LORD LYTTLETON AT HAGLEY HALL

The Problem of Patronage

E.A.M. Bulmer

In the course of the literary analysis of English 18th Century architecture, Hagley Hall has variously been described as "a major landmark in the Palladian Inigo Jones tradition"[1] and "a Palladian building of no particular importance".[2] While Hagley does not rank among the houses generally argued to be the pioneers of "English Palladianism" it is by no means unworthy of study. The aim of the present enquiry is to attempt to establish Hagley Hall, its exterior articulation and interior decoration, in the context of mid-18th Century patronage.

English architecture of this period has attracted a great deal of scholarship and although much of it seeks to clarify and rationalise the mechanism and government of patronage, it is often prone to generalisation and an unjustifiably selective use of material. The Lyttleton and Miller correspondence provides a clear account of the building of Hagley Hall and also, with some reinterpretation, a valuable insight into the particular patronage of Lord Lyttleton. The letters have been selectively plundered by authors interested in documenting the design stages of the new house but material that enables elucidation of the thoughts and views of Lord Lyttleton has been mainly passed over.

No new material has been used for the present study but the existing sources have been used in a wider context to attempt to achieve some clarification of Lyttleton's outlook and the government of his patronage.

Introduction and Background

> "Sir George Lyttleton was an enthusiast born in religion and politics: absent in business, not ready in a debate, and totally ignorant of the world: on the other hand his studied orations were excellent, he was a man of parts, a scholar, no indifferent writer, and by far the honestest man of the whole society."[3]

Lord Waldegrave's description, though more complimentary than some (Lord Hervey had attributed to him a wandering mind and a tendency to reveries and forgetfulness) appears to adumbrate the main facets of George Lyttleton's character quite succinctly. His early years were characterised by the standard elements of the education of a 'young gentleman'; educated at Eton and Oxford, he embarked on the "Grand Tour" in 1728.

The 1730s fostered the development of his two leading interests: literature and politics, his achievements in which are adequately assessed by Lord Waldegrave. He was responsible for a sizeable literary output and he formed associations with most of the age's literary figures; Pope, Horace Walpole, Swift and Voltaire among others and early in his life he patronised a number of aspiring writers such as Thomson, Richardson and Smollett. Lyttleton's political ties were with two main groups; after being elected as MP for Okehampton[4] he gained the favour of Frederick, Prince of Wales later becoming his Secretary and he also allied himself with the group in opposition to Walpole under his uncle Lord Cobham.[5] Although never a distinguished politician, Lyttleton held office as Cofferer to the Navy in 1754, Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1755 and was finally elevated to the peerage in 1756.

The estate at Hagley in Worcestershire had been held by the Lyttletons since 1556 and by the 18th century, Hagley Hall had become the principal family residence, although the house was probably little more than a gradual enlarging of the original "hunting lodge".[6] On the death of Sir Thomas Lyttleton in 1751, George inherited the house and estate prompting Lord North to write to Sanderson Miller:

> "I imagine Sir George begins to be busy in the thoughts of executing his great schemes; and 'tis possible that may have postponed your entering into your winter's retirement."[7]

Lyttleton had begun the 'improvement' of Hagley Park before his father's death and had engaged the help of Sanderson Miller of Radway, a close family friend and gentleman architect who had executed work on his own estate in a gothick idiom. Miller with his builder Hitchcox, had furnished Hagley Park with a ruined castle in 1748, and it was Miller who was immediately consulted about the building of a new house:[8]

> "Sir George has wrote to me to try what I can do at a modern house. I find it very difficult to contrive a sufficient number of bedchambers without making the house very large, however I have spared no pains in considering it in every light, and can find faults enough in everything I can contrive but still hope to build a creditable convenient house for the sum he allows."[9]

This letter outlines three important stipulations that appear to have been made through the design stages of the house; a specified number of bedrooms, an emphasis on convenience and a maximum expenditure, in fact a figure of £8,000.[10]

Miller's first designs have disappeared and though it is clear

they were in the 'gothick taste'[11] it is uncertain whether he envisaged a completely new house or whether he proposed:

> "building three new fronts, and altering every room by a Gothic model, and that with an eye to frugality . . "[12]

as Shenstone reported to Lady Luxborough.

However, any plans that Lyttleton might have had for a gothic house were not shared by his forceful and opinionated second wife. It seems that while Lord Lyttleton had consulted Miller about a new house, Lady Lyttleton had asked a family friend Thomas Lennard Barrett to prevail upon his cousin John Chute of the Vyne to produce designs. Chute was at that time engaged on alterations to Strawberry Hill with Horace Walpole but his own work at the Vyne and his architectural writing indicates that he was versed in various building styles from gothic to classical. The three consecutive sets of drawings that he produced for Hagley Hall are variations on a type derived from Italian renaissance palaces, which never seems to have found a place in the architectural output of 18th century England.

In a letter of June 1752, Lyttleton explained to Miller that:

> "Upon showing the plan to my wife she finds it so different from what she desired of Mr. Barrett and so inconvenient in many respects, that I believe that no alterations that can be made in it will answer our purpose. We therefore desire that you will try your skill in the Greek Architecture being persuaded that no other Gentleman Architect will have so great regard to convenience as you, or know so well how to give us the rooms that we want, we are pretty indifferent about the outside it is enough if there be nothing offensive to the eye . . . Your Gothick House was an admirable good one and the nearer you can bring this one to that the better it will be . . . "[13]

Miller was therefore given 'carte blanche' for the exterior elevation of the new house but the Lyttletons' stipulations for the interior disposition were considerably more demanding and were the root cause of the necessity for three stages in the Chute plan and it is apparent that he never satisfactorily solved the problem; his ground plans seem confused and impractical in comparison to that finally executed.

Barrett writing to Miller in July of the same year was impatient:

> "to see your Gothic Plan brought within Italian Fronts; if you can compass this for the price Sir George fixes I shall say you have done a miracle."[14]

Miller's eventual plan may have answered the problem of the rooms required by Lyttleton but it seems unlikely that he still believed that the work could be carried out for under £8,000, though Lyttleton, in 1754 on his appointment as Cofferer to the Navy writes:

> "It is a good £2,200 per annum, all Taxes deducted, and, if I hold it three or four years will build my new House with the help of my falls of wood without my being obliged to borrow any money."[15]

Between 1753 and 1754 the design of the house was still being subjected to modification. Lyttleton had extreme faith in Miller's architectural ability and apparently, versatility, although there were elements of Chute's plan that he admired and he hoped that Miller might be able to:

> ". . . transfer some of the beauties of them (Chute's fronts) into your plan, or at least borrow some hints of them that will be useful."[16]

Finally, in May 1753 Lady Lyttleton was able to report that:

> "At last Hagley House is absolutely fixed upon, both as to the inside and the outside and perfectly to the satisfaction of Sir George and myself. Mr. Prowse has had a model made in wood . . . 'tis very simple and neat and the Towers give it a dignity; as to the inside all that is considerable is yours, some little alterations I desired by way of convenience, which Mr. Prowse has contrived so as not only to satisfy me, but (he says) to mend the House."[17] (Fig. 2,3)

As an MP Thomas Prowse would have been known to Lyttleton but it is probable that he was brought in by Miller who had worked with him at Wimpole Hall in 1750 and who was collaborating with him in the design of Warwick Shire Hall in 1754. It was Prowse who was responsible for Miller's subsequent employment of John Sanderson to draw out the Hagley plans so that they were "properly figured for the direction of the workmen".[18]

The derivation of the interior and exterior designs of Hagley Hall is unclear. Miller had not executed a building in a classical idiom before, all his previous work being gothick but Lyttleton was apparently confident that he was capable of "trying his skill in the Greek Architecture". The similarity of Hagley to a number of other "Palladian" houses argues that its design stemmed not from Miller's ingenuity but from published sources or individual buildings.

