprising to find the work done by local craftsmen whenever it was possible. Still the degree of excellence they (or others unnamed) achieved is noteworthy.

The ceiling details of the Ante-Library for instance, show a spidery lace, very much within a Rococo format, but again, more evocative of English interpretations than the more voluptuous historical French models. A review of the countless examples available reveals the typical approach of a wide cove enlivened with coquillage and punctuated at corners
and mid-length with cartouches, most often extending the cove decoration into a largely plain, flat ceiling. Chesterfield House notwithstanding, the eighteenth-century English version, probably for practical reasons, begins with a flat ceiling upon which the cove is only suggested with a straight moulding to which the mid-length and corner embellishments are applied. Today, one of the finest example of this approach is to be seen at Petworth House (previous page), where the White and Gold Room not only displays the technique, but largely creates as well a French sensibility of cool elegance. Here, Francesco Vassalli's comparatively understated decoration has its parallel in the Ante-Library ceiling.

Wrest's door details are an advance of sorts on those at Petworth, in as much as de Grey's design features the contoured panel detail seen in Wyatt's work at Apsley and Stafford Houses. The Petworth panelling is flat. In advance
of composition appliqué, Petworth’s moulding flourishes are done in carved wood, and here one may observe a subtle advantage of having all the work done in situ. De Grey’s doors were produced locally, but the embellishments came from Jackson’s in London. Whereas French detailing, integral to the panel, is profiled exactly by the recess, it would appear that in Wrest’s case, the panel had been crafted well in advance of (certainly apart from) the decorations to be applied.

George Jackson & Sons were the only London contractors to be named as having made an architectural contribution, which included chandeliers and vases with their usual composition details. No mention of the Vestibule’s carton pierre reliefs is recorded except by the earl’s own description in his letter. However, as embellishments of this material were part of Jackson’s trade, it is likely they supplied them from stock, rather than as especially manufactured for Wrest. Together with their frames, the angelic reliefs in upper panels and overdoors (figure 432) seem appliqué rather than the integrated design elements they surely would have been as custom fitments. In spite of the exquisite carving, Edward Wyatt’s relocated decorations from Carlton House, have a similar discomfiture as applied to the doors of Windsor Castle’s Green Drawing-Room.

As with most of the other interiors, the Entrance Vestibule has more intimacy and

a Although de Grey’s house records have the efficiency of an accountant’s hand, they list only the trades without craftsmen’s and suppliers’ names. All that is known of the craftsmen are from Clephane’s and Oliver’s letters concerning the progress of the construction and fitting out. Clephane complains in several instances of difficulties in getting Jacksons to meet schedule, as did Benjamin Wyatt during the course of the work at Stafford House. It would appear that as large a manufactory as they had become, Jacksons had more contracts than they could comfortably deal with.

Bedfordshire Record Office 1/30/18/9/1-4, 7-9 (Clephane); 7/ Sept.25, 10/ Oct. (10?); 11/Oct.21, 1839 (Oliver); Stafford Record Office D593/p/22/1/16, letter 69, Feb.12, and Letter 70, March 2, 1836.
charm than sophistication. In spite of its chimney-piece and superbly crafted doors, the room is somewhat Baroque, but not French in the sense that its mood is any thing like the standard purgatorial atmosphere normally greeting visitors, who may or may not be allowed to pass further. The bible of late nineteenth-century decoration by Elizabeth Wharton and Ogden Codman succinctly states the case for entrance vestibules:

It should be borne in mind of entrances in general that, while the main purpose of a door is to admit, its secondary purpose is to exclude. [They add that although] ... A country house, where visitors are few and life is simple, demands a less formal treatment than a house in a city or town... ... The vestibule should form a natural and easy transition from the plain architecture of street to the privacy of the interior.

