

Review Article

A Line on Copper: The Art and Practice of Engraving in the Age of Enlightenment – Expertise, Enterprise, Education and Entertainment

Iain Gordon Brown

David Alexander, *A Biographical Dictionary of British and Irish Engravers 1714–1820* (London, Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art; distributed by Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2021). 1047 pp. ISBN 978 1 913107 21 5. Hbk. £75.

It has been my privilege to discuss, in the pages of *Scottish Archives*, two previous great works of scholarship from the Paul Mellon Centre/Yale University Press stable. These were the fourth edition of Sir Howard Colvin's *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600–1840* (2008); and Ingrid Roscoe, with Emma Hardy and M. G. Sullivan, *A Biographical Dictionary of Sculptors in Britain 1660–1851* (2010).¹ Publication of David Alexander's new compilation allows me to complete a hat-trick of reviews of invaluable reference works that illuminate – transform, even – the study of British cultural history.

Almost any collection of historic family or estate papers, and many an archive of a corporate body such as a regiment, a commercial concern of long-standing or an old established club, society or institution of one kind or another, is highly likely to contain examples of engraving. These may range from ornamental bill-heads and handsome trade cards to burgess tickets, membership documents, and ephemera of all sorts. Maps large and small, charts and architectural plans will in all probability be included. Topographical prints are very likely to be present; portrait engravings almost certainly so. Social and political satires and caricatures may well be expected. Other categories of engraved material might range from fashion plates to printed musical scores. Engravers were responsible for producing all such items, and many more besides.

It is all too easy for us – living, as we do, surrounded by images in photographic and now digital form – to forget that, in the period covered by

¹ I. G. Brown, 'British Architects and Sculptors in their Lives and Works', *Scottish Archives*, 16 (2010), 123–33.

David Alexander, all dissemination of images was by the medium of one or other method of reproductive printmaking. Alexander deals with the age of copperplate engraving from the accession of the House of Hanover until the death of King George III – although, in fact, his coverage extends rather further, indeed well into the reign of Victoria. After 1820 or thereabouts, steel engraving and lithography increasingly took over; and, later still, wood-block illustration became ubiquitous. By ‘engraving’ on copper is to be understood also etching, aquatinting and the various specialist techniques such as mezzotint and stipple, and not just the most universally practised medium of line-engraving.

One can forget, too, the importance of the engraver’s art and profession in the fabric of society. Alexander’s book indicates how many people were employed in the trade; it also demonstrates how many amateur engravers and etchers there were. The appearance of more than a few women in the ranks of the engravers is interesting. Something like a total of three thousand biographical entries make up this huge *Dictionary*. Had the publisher not insisted that the author trim his text by a very large proportion, even more lives and careers would have been noted and discussed. Individual entries range from a few lines on a minor engraver – the Irishman Henry Trench is here, yet he was responsible for only one etching – to a substantial essay on some of the major practitioners of the trade. One learns a great deal, for example, about Francesco Bartolozzi (who may stand here as representative of those distinguished European engravers who found even greater fame and fortune in Britain); the Basire and Boydell families; Matthew and Mary Darly, pioneer publishers of political satires; James Heath and Francis Jukes; Thomas Major and John Keyse Sherwin.

As Alexander writes in his incisive (no pun is intended) and informative introductory essay, with its overarching title of ‘Engraving and Cultural Supremacy’, the print market in Britain became ‘a powerful barometer of artistic and intellectual development’, exemplifying the profound change which overtook the country in this period. Britain became a great power; society became more fluid and more urban. More people enjoyed more purchasing power and wider horizons. Education spread; technology developed; interest in history, topography and travel, both domestic and foreign, increased. Medical and scientific knowledge leapt forward. This was the changing and expanding universe that the engravers served, and in which they in turn disseminated knowledge.

The extensive and valuable introduction is divided into two parts: ‘The Engraver’s World’ (with six judiciously arranged sections), and ‘The Development of Engraving, 1714–1837: An Outline’ (which has thirty-nine sections). These cover every aspect one might think of. General points are reinforced by examples of the experience and achievement of individuals. Lots of engravers went bankrupt: Alexander explains why this was often their fate. He also discusses the status, social identity and financial standing of the profession. The importance of Hogarth’s Act of 1735 in establishing copyright protection – hence the printed line beneath many an image, viz. ‘Published as the Act directs’ – is addressed. The importance of several individual plates in the history of British engraving

as a whole is made clear in the mini-essays on two celebrated works by the great William Woollett. Due attention is paid to the very important place of book illustration, first in the case of literary works, and then (and more especially) in that of works relating to topography and to scientific and technical subjects.