Miller did not possess an extensive collection of architectural

treatises or pattern books,[19] though his copy of Alberti's "Ten Books of Architecture"[20] seems to have received constant consultation. However, it is almost certain that he would have had access to most of the contemporary publications available, including editions of Palladio's "Quattro Libri", "Vitruvius Britannicus" and the "Designs of Inigo Jones". Miller's designs for Warwick Shire Hall also show a confident knowledge of Greek architectural forms.

Hagley's derivation has variously been attributed to Houghton, Holkham and Croome Court, all now labelled "English Palladian" houses. As published in "Vitruvius Britannicus" Houghton does have similarities with Hagley most notably its ground plan, but the articulation of the facades of Houghton have little in common with those of Hagley. Holkham on a much larger and grander scale shares only its towers with Hagley. Pevsner claims that Hagley was "immediately inspired by Croome Park"[21] and this has usually been claimed to be substantiated by a letter written to Miller by Lord Coventry in 1752:

> "Whatever merits it (Croome) may in future time boast it will be ungrateful not to acknowledge you the primary author."

This appears to refer to Croome Court and the house was still under construction in 1752 but the letter continues:

> "It was owing to your assurances that Nature had been more liberal to me than I apprehended . . . "[22]

This indicates that Miller's advice was probably concerned with the Park rather than the house and he is linked with a drainage programme of 1745.[23] The architect of the house named in "Vitruvius Britannicus" is Lancelot Brown who was also responsible for improving the Park, which even after his attention, appears to affirm Lord Coventry's need for assurance of Nature's liberality. Wittkower, who confidently attributes Croome Court to Miller,[24] analyses the motifs that were implicit in the articulation of an 'English Palladian' facade; these were the Venetian or Serlian window and the blocked quoins used as window and door surrounds, both employed by Campbell in the Houghton designs. Unlike the body of 'English Palladian' houses, Hagley relies on neither of these features for articulation of the eleven (as opposed to the standard nine) bay entrance and garden facades which, also contrary to the Palladian model, are identical. Hagley Hall therefore, is considered Palladian for its towers and possibly its rusticated basement, though this was common to many houses of the period. If these towers had been omitted from the design of the house, Hagley would have been almost identical to Devonshire House in London designed by William Kent. The articulation of

the facades is very similar and the internal arrangements including the twin staircases and room proportions are barely distinguishable.[25] The "Designs of William Kent" were published by Vardy in 1744 so it is quite possible that Miller was aware of the designs for Devonshire House.

The suggestion that the designs of the house might not have originally included the towers stems from Lady Lyttleton's remark that the house was given dignity by the Towers, perhaps implying that they were the innovation of Mr. Prowse. Exactly this treatment was applied to Kimberley Hall in Norfolk by Prowse between 1754 and 1759 as the lines of a local vicar attest:

"Fixed by Prowse's just Palladian hand,
Its towered honours stand."[26]

It seems probable that Prowse was also responsible for the arcade in the north-west front at Kimberley as it is identical to that added by him to the Hagley design.[27] That Prowse was responsible for a number of important amendments to the Hagley design is evident from the Miller correspondence. The window surrounds of the tower rooms at 'piano nobile' level bear a resemblance not just to Kent's work but also to that of Prowse at Hatch Court completed in 1755.[28] McCarthy suggests that Prowse had a greater part in the design of the exterior than Miller and correspondence between the two shows that Miller respected Prowse's greater practical and academic architectural knowledge.[29]

The direct authorship and sources of the Hagley designs will have to remain a matter for speculation. What is clear, however, is that it is inadequate to simply dismiss Hagley as "a Palladian building of no importance."

THE FURNISHING

"About the Outside".

Summerson's comment on the unimportance of Hagley Hall has the significant implication that he distinguished the house as a product of an architectural 'movement' the initiation of which in England, he was one of the first to attempt to explain. It is necessary at this point therefore, to chart briefly the important developments in the dissemination of these ideas as perceived by him.[30]

The starting point usually taken for "English Palladianism" is 1715, the year that saw the publication of Leoni's edition of

Palladio's "Quattro Libri dell'Architettura" and Campbell's "Vitruvius Britannicus", the two works that provided the basis for an introduction of selected classical motifs into domestic architecture. The importance of Leoni's "Palladio" has been convincingly diminished by Wittkower[31] who shows that Palladio's designs were radically altered by Leoni who, like Campbell, perceived an imminent building boom. Campbell used "Vitruvius Britannicus" to illustrate existing buildings of quality, coupled with his own designs for Wanstead House and an introduction advocating a reappraisal of the architectural merits of Inigo Jones and Palladio.

Summerson argues Campbell to be the chief protagonist of this "Palladian movement" encouraged by a growth in the inclination to build or rebuild country houses in the 1720s and by the 'enlightened' patronage of men like the Earls of Burlington and Leicester. In successive volumes of "Vitruvius Britannicus" Campbell published three alternative elevations for Wanstead and designs for Houghton Hall and Mereworth Castle, thereby providing the models for a large part of the architectural production of the ensuing decades.

This is of course only a very brief adumbration of Summerson's analysis but it suffices to suggest the implied importance of "Vitruvius Britannicus" as a manifesto of 'anglo-Palladian' design. The lists of subscribers were extensive and impressive, comprising aristocratic patrons, many of whom were to build or remodel country houses. Lyttleton does not appear as a subscriber to "Vitruvius Britannicus" until Woolfe and Gandon's edition of 1771 the volume which included the plans and elevation of Hagley Hall.

A further important aspect of Summerson's analysis is the suggestion of a politicising of architecture such as the theorising of the Earl of Shaftesbury during the years that fostered the establishment of the "Whig supremacy". With the Hanovarian succession and the consequent stabilisation of government came Shaftesbury's advocacy of "a national taste" to establish "a United Britain, the principle seat of the arts". His was an inherently political reaction against Tory dominance in the arts through their hold on the Board of Works and royal patronage. Shaftesbury's writings neatly dovetailed with the production of "Vitruvius Britannicus" lead to the belief that Palladian architecture, emblematic of Venetian democracy, was a potent political expression that had an immediate appeal to those contemplating architectural patronage in the first half of the 18th Century. This implies, however, that Shaftesbury's "national taste" was exemplified by a selective plundering of renaissance and classical motifs; it is perhaps ironic therefore that this 'whig expression'

should have been based upon a reappraisal of Inigo Jones, architect to the Stuart Court and Palladio, product and embellisher of a state dominated by Roman Catholicism. A "national taste" would surely have been more convincingly realised by a mode of architectural expression representative of the British heritage. The majority of buildings that expressed historical and religious independnece in Britain were recognisably gothic in character. The aim here is not to suggest that Shaftesbury was a 'gothicist' but to indicate a need for greater caution in the interpretation of the political connotations of an architectural idiom.

Statistics for the incidence of housebuilding between 1710 and 1725[32] show that the majority of patrons not among the peerage were MPs and the suggestion is that many of these politicians were Whigs who recognised the didactic potential of a building derived from a Palladian model. A patron recently blessed with wealth and political status had the means of consolidating his social and cultural pretentions; the raising of an edifice that was either derived from, or merited inclusion in "Vitruvius Britannicus" secured him his position in the new national and cultural identity.

Although Hagley Hall was not built until the 1750s the implication is that it is one of a number of houses that derived both plan and elevation from Houghton built by Sir Robert Walpole to establish his newly acquired social and financial position in Norfolk.