In Blondel's *Maisons de Plaisance* plans, no vestibules are found. A happenstance of this particular publication (*Maisons de Plaisance*). Blondel features an oval vestibule in a plan illustrated by Peter Thornton in Authentic Decor, 1984. Here he identifies "An Ideal Building, France", from Blondel's unpublished manuscript entitled *Abrégé d'Architecture concernant la distribution, la décoration, et la construction des bâtiments civils*, Paris, 1740. The manuscript is housed at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, which was known as the Bibliothèque Royale when the earl de Grey did his research there. Whether he was aware of this particular plan is unrecorded, but Wrest's vestibule is similar to the one illustrated by Thornton. Authentic Decor, The Domestic Interior 1620-1920, Viking, plt.115, pg.93; BPRO CRT 190/45/2, Memoirs 1790-1859, year 1834.
provided. Rather the visitor arrives straightway into either a gallery (or salon) with staircase hall adjacent or the staircase hall itself. Michel Gallet gives a French view:

For at least four centuries, from the unknown master of Chambord to Charles Garnier...the staircase was above all the place of reception and splendour. Louis XIV would often welcome his guests from the top of a grand stairway. There, his glory might prevent him from stepping down towards the visitor, but his words of welcome were always timely and often impressed the court by their aptitude.\textsuperscript{286}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{staircase}
\caption{434 - \textit{Unknown} Ancien Hôtel Particular, 4 rue de Braque (c.1720) Eggimann, vol. 2, plt.XVII. 435 - F.-J. Bélanger Folie St. James (1775-80) Vestibule and Stair, Friedman, pg. 71.}
\end{figure}

Whilst Gallet is describing circumstances where the reception or State rooms were on the first floor, an arrangement where they are located at ground or entrance level, largely did not affect the formality of the vestibule's decoration. Figures 434 and 435 illustrate vestibules from a Paris hôtel (c.1720) and Bélanger's Folie St. James, which is located near (and built shortly after) Bagatelle. Paralleling Wharton's instructions, one might admit that Bélanger's Neo-Classical countryside offering is slightly less ceremonious than the austere, elegant Rococo town house example, but in both instances the sense is of pause rather than rest. Robert Adam's Roman basilica for the duke of Northumberland is not meant to intimidate quite to the degree of the "dying Gaul" displayed there; but of nearly the same proportions, the late Medieval Great Hall at

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{vestibule}
\caption{436 - \textit{Adam} Syon House, The Great Hall (c.1762) © English Life Publ. Ltd., 1987.}
\end{figure}
Cotehele, Calstock, offers a traditionally English sense of shelter and hospitality which is not at all different from a visitor's first impression of Wrest's interior. French formality had no place in the mind or country seat of one whose care for local residents was more likened to that of an olden-times country squire, than a Victorian noble refugee from the Industrial Revolution. Like a country squire, whose resources were largely local and work done by resident craftsmen, his "welcome" reflects both the traditional frugality of the squire and the awareness of his dependence on those around him. Not so with the space directly following:

One can readily see in the Great Stairs, what de Grey meant in assessing the Carlton House staircase as being too small. Not only does Wrest's echo Wyatt's spectacular staircase at Stafford House, it is of an even greater scale when one considers it serves only bedrooms and domestic quarters. From its lantern design, one might speculate if de Grey had visited Stafford House. Although the lantern is of smaller dimension, its decoration follows Wyatt's to the extent that it could have graced one of the London mansion's smaller apartments. The Great Stairs' cast iron balustrade, whilst slightly simplified, follows Blondel so closely,
there can be no doubt as to its source. Again, no house records identify the craftsman, but as constructed, it echoes the Stafford House detail to the extent that one might speculate Bramah was employed here as well. De Grey’s portfolio includes a study for the Garden Front balustrading; and as with the Great Stairs’ detail, it is somewhat simplified as constructed. The writer has illustrated the corresponding Blondel design earlier (figure 298), which is paired, on the same page of *Maisons de Plaisance* with that used internally. Artistically gifted, but also blessed with a benevolent sense of humour, de Grey might have been amused at these small discoveries.

*End of Section I*
Please go to Volume 2