No criticism is intended when a reviewer, who has tackled the other ‘companion’ volumes already referred to, points out that the scope of Alexander’s volume is, in chronological terms, clearly very much narrower. But it has to be admitted that Alexander’s is also a rather different kind of reference work, and that in some significant ways it is more limited.

Alexander does not attempt to list all the output of all the engravers included within his covers in the way that Colvin lists magisterially all the buildings designed by his architects, and that Roscoe does the busts, statues and monuments carved or cast by her sculptors. For the output of engravers, such a task would have been impossible. Think, for a minute, of the sheer number of plates that it is theoretically possible to find in books of all kinds appearing between 1714 and 1820, and then again of the tens of thousands of individual prints likely to have been published and sold in a buoyant market in the same period – maps, music, ephemera and the rest of the engravers’ varied and miscellaneous cumulative output included. The number of portrait plates alone must be vast; equally, the production of social and political satires was very large. ‘Fine art’ prints – engravings that reproduce works of art originally created in other media, most notably paintings, works of sculpture and antiquities – were issued in great quantity. The output of topographical prints, widely defined, increased enormously to meet a rising demand among people keen to know more about their own country and equally about the rest of the world, especially at time when travel was limited for economic reasons or largely impossible due to war.

George Vertue engraved about 1,100 plates, and is known to have employed only one apprentice in the whole of his long and distinguished career. The fact that he was a one-man-band caused him to lose out to the Dutchman Jacob Houbraken in the commission to engrave the plates for the Knaptons’ *Heads of the Most Illustrious Persons of Great Britain* (otherwise known as ‘Birch’s Heads’). Houbraken had a large studio and assistants, and could take on a major project of this kind. Charles Turner engraved 638 mezzotint portraits and some three hundred subject prints. Andrew Bell, of Edinburgh, engraved hundreds of plates for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, of which he was joint proprietor with William Smellie. Bell went on to engrave around three hundred anatomical plates after Bernard Albinus for an edition published as *Anatomia Britannica*. Ackermann’s *Repository of Arts* boasted some 1,600 unsigned plates. Rees’s *Cyclopaedia* appeared in forty-five volumes with 849 engraved plates. So, as one might perhaps say, ‘there was a lot of it about’. Clearly all these vast numbers of images – and there are, literally, countless other printed books with some or often large numbers of illustrations – cannot possibly be listed in this or any single reference book. It is clear that one is not comparing like exactly with like in setting ‘Alexander’ on the shelf beside ‘Colvin’ and ‘Roscoe’.

The idea of direct comparison fades a little, too, when the nature of Alexander's biographical entries is examined: his book proves somewhat less companionable than the other great biographical dictionaries that need to be with arm's reach of any British art or architectural historian. This is partly because the source material is, perhaps, rather less appealing to the general (if informed and culturally literate) reader. Colvin and Roscoe are profuse in their use of archival sources. Alexander's biographical entries are heavy largely with references to the appropriate but more mundane and repetitive apprenticeship, property, insurance and bankruptcy records of the individual craftsmen, as well as to newspaper advertisements.

To his great credit, Alexander manages to include mention of many individual plates by many different engravers. This gives a much rounder and more instructive picture of their careers and their individual production than, at first, I thought I was going to find in the pages of this great dictionary. So mistaken were my initial opinions that, in order to assess the work as fully and fairly as possible for the purposes of review, I found I had to delve deep into the book; and, in fact, I can legitimately claim actually to have skimmed the entire text of a very large reference work. I found it fascinating! But then I happen to like historical prints, and have collected a fair quantity of various kinds, illustrative of people, periods or topics in which I have a personal interest. All sorts of information leapt out from Alexander's pages about the engravers of various prints I have, or otherwise know about. I was able to make many connections. All in all, preparations for constructing this review were both pleasurable and profitable. My prediction is that 'Alexander' will be an invaluable reference tool, and arguably one of even greater use than the others to the average British archivist or research librarian.