Contemporary reaction appears to support this; Horace Walpole in a letter of 1758 wrote:

> ". . . To my comfort, I have seen the plan of their hall,
> it is stolen from Houghton, and mangled frightfully."[33]

and Shenstone charting the progress of the building reported in 1756 that:

> "The house at Hagley is, in a manner finished, so far
> as concerns the shell; and wants nothing besides a portico
> to be as compleat as most in England."[34]

The similarity of the house to Houghton and its other derivatives such as Croome Court was not therefore unnoticed by Lyttleton's friends and Lyttleton himself toyed with the idea "of adding a Portico and other Beauties . . . "[35] This portico was never built but it indicates that Lyttleton perceived a deficiency in his facade during the building stage and he was no doubt aware of the example of Croome Court—not far distant.

The eventual determination of the designs for Hagley shows that Lyttleton cannot be numbered among those patrons who felt that the classical idiom was the immediate and only form in which to build and therefore employed the most suitable architect or

builder for the job. Lyttleton first approached a family friend over the question of his new house and simply asked him to produce designs in the Gothic or Greek styles according to the current state of the negotiations with his wife and those involved in the planning stages.

Lyttleton's attitude to the exterior articulation is unambiguously demonstrated in the letter to Miller of June 1752:

> ". . . We are pretty indifferent about the outside, it is enough if there be nothing offensive to the eye . . . "[35]

This extraordinary admission immediately indicates that the idea that modern building was most beneficially executed in an "English Palladian" style was not so obvious as to be universal. Lyttleton was not a great politician and arguably required the reassurance of classical connotations, yet his original preference was for a gothic house. More prominent examples of this 'gothick taste' such as Horace Walpole's Strawberry Hill have tended to be put down to idiosyncracy or a conscious reaction against classical dogma.

Without the evidence of the Miller correspondence, Lyttleton appears to fulfil all the criteria of the Summersonian enlightened patron; a Whig politician elevated to the peerage after a fairly successful career, much of whose time was devoted to his literary output, the embellishment of his Park and the building of a new house in a clearly classical form.

Lyttleton's own words in his correspondence with Sanderson Miller reveal him to have been a man who, despite a shortage of money, was prepared to have the appearance of a new house, practically dictated to him by a difficult wife, his patronage therefore becoming little more than pragmatism.

It is untrue, however, to suggest that Lyttleton was incapable of conscious and calculated artistic patronage and this is most clearly illustrated by the numerous 'improvements' made by him and some of his closest friends to Hagley Park. It is necessary to outline the creation of the Park in order to broaden the context of the examination of Lyttleton's patronage.

Lyttleton's overriding interest in literature manifested itself not just in his published work but also in the laying out of Hagley Park. His early years included frequent visits to his uncle's house, Stowe, where the many garden buildings were carefully contrived in a series of vistas and compositions that excited the visitor to muse on the beauties of Nature and its literary associations. These visits, coupled with his early friendship with Alexander Pope, must have helped instil in him not just a love of carefully contrived landscape but also the conviction of the ties between literature and nature.

Hagley was already well-favoured with a wealth of interesting contours and much mature woodland before Lyttleton began to adorn the Park in the 1730s. He enlisted the help of John Pitt of Encombe to advise him on planting and to design a classical rotunda and Pope claims to have had more than an advisory capacity in a letter to Ralph Allen in 1750.[37] The grounds gained numerous seats dedicated to Pope, Thomson and Shenstone among others and among the buildings were a porticoed bridge, a grotto, a hermitage, a sham ruined castle and a Doric Temple. Throughout the Park was a liberal sprinkling of inscriptions, nine of which are quoted in full in "The English Connoisseur" published by Thomas Martyn in 1767 and are taken from classical poets such as Virgil and Horace and English literary figures like Milton. Martyn explains in the preface to his book that Hagley Park and the Leasowes are included in his work as "these delightful spots are the objects of true taste" and "are admired by every person of judgement." As at Stowe, the Park was conceived in a series of Elysiums but emphasis was more on the natural and picturesque and they relied on exciting the emotions and the literary spirit[38] rather than on the gratification achieved through the recognition of classical set pieces.

> "The Park, which we are as proud of as Lord Cobham of Stowe especially since the honour Mr. Thomson has done it in the New Edition of his Seasons."[39]

wrote Lyttleton in 1745; and one has only to read Thomson's description of Hagley Park to form some idea of the desired effects of a walk in these grounds. The sources of the garden buildings were essentially selective and no form of historical continuity was attempted but all shared a common literary link in praise of Nature and the Poetic Muse.

The largest and most ambitious of the garden buildings was Miller's ruined castle, Lyttleton's first experiment with gothick architecture. Miller had already built a sham castle on his own estate at Radway, elements of which were derived from Warwick Castle and the siting of which was meant to represent that of the raising of the Royalist Standard at the battle of Edgehill. Thus Miller's building provided not only an eyecatcher from his house, but also the spirit of its historical associations. This apparently appealed to Lyttleton although it is arguable whether his interest was that of the antiquarian as he was quite prepared to plunder the genuine mediaeval ruins of Halesowen Abbey to authenticate the new feature.

The analysing of Lyttleton's interest in Gothic Architecture presents problems. It seems to have been awakened by Miller's gothick exploits at Radway but it became sufficiently strong for

him to contemplate the remodelling of old Hagley Hall along gothic lines as Shenstone's letter suggests:

> "But least of all do I approve their intention of building three new fronts and altering every room by a gothic model . . . "[40]

The appeal of gothic architecture in suggesting a secure historical pedigree is one that is often advanced as an explanation for mid-18th century gothick building. While it is true that George Lyttleton was the first member of the family to be raised to the peerage, the family's ownership of Hagley for three centuries was unchallenged and needed little substantiation. Any preference for gothic architecture has come to be remarked upon because it implied a "gothic revival", an interpretation that has gained credence by the apparent lack of a clear direction in taste in the middle of the century. B.S. Allen in "Tides in English Taste 1619-1800" argues convincingly that an antiquarian interest in gothic architecture had existed since the Middle Ages and that the complete dominance of a preference for classical forms in the early 18th century is erroneous and misleading. He claims that many mourned the passing of Elizabethan and Jacobean hospitality in the Great Hall and saw their national heritage subordinated to the influence of French taste in cooking and clothing and the transformation of the Italian temple into the English country house. Testament to a wide interest in gothic architecture was the large number of Antiquarian Societies throughout the country, and the extensive subscription to a folio of views of ruined castles and abbeys[41] published by Samuel Buck at much the same time as Campbell's "Vitruvius Britannicus".

What becomes apparent is the existence of a dual attitude to gothic architecture. Those antiquarians who appreciated the architectural achievements of the Middle Ages devoted their efforts to conserving as many gothic buildings and ruins as they could. However, there also existed a body of men who, though they admired the beauty of gothic building did so for its picturesque qualities and the interest of an irregular silhouette that punctured the skyline with pinnacles and towers. To this latter body belong Horace Walpole, Lyttleton, Miller and most of his patrons.

Hagley Park was, with the neighbouring Leasowes, the goal of many a traveller in the second half of the 18th century and literary descriptions of the Park abound.[42] It is the comment of one of these travellers that raises an interesting question. Bishop Pococke aired his views on the effect of the new house in its Park; Hagley Hall:

> ". . . as it is seen through the trees from different parts appears like what we may imagine one of the Greek and Roman Palaces to have been."[48]

This is a consideration that one would have expected of Lyttleton, who was so proud of his Park. The effect of the house in the context of the Park seems to have been overlooked, however, as the prominent position the new house enjoyed had been ignored until only a short time before the laying of the foundations in 1754. This suggests that Lyttleton considered the house as in some way separate from the Park and its literary associations so carefully contrived by his own enthusiasm and the advice of a select group of friends. Although he was prepared to exercise pragmatism in the design of a house for his family, his overbearing second wife was never invited to contribute to Lyttleton's very particular literary expression, Hagley Park. In the Park Lyttleton demonstrates himself to have been a man capable of conscious and informed patronage which makes the account of the building of the house all the more difficult to explain.

The tendency has been to divide the century into a series of consecutive 'movements' from ''English Palladianism'' through to ''Romanticism''.[44] It is these inherent historical and cultural divisions that produce the dangerous generalisations about 18th century patronage that have been too readily absorbed into the analytical process, and make it difficult to place Lyttleton.

A similar treatment was adopted by the ''Whig historians''[45] of the 18th century constitution, who analysed the progress of government in England in terms of the predominance of the Whig or Tory parties, thus downgrading the occurrence of individuality. In the present century Sir Lewis Namier interpreted the political situation of 1760 not as a two party conflict but a period of government characterised by a number of interested groups who could not accurately be labelled as wholly Whig or Tory. This interpretation was subsequently applied to the political history of the rest of the 18th century. Although now generally discredited, Namier's is an approach that might usefully be adopted for a study of 18th century taste for it is not one that is governed by the restrictive divisions of previous analysis.

The attempt to rationalise inherently subjective criteria such as taste and patronage was in fact initiated in the 18th century by contemporary writers trying to account for the dominance of particular 'styles'.

Burke in his ''A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful'' sought to establish rules by which taste could be analysed on the assumption that:

> ''It is probable that the standard both of reason and taste is the same in all human creatures. For if it were not some principle of judgment as well as sentiment common

> to all mankind no hold could possibly be taken either on their reason or their passions, sufficient to maintain the ordinary correspondence of life. It appears indeed to be generally acknowledged that with regard to truth and falsehood there is something fixed.''

The assumption is today recognised as unacceptable owing to the multitudinous elements that govern taste. Burke's contribution however, was to try and determine these elusive 'rules' by an examination of human nature and particularly emotions. The value of this psychological rather than historical approach to the study of taste is perhaps the element of real relevance to be accepted from his ''Enquiry''.

Unfortunately, on empirical evidence the early decades of the 18th century produce a picture of a universal acceptance of classical doctrine that manifested itself in the patronage of the Arts. There were certainly a large number of houses built in the first half of the 18th century that owe their appearance to an anglicised Palladianism and they have tended to suggest that the direction in architecture initiated by Inigo Jones in the 17th century was, a hundred years later, finally and universally adopted. The consequence of this is both to dismiss alternative preference in patronage as frivolous and idiosyncratic and to provide a standardised analysis of architectural inspiration.

This is the overriding factor emphasised by a study of the conception of Hagley Hall. If it were not for the Miller correspondence (and even despite it in many cases) Lyttleton would be classed in that group of patrons, the second generation of Burlingtons who perceived that a building along Palladian lines was the primary expression of political and social ascendency and that cultural pretensions were embodied in facades of classical articulation.

What Burke and many 20th century historians apparently overlook, is the existence of individuality and a variety of taste. Though content to accept it as a feature of modern society with efficient communication they cannot envisage the same phenomenon backdated more than two centuries. A letter from Lord Lyttleton to Sanderson Miller of circa 1755 is of interest in this context and is worth quoting in part; referring to ''the fine things'' he saw on his Norfolk Tour he wrote:

> ''. . . You must take an opportunity of seeing them too; for to a man of your taste no part of England is so well worth a visit at least none that I have seen. Lord Leicester's[46] alone would pay you the trouble and expense of your journey. The only danger is that it should

put you out of conceit with your Gothick Architecture; but you are a Man of too large ideas to be confined to one taste. And even Lord Leicester's wants the view of Gothick Castle to make it compleat, of which he himself is so sensible that he has desired me to make interest with you to come and give him a Plan. . ."[47]

This letter indicates that Lyttleton regarded it as a facet of the trained mind to be able to enjoy a variety of taste and that it was not therefore imperative to adhere to an architectural style that would lead to the realisation of Pope's fears as expressed in "An Epistle to Burlington" of 1731, that "imitating fools":

"Shall call the winds thro' long arcades to roar,
Proud to catch cold at a Venetian door,
Conscious they act a true Palladian part,
And if they starve, they starve by Rules of Art."

Hagley Hall has been labelled a "Palladian" house but what is evident is that its conception did not follow the pattern associated with "English Palladian" houses. Lyttleton did express an original preference for the appearance of his new house, but was not prepared to defend it in the face of opposition from his wife. Although it is known that he was prone to seek advice from a great number of his friends it is apparent that he was not a man whose 'taste' was governed by impractical or didactic forms of architectural expression. While Hagley Hall was the product of pragmatism, the laying out of the Park and the subsequent interior decoration of the new house show Lyttleton to have been "a man of too large ideas to be confined to one taste" and consequently, one very difficult to fit into the body of analysis of architectural patronage of the period.

"The Furnishing".

Shortly after the opening of Hagley hall in September 1760, one visitor to the house wrote:

"the rooms are convenient and in the justest proportions; the ceiling pieces rich; the cornices light, eligible and fanciful.[48]

and Lyttleton himself admitted in a letter to Miller of 1760 that:'

"The Beauty and Elegance of it now the furnishing of it is compleated and most of the furniture up exceeds my expectations. . ."[49]

Unfortunately, the building and decorating accounts have disappeared and it is presumed that they were destroyed in a fire of 1925 that gutted the library and a number of adjoining rooms.

Dickens and Stanton appear to have had access to some accounts as they state the amount spent on the house, Park and Church to have been £25,823.3s.4½d.[50] a sum too exact to be unsubstantiated. Beard[51] and McCarthy[52] claim that after furnishing this sum had risen to £34,000 indicating that approximately £8,000 (the sum originally stipulated for the building of the house) was laid out for the interior decoration. The only surviving accounts are those of Lord Lyttleton with the bankers Hoare and Co.[55] which list payments to "Sanderson Miller", "James Stewart", "fra. Vassall", "Mr. Cipriani" and "Wm. Chambers". Apart from Miller's builder Hitchcox, the only other craftsmen mentioned in the documentation are Lovell[54], Hollier and Bromfield.[55]

James Stuart painted the corner panels in the Drawing Room ceiling[56] and it is unclear whether it was he or Cipriani who was responsible for the central panel.[57] It has been suggested that the payments to Chambers were accepted on behalf of Cipriani.[58] The Italian stuccoist Francesco Vassalli signed a relief in the Hall and is said to have executed the roundels and putti in the same room, and the trophies and swags in the Saloon. As a consequence of this the plasterwork in the other principal rooms has been attributed to him. Apart from the fact that £50[59] is the only recorded payment to Vassalli it appears that, although the plasterwork is characteristic of the decorative work of Italian stuccadores, the design and articulation of the schemes has more than a hint of French rocaille.

The earliest mention of furnishings for the house is made by Lyttleton in a letter dated November 1752 when he requires:

> "the measure of my Best Drawing Room and Best bedchamber and Dressing room as they are in your plan. My reason for asking for them is that I believe that I have an opportunity of buying some very fine tapestry exceeding cheap. . .[60]

This tapestry, probably woven in the Joshua Morris factory, was hung in the Drawing Room which, with its ceiling paintings, plasterwork and gilt furniture upholstered to match the tapestry gives the impression of a French room of the Louis XV period.

The Library is one of the two main rooms where 'classical' features predominate. Lyttleton's collection of books (few of which betray any interest in architecture)[61] was housed in simple upright bookcases topped by broken pediments framing busts of literary figures. The frieze and ceiling mouldings are restrained by comparison with those of the other principal rooms. The other classically conceived room is the Hall, that room in the house to

which the greatest range of visitors was admitted. It boasts plaster copies of classical statues in niches articulated with shell motifs, and relief panels of mythological subjects emblematic of Nature and the pursuits of the countryside. The whole is crowned, however, by a ceiling embellished with decorative plasterwork that is derived from "rocaille" motifs of the type introduced from France by engravers such as Gravelot.