There is an essential difference between what British architects designed or British sculptors created and what British engravers produced to earn their bread. Architects and sculptors were responsible for works that are immediately obvious in town or country, the majority of their creations being either strikingly noticeable or outstandingly beautiful, or both. Here is an example. In front of General Register House by Robert Adam – one of the finest buildings in Edinburgh – stands one of the city's finest statues, the equestrian Duke of Wellington by Sir John Steell. All residents and visitors must surely notice and admire both later statue and earlier building. They can hardly not do so. The contribution of the engraver to public pleasure is different. Certainly, engravers contributed to the artistic enlightenment or entertainment of the people who bought their works or just looked at them in the windows of print-shops. Equally certainly, engravers were responsible in no small degree for the progress of public education through the essential images they produced in all fields of knowledge. But no matter how skilful, engravers were much more in the nature of 'tradesmen', producing work shut away in printed books or in connoisseurs' portfolios, or else hung in country house, mess or club corridors. And the engraver's business was in the *reproduction* of works of art that, in their original form, had been created in another medium (mostly as original drawings, watercolours or oil paintings) by other, 'real' artists.

Thus, although engravers unquestionably displayed remarkable skill and virtuosity, brought to their work huge talent and worked extremely hard, theirs was a secondary art form, and they were, generally speaking, treated with, and accorded, the respect that their profession and social status conferred. That said, John Boydell (whom Alexander rates as an engraver merely ‘of moderate ability’, but as one who had ‘great political and promotional flair’), famously became Lord Mayor of London. However well some did in life – many prospered, and rose in the world – many others merely drudged. Most engravers toiled interminably, and for all those who failed or ended their days in penury many more were well rewarded. Valentine Green, for example, ‘lived like a gentleman’.

There is a most interesting anecdote which it is regrettable David Alexander did not know. In 1744, Allan Ramsay the elder addressed an intriguing letter to Sir John Clerk detailing how a young engraver had thought himself slighted on a visit to Penicuik House for a purpose that remains unclear and of which there is no other record. Nor do we know who the man in question was. Ramsay wrote thus:

Your thoughts about the young engraver’s leaving Penicuik abruptly were right. I have had a conversation with him since & find that his gentle highland Blood hauld him by the Ears into a Pett for being as it sugested to him sent to dine with a dull chaplain and some lower servts with Leather Breeks and in a room not to his liking.

Ramsay had assured the youth that Clerk was the least likely of men to have willingly or consciously wanted to give offence to anyone, surmising that the baronet had actually wanted to spare the visitor the embarrassment of ‘being crouded against a great Number of Ladys in his riding case’. The engraver had protested that he had been ‘very well dressed and had on silver spurs, but said [Ramsay] Spurs tho Silver will tear a Brocade Goun as well as Brass’. Ramsay had reminded him that

it was not proper for such as him or me to be too peremtor in punctilios with persons eminently above our Rank who ... were under no obligations to examine books of Haraldry & genealogies to find out whether people who live by Industrie and Ingenuity are of gentle descent or not – I came not in termes with him about engraving the drawings till he come to himself ...²

I had never been able to prove conclusively who this petulant young man was. But, now, examination of the lives and careers of all the Scottish engravers of the right period listed in Alexander’s biographical dictionary enables me to narrow the likely field to three candidates. Thomas Smith worked on the engravings for what would become William Adam’s *Vitruvius Scoticus*: those might, just possibly, be the ‘drawings’ mentioned by Ramsay. Another, better, candidate is George Chalmers, himself the son of an Aberdeenshire baronet (which might explain

² (ed.) [B. Martin, J. W. Oliver,] A. M. Kinghorn and A. Law, *The Works of Allan Ramsay*, IV: *Letters* (Edinburgh 1970), 225–6, printing National Records of Scotland, GD18/4348.

his having been put out by Clerk's perceived snub) and who began life as a heraldic painter and engraver before succeeding to the baronetcy. However, more likely still, I think, is the young Robert Strange, from Orkney (might that do for 'highland blood?'), whose apprenticeship to the gentlemanly Richard Cooper the elder in Edinburgh was completed in 1742. Strange, a Jacobite, was to become a very eminent engraver himself, and his success was recognised by a knighthood – by which time he must surely have forgotten whatever slight and grudge he had once sustained and borne.

Many plate-books and even single engravings were produced for a luxury market. The six parts of Thomas and William Daniell's *Oriental Scenery* (1795–1805) cost in total £250 guineas. Only the most opulent of nabobs could afford such a work. Not infrequently, Alexander includes the prices for which individual portrait, landscape and topographical prints were sold at the time of their creation, including some in my own collection that I have often bought cheaply in charity shops or at the annual Christian Aid book sale in Edinburgh. The relatively vast price a print was worth in 1777 or 1788 bears little relation to what the same item could be bought for (if one is lucky) nowadays. Interest in and appreciation of – and so the commercial value of the print as a commodity – is evidently not what it was!