The largest room in the house, the Gallery, is divided by two screens of fluted corinthian columns and houses the collection of portraits from the old Hagley Hall. These pictures were given continuity when hung by the addition of a new set of frames carved in a free but not perceptibly 'rococo' manner.

The most important pictures in the house were listed by Thomas Martyn in 1767 in the "English Connoisseur". The house was included in his work for "the great taste" in which the grounds were laid out, but he was also given access to the principal rooms which he describes, cataloguing the paintings. Of fifty seven pictures listed, 36 were portraits by English and Dutch artists; of the remaining paintings, 8 were Dutch, 7 Italian and 4 English. It is apparent from this inventory that Lyttleton was not a great collector, many of the paintings must have hung in the old house and therefore been inherited, and the collection contains no classical landscapes of the Claude, Gaspare Poussin school with only Titian and Bassano representing the 16th century Venetians. The two rooms containing the greatest number of paintings (17 and 13 respectively) were both small dressing rooms and must therefore have had the appearance of (French) "cabinets".

Two comments by Horace Walpole indicate his feeling that Hagley was not decorated in as suitable or noble a style as Houghton or other "classical" houses. After remarking the derivation of Hagley's plan from that of Houghton, he continues:

> ". . . and *both* their eating room and salon are to be stucco with pictures."[62] (Walpole's italics)

In fact the stucco in the eating room as it survives today is limited to the frieze and ceiling. It was apparently considered irregular to repeat the combination of paintings and plasterwork in more than one room.[63] Walpole's further comment of interest here is included in the "aedes Walpoliana" a description of the art collection of Sir Robert Walpole at Houghton. He complained of ". . . the drudging mimickry of nature's most uncomely coarseness . . ."[64] which was the chief characteristic of Dutch painting. It was not until mid-century that any sort of 'vogue' for collecting Dutch painting was established and even then, it was considered to represent the taste of those who had rather limited

resources for collecting and were more confident of buying a genuine Old Master if they chose a Flemish picture.

The patronage of painting in the middle of the century displayed the same characteristics as that of the early decades. The most noble and collectable works were those of the Italian schools, the French were virtually ignored save for Claude and the Poussins, and the services of native artists were required primarily for portraiture.

It should be said of Lyttleton, however, that he lacked the capital required to purchase works of the Italian masters, by then highly sought after, particularly after the cost of building and decorating his new house. By not adding significantly to his picture collection and by the widespread application of decorative plasterwork (a relatively cheap form of wall and ceiling decoration) Lyttleton was able to direct most of his resources for the interior to the purchase of fine furniture and fittings.

The Guide Book of 1902 to Hagley Park suggested that the house was "chiefly remarkable for . . . the appropriateness of the decorations," the implication being that the appearance of the interiors was as should be expected of a house the exterior of which is seen to be derived from a Palladian prototype. However, houses such as Houghton and Holkham appear to have aimed at recreating classical proportions and grandeur, not simply in the exterior articulation but also in the interior decorative schemes. Classical motifs were applied with a view to achieving nobility and elegance through Vitruvian correctness. Niches holding statues, reliefs, classical cornices and mouldings abounded, and shared origins of design with much of the furniture both fitted and moveable. The decorative treatment of the interior subject to the least variation, was the division of the ceiling in a manner directly derived from Inigo Jones, especially his design for the Banqueting House in Whitehall. This style of decoration used and evolved by architects such as William Kent, formed the basic model for interiors of English Palladian houses. The Italian stuccoists who originally worked under architects such as Gibbs, were also employed for the decoration of Palladian houses, Mereworth Castle by Colin Campbell being a conspicuous example. By the 1750s standard classical interior decoration was represented by stucco work that encompassed: mythological reliefs, busts, trophies, garlands and rampant scrollwork applied in a lighter and less disciplined manner than the more "robusto" classicising of the Kent School.

At Hagley Hall therefore, the appropriateness of the decoration extends to the Hall and Library; the former for receiving visitors from members of the estate staff to personal guests of Lord Lyttleton

and the latter for housing the book collection containing many classical texts. The remainder of the rooms do not conform to the canon of classical taste but reveal an impression of French elegance embodied in the furnishings and the resrained but discernibly ''rocaille' forms of the pasterwork. These interiors have been described as ''rococo'' and they should be seen as produced by a preference for ''comfort, convenance et bien-sceance''[65] as embodied in French apartments of the period.

It remains to attempt to analyse Lyttleton's 'francophile' taste. The studies of Summerson, Lees-Milne and others have led to a general belief that the unquestioned goal of the Grand Tour was Italy and, more specifically, Rome, Florence, Venice and Naples. France did not receive a great deal of attention and antiquarian interest was only aroused by classical monuments such as the Maison Carrée at Nimes.

Lyttleton's letters to his father from Paris and Luneville display a genuine interest in French Society, and politics and a ''virtuous and studious''[66] attitude to learning the language and manners of the French. He writes of an admiration for the finery of French dress which often occasioned requests for further funding and a determination that:

> ''A stay in any place will depend on my liking the company.''[67]

To his father's suggestion that he should travel to Italy, Lyttleton exhibited a reluctance based on the anxiety that learning Italian (though he knew of a good Academy at Siena) would be to the detriment of his grasp of the French language. When he did continue into Italy, his comments concerning classical antiquity and architecture are confined to an admiration of the palaces of Genoa and an admission that:

> ''I shall go from Rome with a strong imperfect knowledge of the great variety of fine antiquities that are in it, more time than I have passed here being requisite to see them as one should do.''[68]

Lyttleton therefore, returned from his Grand Tour with a cursory knowledge of the antique remains in Italy and a relatively well-developed perception of French culture and society. When Lyttleton was elected to Parliament, however, he allied himself to a group sometimes known as the ''Boy Patriots''[69] for their vehement opposition to Walpole and his maintenance of peace with England's old enemies, among them France. It is unclear whether Lyttleton's motives were political opportunism, family allegiance or adherence to ideals, but that he was essentially an opposition politician was reinforced by his association with Leicester House,

the London residence and fashionable court of Frederick, Prince of Wales, whose antagonism towards his father, George II was notorious.

George Virtue recorded that Frederick, unlike his father and grandfather, took an active interest in the arts and not only had he a mental catalogue of the entire Royal Collection, but he also played a part in the patronage of native and living artists. Leicester House attracted those politicians who were opposed to the King's Ministers and those members of fashionable society who realised that the entertainments it offered were more animated and informal than those of Hampton Court. The Prince of Wales was seen as the nominal head of a fashionable elite, and Lyttleton as his Secretary and "chief favourite"[70] would have witnessed London society's various vogues. Although Lyttleton's preference was for the quiet solitude of Hagley Park (attested by the fact that his work for the Prince of Wales was unpaid in order to avoid total commitment)[71] he must have had to spend a good deal of time in London to pursue his Parliamentary duties and no doubt, at the behest of his society-loving wives.

In the early 1740s the Prince of Wales started attending the entertainments and alfresco meals in the Vauxhall Gardens; "where the jazz spirit of 18th century London was wont to manifest itself most hilariously. . . "[72] A special pavilion was erected there for him while other ticket holders were provided with "supping boxes" arranged in curving wings decorated in a delicate and fanciful gothick style and the walls of which were hung with scenes painted by Francis Hayman and his associates. The emphasis of the Gardens was one of fashionable parade in exotic surroundings comprising capricious gothick and chinoiserie structures and a large rotunda decorated with unrestrained rococo forms, in its large cupola and in the glasses and girandoles that adorned its walls. It seems highly likely that Lyttleton accompanied the Prince of Wales to the Vauxhall Gardens on occasion and he must therefore have had some awareness of the sources of this new decorative form.

It was apparently Hogarth who produced the idea of the "ridotto alfresco" that saved the Vauxhall Gardens from financial collapse and it was Hogarth's artistic circle in and around St. Martin's Lane that provided the scene decorations. The St. Martin's Lane Academy and Slaughter's Coffee House, the regular meeting place of a "St. Martin's Lane Set" fostered the growth of the "rocaille" decorative style in England. Apart from a number of influential French pattern books it was the arrival of the engraver Gravelot in London in 1732 that heralded the beginning of the gradual and somewhat limited dissemination of rococo forms and ideas in England. Gravelot specialised in book engraving which, by its

potentially wider public than that of painting, assured his work a certain amount of popular exposure. Although a number of his engravings in collaboration with Hayman for the Vauxhall Gardens decorations depict chairs with interlaced backs,[73] it was the use of rocaille forms in his frontispieces and illustration surrounds that appears to have had the greatest influence on furniture design. St. Martin's Lane was the address, not only of the Academy where Gravelot conducted drawing classes, but also of many of the more prominent carvers' workshops including the firms of Vile and Cobb and the newly successful Thomas Chippendale. Chippendale, who may have been trained at the St. Martin's Lane Academy,[74] demonstrated in his "The Gentleman and Cabinet Maker's Director" of 1754 and in subsequent further editions, an adoption of gothick, chinese and rocaille forms for the design and articulation of high quality furniture. He was by no means alone in this as other carvers and craftsmen produced similar pattern books to cater for the "gout du jour".[75] In a more discernibly rococo vein were the designs of Thomas Johnson a carver, who, when it was within his means, moved to Grafton Street in the same parish as Leicester House and, at the height of his career, ran two workshops in Tottenham Court Road. His designs were wholly asymmetrical and were derived from French sources such as Berain and Toro and even Barlow's illustrated edition of "Aesop's Fables". Ironically, Johnson was a member of the Anti-Gallican Association founded in 1745 to oppose "the insidious arts of the French Nation". It is arguable whether this is satirical allusion or demonstration of fear of the import of "papier mâché" from France.

In the 1740s and 1750s therefore, in a relatively concentrated area of London, the use of "rococo" decoration flourished and it cannot be coincidence that Hogarth in his "Analysis of Beauty" argued that although beauty was ultimately derived from the antique it was dependent on the variety and even irregularity of form and a composition constituted by "serpentine line".

The two notable houses in London decorated at this period that acknowledged a debt to the French manner were Norfolk House[76] and Chesterfield House[77]. Both houses had simple classical elevations, that of Norfolk House by Brettingham, builder of Holkham and that of Chesterfield House by Isaac Ware who collaborated with Burlington to produce an unaltered edition of Palladio's "Quattro Libri".[78] The interiors of both houses, designed for frequent and lavish entertaining, were resplendent with gilded rococo wall and ceiling decoration and the furnishings were all typical of the production of the aforementioned workshops. The conscious effect of these houses was to surprise the visitor by the richness of the decoration in the French manner concealed behind

unassuming classical facades. The fact that the facades of houses that were given rococo interiors were all classical is suggestive, not of unenlightened taste, but that the rococo in England was solely a cosmetic art applied to the enriching of interiors and furnishings. The architect of Chesterfield House, Isaac Ware, published in 1756 his "Compleat Body of Architecture" in which were contained his designs for the house but also a fierce attack on the importation of decorative fashions from France. Justifying his work at Chesterfield House by claiming that those who requested decoration in the French manner should be indulged for "they deserve no better" he reasoned that rocaille forms had replaced those of Greece and Rome:

> ". . . not because the possesser thinks there is or can be elegance in such fond weak illjointed and unmeaning figures! It is usually because it is French."[79]

The implication that a taste developed in England simply because it was imported from France, is difficult to substantiate. France and England were at war for most of the 18th century and English nationalism was such that it would not condone the culture of its enemy without good reason. The success of the introduction of the "gout du jour" in London is in part explained by the idea that the French were masters in the 'art of living' and knew how to create a set of apartments that embodied elegance and grandeur with a regard for intimacy, comfort and function. As a backdrop to a formal or informal social occasion, usually at night, the interiors of Norfolk and Chesterfield House must have seemed unsurpassable in their combination of splendour and refinement, that relied neither on Vitruvian austerity nor classical dogma, whilst also confirming the taste and discernment of their owners.

That the interior of their house was of primary importance to both Lord and Lady Lyttleton is amply demonstrated by the documentation of its design stages. The implication is that the room disposition was governed by a clear perception of the functions of the house. As the ground plan engraved in "Vitruvius Britannicus" Volume V shows, the "piano nobile", besides comprising the principal rooms, included the two bedrooms and three dressing rooms that formed the apartments of Lord and Lady Lyttleton, conveniently close to the Library and Saloon. The rest of the house two floors of bedrooms, must have been intended for guests and servants as Lyttleton's only children (by his first marriage) lived with their maternal gandmother and Lyttleton's brothers and sisters were all married and settled elsewhere. The idea of the family home may have been emblematic but it was not the raison d'être of the house's creation. The geographic isolation of the Hall may have accounted for the stipulation of the number of bedrooms, which

had been made even before the first gothick design, as guests would have been expected to stay in the house for a period rather than make a fleeting visit. However, constant and liberal entertaining was not apparently envisaged, as is indicated by Lyttleton in a letter of June 1752 discussing the need for:

> "a room of separation between the Eating Room and the Drawing Room to hinder the Ladies from hearing the noise and talk of the Men when they are left to their bottle, which must *sometimes* happen *even* at Hagley . . ."[80] (author's italics)

The largest assembly at Hagley Hall that is recorded was that of the 'housewarming' when friends of the Lyttleton family and the neighbouring society were entertained for three days and the only disapprobation of the proceedings was made by Charles Townshend who complained of the tripartite division of the assembled company according to rank, and the failure of the servants to air the beds.

Hagley Hall appears to have been conceived as a house primarily for entertaining but one that replaced the family home without assuming its functions.[81]

Lyttleton's marriage ended in 'amicable separation' in 1759 so that although Lady Lytttleton played a prominent role in the design of the house, she was never actually to take up residence in it. Lord Lyttleton was therefore, chiefly responsible for the interior decoration of the house and he enlisted the help of Mrs. Montagu in London to supervise the purchase and despatch of some of the furnishings.[82]

Lyttleton spent a relatively high sum on the transforming of the interior of an English Palladian house into a suite of rooms that were to combine the elegance and comfort of decoration in the French manner with a restraint of ornament suitable to a rural setting evolved for literary contemplation rather than as the meeting place of fashionable urban society.

The interior decoration of Hagley Hall was at no point dictated by the rules associated with the Palladian exterior of the house. The demand of Lord Lyttleton was for "comfort, convenance et bien sceance", and in this sense he pre—empted the work of Robert Adam who claimed that it was he and his brother who effected the:

> "remarkable improvement in the form, convenience, arrangement and relief of apartments."[83]

Lyttleton's Grand Tour, his political career and his disregard for classical dogma instilled in him an admiration for decoration in the French manner; to which Hagley Hall remains faithful testament.

Inherent in the entire body of analysis of 18th century architecture is the acceptance that the English aristocracy in the Georgian era was blessed with a perception of what constituted a just and beautiful building. The approach to the examination of 18th century building has in itself been 18th century; subjectivity has been the foundation on which an apparently objective analysis has been constructed. This basically 'right wing' approach (adopted by Summerson, Lees-Milne, Hussey and others) has managed to create an analytical framework in which patronage, although conservative, can still be enlightened.