The mystery of David Alexander's compilation – in many ways so admirable and so comprehensive – is his selection process. There are some strange omissions and some equally strange inclusions. When one thinks of Francesco Bartolozzi it is natural to think, too, of his friend, contemporary and fellow Florentine Giovanni Battista Cipriani. But Cipriani is not in Alexander. Even I have interesting engraved work by him on my walls. Some Scottish examples will indicate further what I mean by the apparently haphazard selection. William Aikman is here, even though it is far from certain that he himself engraved anything. Oil portraits by Aikman were engraved by John Smith and George White, and those men naturally have their own entries. David Steuart Erskine, eleventh Earl of Buchan, is included: Buchan studied printmaking at the Foulis Academy in Glasgow, but he appears to have etched only one plate himself. John Clerk of Eldin, however, who was by any judgement a very distinguished amateur etcher with a large and celebrated body of work to his credit, finds no place. If the Hon. Charles Greville is included on the strength of but two aquatints and a single 'mezzotint with etching, possibly on an aquatint base', and on account of his association with Paul Sandby, then Clerk of Eldin should most certainly have had an entry – and perhaps a substantial one at that.³ Alexander has, moreover, mixed up which 'William Hamilton' was involved with Greville: it was, in fact, the famous Sir William and not the painter William Hamilton, RA, listed here on p. 417. Maria Graham, née Dundas, gets in on the basis of only three etchings of her own in her book on India; but her presence does at least serve to increase the number of female amateurs represented. Alexander

³ See, most recently, G. Bertram (with I. G. Brown and D. Macmillan), *The Etchings of John Clerk of Eldin* (Taunton, 2012) which contains a full, illustrated catalogue.

Kincaid is not included, despite his having dedicated his plate of the Riding of the Scottish Parliament to Lord Buchan. The R. Rogers who produced an attractive plate of Leith races in 1791 is not in either. John Finlayson, having (as Alexander puts it) ‘Scottish connections’, is here recorded – quite correctly – as having dedicated to Lord Buchan an engraved portrait of William Drummond of Hawthornden, and as the engraver of Buchan’s own portrait by Joshua Reynolds. What is not mentioned is Buchan’s suggestion (made in manuscript notes of 1794) that Finlayson had at some point been imprisoned for having engraved the map of Prince Charles Edward’s escape from Scotland.⁴ This story seemed improbable on several grounds. That Alexander gives it no credence is significant. At the end of his period, Alexander omits George Tytler – a Scot who, in 1822, produced not only a panorama of Edinburgh at the time of the visit of King George IV but also a fascinating and intriguing ‘Grand Tour’ alphabet in the form of ‘historiated’ or emblematic individual cards. Both engraved and lithographed versions exist. David Alexander was kind enough to furnish me with some information on Tytler when I was preparing an article on this ‘alphabet’.⁵ Yet there is no entry on this interesting Scottish engraver. It must be that he fell victim to the radical but regrettable pruning of Alexander’s text.

There are a few Scottish quibbles. Alexander always calls Sir William Allan, ‘Allen’. Material in the National Library of Scotland could have been cited in the sources for the entries on Alexander and David Deuchar. The ‘Edinburgh Academy of Arts’ is presumably the so-called Trustees’ Academy. William Archibald’s two Edinburgh addresses are wrongly expressed. Thomas Hosmer Shepherd is not credited with the influential *Modern Athens!* of 1829, a book that is such an important source for the architectural development of late-Georgian Edinburgh. Alexander Baillie didn’t, surely (any more than Edward Mitchell, of whom it is similarly said) seek sanctuary as a debtor ‘in Holyroodhouse’, but rather did so within the bounds of Holyrood Abbey – a totally different thing. John Heaviside Clark, ‘Waterloo’ Clark, a ‘prolific etcher’ and ‘an extraordinarily productive engraver’ (as Alexander categorises him) of naval, military and topographical prints, was not just the artist of a celebrated series of views of Scottish towns but also the inventor of an ingenious game. Without, I think, really knowing what this is, Alexander refers to it a ‘toy’ called ‘The Myrorama’ [*sic*]. This pleasing drawing-room diversion actually allows the player to make up, from a series of oblong cards, endless views of imaginary ‘classical’ and ‘romantic’ landscapes in innumerable delightful permutations. It is, in fact, the *Myriorama*: a facsimile was republished by Pomegranate in 2016 from an example in the Huntington Library, California.

⁴ Glasgow University Library, Murray 502/66; cited in M. Campbell, “‘Lord Cardross’ and the “Boy with a squirrel”’: Sir Joshua Reynolds’s First Encounter with the Earl of Buchan and John Singleton Copley”, *Burlington Magazine*, 129 (November 1987), 728–30.

⁵ I. G. Brown, “The Illustrated “Grand Tour” Alphabets of George Tytler, 1820–1825”, *The British Art Journal*, 19:3 (2018/19), 56–63.

But there are many Scottish ‘revelations’, too. Scottish engravers in London were often employed by Scottish-born booksellers (that is, publishers). Together they constituted a powerful ‘mafia’. A great deal of information of Scottish relevance (on engravings of Scottish scenery and historic sites) is, for example, packed into the entry on Francis Jukes on p. 514, column one. I did not know that in 1764 the same Alexander Baillie mentioned above (who had been to Italy, but apparently – and interestingly – not as a young man at the outset of a career), engraved two prints after paintings of religious subjects by Francesco Fernandi, called *Imperiali*, in Sir James Clerk’s collection. Baillie also engraved maps and portrait prints. As is the case with so many of the engravers of the time, the range of work one man might produce was often very wide, although there were always specialists in one specific field or genre. Edinburgh-born Francis Legat had a London career as an engraver of large history pictures, but this had a bad effect on his health. His ‘complexion had that livid tinge which is generally attributed to the effect of the aqua fortis’. Work on a print of the death of General Sir Ralph Abercromby took some seven years and ‘impaired his constitution’. It was not even a commercial success when it appeared, completed by another engraver, after Legat’s demise.

John Beugo, noted for his engraving after the celebrated portrait of Robert Burns by Alexander Nasmyth, was also responsible for forty-seven plates illustrating two hundred quadrupeds and fifty-eight plates showing two hundred birds for a systematic work on natural history published five years later. Beugo then reverted to portrait engravings, producing a fine image of Nathaniel Spens in the uniform of the Royal Company of Archers after the splendid painting by Henry Raeburn. Edward Mitchell’s fine print after another painting of the death of General Abercromby, this time by James Northcote, was the first large engraving of an historical picture to be published in Edinburgh. Alexander sorts out possible confusion between two Scotsmen named Andrew Wilson: one definitely an engraver, however little known; the other the very much better-known painter and important picture dealer, who happened to produce two etchings. William Howison, apprentice to the first of these Wilsons, was enabled to remain in Edinburgh rather than gravitating to London due to ‘the improved strength of the print market in Scotland’. William Miller, who had studied in London under the topographical engraver George Cooke, was similarly able to return to Edinburgh and do well on commissions from London: he was in fact one of Turner’s favourite engravers. The Edinburgh-born (and largely Edinburgh-based) James Stewart engraved fine plates of Scottish historical scenes and genre subjects. He ended up as a member of the legislature of Cape Colony. Isaac Cruikshank, father of the more famous George, was himself the son of a Scottish customs official who had lost his post due to Jacobite associations. Isaac was taught drawing and etching by John Kay in Edinburgh, a training that stood him in good stead for a career as a caricaturist. Unfortunately, customs duty on alcohol was evidently not high enough to keep him off the bottle, and he died of drink.

Many a biographical entry yields fascinating and appealing information. A series of interesting vignettes emerges. Giles King, George Vertue’s only

apprentice and written off by his master for ‘ill conduct, vileness & insobriety’, certainly lived up to (or died in accordance with) this assessment: he fell into the New River when drunk, and drowned. James Gillray is described, at an early stage of a career that would lead to greatness in the realm of social and political caricature, as finding it ‘irksome and demeaning to engrave dog collars’. The print-publisher John Boydell paid the great painter Richard Wilson the sum of £50 for his oil of *Niobe*, and the engraver William Woollett £150 for his bestselling engraving after it. Boydell himself made £2,000 from the print. In his late sixties, William Byrne was still working on the engravings for Thomas Hearne’s *Antiquities of Great Britain*, a project begun well over thirty years previously and on which he was occupied (as he told the diarist Joseph Farington) for seven hours a day: four in the morning and three in the evenings. We don’t know how he spent his afternoons ...