The belief in the rationality of thought and advanced aesthetic sense of 18th century house builders has lead to a tendency to generalise about the government of patronage. Hence, men like Burlington become the arbiters of taste for a complete section of society, for over twenty years. When finally his influence can no longer be recognised, in the middle of the century, taste becomes "confused", "unsettled" or "inchoate"[84] and the rest of the century becomes a series of neatly interlocking 'movements' such as the Gothic and Greek Revivals.

When one attempts to analyse the building of Hagley hall in the context of this approach to the 18th century, it becomes apparent how inadequate it is. Hagley Hall and Park contain elements from all the 'movements' that collectively are said to have made up the 18th century[85] and therefore makes a mockery of this artificial historicist approach. Fortunately, sufficient documentation exists for the building of Hagley Hall to determine that Lyttleton was not subject to a belief in the dominance of a particular architectural idiom. While he was obviously not as confident of his own views as Burlington or Coke, he was not sufficiently susceptible to fashion or a prevalent taste to rule out free choice as to the appearance of his new house. Although he became "indifferent about the outside" he possessed and fulfilled a preference for "rococo" decoration for the interiors.

What the example of Lyttleton shows is that patronage is not necessarily governed by adherence to individual doctrine but is initially the product of subjectivity and can embody a variety of values that operate in an unconnected but rational way. In the final analysis, whether Lyttleton "reflected closely the informed taste of the decade 1750-1760"[86] or represented "the uncertainty of taste in the middle decades of the 18th century"[87] cannot be dependent on the existing analysis as it does not acknowledge the validity of individuality or the co-existence of a variety of tastes.

The government of patronage is dependent on a whole range of unconnected factors (in any century) and the establishment of

hard and fast rules by which to analyse taste is anachronistic. This apparently simple factor is most poignantly brought out by the study of the building of Hagley Hall and calls into question the authority of much of the existing architectural analysis of the 18th century. Perhaps the most one can do to rationalise the patronage of Lord Lyttleton, is to suggest that, in his own words, he was:

> "A Man of too large ideas to be confined to one Taste."[88]

NOTES

1. Peter Reid: *"Burke's and Savill's Guide to Country Houses"* Vol. II, p.205. A lightweight guidebook; the description of Hagley Hall is taken from Pevsner's *"The Buildings of England"* BE 35 Worcestershire, p.177.
2. John Summerson: *"Architecture in Britain 1530-1830"*, p.399.
3. *"Lord Waldegrave's Memoires"* quoted in L. Dickins and M. Stanton: "An 18th Century Correspondence", 1910, p.146.
4. Thomas Pitt's Rottenborough.
5. Known as "Cobham's Cubs", the "Boy patriots" or the "Cousinhood" the members: Lyttletons, Grenvilles and Pitts were all related to the Temple family of Stowe.
6. Horace Walpole in a letter to Bentley of September 1753 writes: ". . . Sir George Lyttleton's house is unmeasurably old and bad; one room at the top reckoned a conceit of those days, projects a vast way into the air." W.S. Lewis: *"Horace Walpole's Correspondence"*, Vol. 35, p.147.
7. Dickins & Stanton: Op Cit, p.183.
8. The building of the new house is well documented in Michael McCarthy: *"The Building of Hagley Hall"* Burlington Magazine, April 1976.
9. Warwick County Records.
10. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.285.
11. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.284.
12. Williams: *"Letters of William Shenstone"* p.322. Shenstone was a poet friend of Lyttleton's; he had been improving the grounds of his "ferme ornée the Leasowes, not very far from Hagley.
13. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.284. (McCarthy omits to discuss Lyttleton's indifference to the exterior).
14. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.285.
15. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.230.
16. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, pp.285-286.
17. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, pp.286-287.
18. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.290.
19. Wood and Hawkes: *"Sanderson Miller of Radway"*, Banbury Historical Society, 1969.
20. Now preserved in the Library of the Faculty of Architecture, Cambridge.
21. See Note 1.
22. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.214.
23. See G. Beard: *"Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England 1660-1820"*.
24. R. Wittkower: *"Palladio and English Palladianism"* p.162.
25. See Woolfe and Gandon: *"Vitruvius Brittannicus"* Vols. IV and V.
26. M. Girouard: *"Hatch Court"* Country Life, October 22nd 1964.
27. M. McCarthy: *"The Building of Hagley Hall"*, Burlington Magazine, April 1976. p.223, note 55.
28. See Note 26.
29. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.289 f.
30. Summerson's analysis in *"The Classical Country House"* Journal of the Royal Society of Arts 1959 and *"Architecture in Britain 1530-1830"* represents the basic approach adopted by most historians of the period.

31. Wittkower, Op Cit, pp.79-85.
32. J. Summerson: *"The Classical Country House"*, Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, 1959.
33. W.S. Lewis: Op Cit, Vol. 35, pp.103-104.
34. Williams, Op Cit, p.460.
35. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.287.
36. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.284.
37. "Among Other Places I have been at Sir Thomas Lyttleton's where your Pillar is impatiently expected. And where I have designed three buildings" Brownell: "Alexander Pope and the Arts of Georgian England". The "Pillar" referred to may be the Prince of Wales Column, a gift to Lyttleton.
38. In 1768 Lady Temple wrote to lady Brown that Queen Mab had presented her with some verses by Lord Lyttleton in a romantic part of the Park. G. Beard: *"Hagley Hall, Worcestershire"* The Connoisseur Year Book, 1954.
39. Lyttleton MSS, Vol. II, 1738-1746.
40. Williams, Op Cit, p.322.
41. Even Burlington was among the subscribers.
42. Thomson, Horace Walpole, Joseph Heeley, Thomas Martyn, Richard Dodsley, William Mason, Wheatley, Dr. Johnson and Bishop Pococke all describe the Park at Hagley.
43. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, pp.287-288. Pococke was no doubt referring to Pliny whose association with landscape was significant, particularly to Hoare at Stourhead. See Kenneth Woodbridge: *"The Stourhead Landscape"* The National Trust, 1974.
44. These movements are crudely: "English Palladianism", "Chinoiserie", "Rococo", "Gothick Revival", "Greek Revival" and "Romanticism".
45. Lord Macauley et al.
46. Holkham Hall.
47. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.235.
48. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.291.
49. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.295.
50. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.292.
51. Beard: *"Hagley Hall, Worcs."*, The Connoisseur Year Book, 1954.
52. McCarthy, Op Cit, p.225.
53. McCarthy, Op Cit, p.225.
54. McCarthy, *"J. Lovell and his Sculptures at Stowe"* Burlington Magazine April 1973.
55. Dicknis & Stanton, Op Cit, p.293.
56. Climenson: *"Elizabeth Montagu 1720-1761"*, Vol. II, p.150.
57. Thomas Martyn, Op Cit, p.43. Attributes the ceiling to Cipriani.
58. McCarthy, Op Cit, 2.225.
    T. Martyn Op Cit, p.43 lists three works at Hagley attributed to Cipriani: the ceiling, an arcadian scene and a drawing perhaps accounting for the £200 paid to Cipriani and Chambers.
59. Beard in *"Decorative Plasterwork in Great Britain"* publishes the Croome Court accounts indicating that £50 would only have paid for the wall decorations of a single room.
60. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.286.
61. The earliest Library inventory at Hagley is that of 1811. The majority of the books were French and classical texts but there were no architectural treatises such as Vitruvius, Alberti or Palladio and no Architectural publication before Wood's "Ruins of Palmyra" of 1753.
62. W.S. Lewis, Op Cit. Vol. 35, pp.103-104.
63. One can only speculate on the reason for this. Did it imply that every room should display a diverse form of decoration or that Walpole disliked the combination of stucco and pictures and was dismayed that it should be applied to 2 rooms?
64. Quoted in the preface to Martyn's *"The English Connoisseur"*. Martyn alludes to the supremacy and desirability of Italian painting in his preface. In the early 18th Century Van Dyck was thought inferior to Sir Godfrey Kneller and throughout the century every Venetian portrait was attributed to Titian or Veronese. See Herrmann: *"The English as Collectors"*.
65. The phrase was coined by Blondell in *"Architecture Francoise"* 1732-1736. Blondell's work was to have a strong influence on Robert Adam, see M. Gallet:

"Parisian domestic architecture of the 18th Century." The small body of houses which gained French influenced interiors were: Woodcote Hall, Belvedere House, Chesterfield House, Woburn Abbey, Petworth and Stratfield Saye.