‘After a promising start’, David Alexander tells us, George Alexander ‘ended his life as a pauper’. Of the young John Keyse Sherwin, Bartolozzi declared that ‘No engraver cuts so bold and beautiful a stroke ... it is all fire; ... by and by he will be everything.’ Regrettably, however, before reading this we have already learned that Sherwin will ultimately be ‘diverted from major work by his involvement in fashionable life’. Thomas Trotter, a London Scot, was working on a plate of Fuseli’s *Macbeth and the witches* when ‘he received a hurt in his eyes by the fall of a flower-pot from a chamber window’, an accident that must have hastened the end of his career even though he still found work as a draughtsman. The Boydells paid him £252 for his *Macbeth* plate, which was finished by another London Scot, James Caldwell. George Bickham the younger offered anyone buying a shilling print from him the sight of an Egyptian mummy, gratis. Charles Turner’s ‘business flair, opportunism and rapidity of production’ showed themselves when he and the artist John James Masquerier brought out a plate allegedly showing Napoleon Bonaparte reviewing the Consular Guard in circumstances that gave the impression Turner and Masquerier had actually been eyewitnesses to the scene, whereas the portrait of Bonaparte was actually based on a small porcelain bust.

Edward Rooker had a dual career as engraver and actor: he was principal Harlequin at Drury Lane. Alexander surmises that this other calling does not seem to have hampered his career as engraver. In actuality, it did. Robert and James Adam got very annoyed with Rooker’s delays in his handling of work allocated to him on the plates of Robert’s *Ruins of the Palace of the Emperor Diocletian at Spalatro*. One reason for this exasperation was precisely the fact that Rooker was always being called away from his engraver’s workbench to the stage. Paul Sandby told Robert that Rooker was an ‘idle worthless fellow’ who ‘woud do nothing ... for now that the plays begin he will never work an hour in a fortnight’.⁶ But the Adam brothers were hard taskmasters. The prominent and well-regarded James Basire engraved only one plate for *Spalatro* – Alexander does not mention this episode either – but the experience was enough for the

⁶ NRS, GD18/4852, Robert Adam to James Adam.

highly-strung *adelpi*: Basire was lambasted as ‘That insignificant trifling ignorant puppyish Wretch’, who had ‘spoilt a plate entirely’. It was ‘hard, ill drawn, of a Bad Colour’, and so on.⁷ The entire history of the preparation of Adam’s *Spalatro* is a fascinating case study in the trials and tribulations of print- and book-making, and Alexander could well have drawn much information and anecdote from the protagonists’ correspondence. It is a source untapped here, although well exploited by others.⁸ Entries for the engravers James Green and Anthony Walker make no reference to their work on Adam’s *Spalatro*. Green turned out to be a problem for Adam, too: he decamped from London to Oxford with some of the unfinished plates for the great book, and was never heard from again before his early death.

Much emerges from the biographical entries to shed interesting light on the social status of engravers. Samuel William Reynolds, for example, came of a family ‘that had lost its money ... but which had enough residual gentility for him to pass as a gentleman with well-developed social skills’. William Wynne Ryland was ‘brought up among gentleman and acquired genteel manners and tastes’. Ryland’s social background, as well as artistic talent, allowed him to be appointed engraver to the King in 1762. However, neither stopped him from being executed in 1783 for forgery of East India Company bills of exchange.

⁷ NRS, GD18/4850, Robert Adam to James Adam.

⁸ E. Harris with N. Savage, *British Architectural Books and Writers 1556–1785* (Cambridge 1990), 76–81; I. G. Brown, *Monumental Reputation. Robert Adam and the Emperor’s Palace* (Edinburgh 1992); idem, ‘The Picturesque Vision: Fact and Fancy in the *Capriccio* Plates of Robert Adam’s *Spalatro*’, *Apollo*, 136:366 (1992), 76–82; and most recently, and especially, C. Thom, ‘“This Knotty Business”’: The Making of Robert Adam’s *Ruins of the Palace of the Emperor Diocletian* (1764), Revealed in the Adam Brothers’ Grand Tour Correspondence’, in (ed.) K. O’Loughlin, A. Šverko and E. K. Wittich, *Discovering Dalmatia* (Zagreb, 2019), 91–115, esp. 94–9.