66. Lyttleton MSS, Vol. I, 1660-1738.
67. Lyttleton MSS, Vol. I, 1660-1738.
68. Lyttleton MSS, Vol. I, 1660-1738.
69. See Note 5.
70. Lyttleton MSS, Vol. I, 1660-1738. ". . . he then advised me in all his affairs for I was his chief favourite." 1735.
71. Lyttleton MSS, Vol. I, 1660-1738.
72. B.S. Allen: *"Tides in English Taste 1619—1800"*, Vol.II, p.81.
73. See D. Fitz-Gerald: *"Chippendale's place in the English Rococo"*, Furniture History, 1968.
75. The phrase used in France for the "rococo" decorative style.
76. The Duke of Norfolk was a member of the opposition group associated with the Prince of Wales.
77. Chesterfield was a close friend of Lyttleton's. His portrait hangs in the francophile atmosphere of the Drawing Room at Hagley.
78. Ware also co-ran the St. Martin's Lane Academy with Hogarth in 1738.
79. Quoted in B.S. Allen, Op Cit, II, p.115.
80. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.284.
81. For a discussion of the ground plan of Hagley Hall see: M. Girouard: *"Life in the English Country House"*, pp.201-204.
82. Climenson, Op Cit, Vol. II, pp.192-195. Maud Wyndham: *"Chronicles of the 18th Century"* Vol. II.
83. Robert and James Adam: *"The Works in Architecture"*, Vol. I., Preface. 1773.
84. B.S. Allen, Op Cit, Vol. II, p.106 f.
85. See Note 44.
86. C. Hussey: *"English Country Houses: Early Georgian"*.
87. B.S. Allen: Op Cit, Vol. II, p.106.
88. Dickins & Stanton, Op Cit, p.235.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lyttleton MSS, Vols. I—VI, 1660-1849

ADAM, Robert & James — *"The Works in Architecture:*
ALLEN, B.S. — *"Tides in English Taste 1619-1800"*
BEARD, G. — *"Georgian Craftsmen and their Work"*
BEARD, G. — *"Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England 1660-1820"*
BEARD, G. — *"Decorative Plasterwork in Great Britain"*
BEARD, G. — *"Hagley Hall"* Connoisseur Year Book, 1954
BEARD, G. & FOLKES — *"Chute and Hagley Hall"* Architectural Review 1952
BLUNT, A. — *"Baroque and Rococo Architecture and Decoration"*
BRACKETT — *"Thomas Chippendale"*
BOLTON, A.T. — *"Hagley Hall"*, Country Life, 1915
BROWNELL — *"Alexander Pope and the Arts of Georgian England"*

CAMPBELL, C. *"Vitruvius Britannicus"*
CHIPPENDALE, T. *"The Gentleman and Cabinet Makers' Director"*
CLARK, K. *"Gothic Revival"*
CLIMENSON *"Elizabeth Montagu 1720-1761"*
COLVIN, H.M. *"A Biographical Dictionary of Architects 1600-1840"*
DAVIS, T. *"The Gothick Taste"*
DICKINS, L. & STANTON, M. *"An 18th Century Correspondence"*
FITZ-GERALD, D. *"Chippendale's Place in the English Rococo"*
FITZ-GERALD D. *"Gravelot and his influence on English Furniture"*
FITZ-GERALD D. *"The Norfolk House Music Room"*
FOWLER & CORNFORTH *"18th Century Interior Decoration"*
GIROUARD, M. *"Life in the English Country House"*
GIROUARD, M. *"Hatch Court"* Country Life, 22nd October 1964
GIROUARD, M. *"English Art and the Rococo"*, Country Life, 1966
GOWING *"Hogarth, Hayman and the Vauxhall Decorations"*
HARRIS, J. *"A Catalogue of British Drawings for Architecture, Decoration, Sculpture and Landscape Gardening 1550-1900 in American Collections"*
HARRIS, J. *"The Palladians"*
HASKELL *"Taste and the Antique"*
HAYES, J. *"French Taste in English Painting, Kenwood"*, Burlington Magazine CX August 1968
HAYWARD, H. *"Thomas Johnson and the English Rococo"*
HERRMANN *"The English as Collectors"*
HODGETTS, J. *"The Letters of Lady Luxborough to William Shenstone"*
HOGARTH, W. *"Analysis of Beauty"*
HUNT & WILLIS *"The Genius of the Place"*
HUSSEY, C. *"English Country Houses"*—Georgian and mid-Georgian
KAUFFMAN *"Architecture in the Age of Reason"*
KIMBALL, F. *"Le Style Louis XV"*
LEES-MILNE, J. *"Earls of Creation"*
LEWIS, W.S. *"The Correspondence of Horace Walpole"*
McCARTHY, M. *"The Building of Hagley Hall"*, The Burlington Magazine, April 1976

McCARTHY, M.	*"J. Lovell and his Sculptures at Stowe"*. Burlington Magazine, April 1973
MANWARING	*"Italian Landscape in 18th Century England"*
MARTYN, T.	*"The English Connoisseur"*
NARES, G.	*"Hagley Hall"* Country Life, 1957
OSWALD, A.	*"Radway Grange"*, Country Life
PALLADIO, A.	*"The Four Books of Architecture"*
PEVSNER, N.	*"The Buildings of England"*
PEVSNER, N.	*"The Picturesque Garden and its Influence Outside the British Isles"*
PHILLIMORE, R.J.	*"Memoirs and Correspondence of George, 1st Lord Lyttleton, 1734-1773"*
REID, P.	*"Burke's & Savill's Guide to Country Houses"* Vol. II
SAISSELIN	*"Taste in 18th Century France"*
SHAFTESBURY	*"Characteristics"*
STEEGMAN	*"The Rule of Taste"*
SUMMERSON, J.	*"Architecture in Britain 1530-1830"*
SUMMERSON, J.	*"The Classical Language of Architecture"*
SUMMERSON, J.	*"The Classical Country House"* Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, July 1959
THOMSON	*"The Seasons"* (Revised Edition 1744)
TIPPING, H.A.	*"Hagley Hall"*, Country Life 1926
TURNER	*"Decorative Plasterwork"*
VERLET	*"French Furniture and Decoration of the 18th Century"*
WATKIN, D.	*"The English Vision"*
WHEATLEY	*"On Gardening"*
WHITLY	*"The Artists and their Friends 1700-1799"*
WILLIAMS	*"The Letters of William Shenstone"*
WITTKOWER, R.	*"Palladio and English Palladianism"*
WOOFE & GANDON	*"Vitruvius Britannicus"*, Vols. IV & V
WOOD & HAWKES	*"Sanderson Miller of Radway"*, Banbury Historical Society
WYNDHAM, M.	*"Chronicles of the 18th Century"*