

THE FORGOTTEN 'ATHENIAN'
Drawings by Willey Reveley

Frank Salmon



Fig. 84 Willey Reveley, 'The Temple of the Sun and Moon [Venus and Rome] as seen from the Amphitheatre [Colosseum]', Rome, c.1784-85, watercolour and graphite, 48.9 x 37.5 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

THE FORGOTTEN 'ATHENIAN' Drawings by Willey Reveley

Frank Salmon

The Yale Center for British Art possesses a collection of some thirty watercolours made by a British architect during a Mediterranean tour in the mid-1780s that formed part of an album acquired by Paul Mellon in 1960. These drawings had originally entered the market at a Christie's sale held in May 1801, following their creator's sudden death on 6 July 1799 'after a few hours' illness, in the prime of life, at his house in Oxford Street', a stone's throw from the present-day Paul Mellon Centre's Bloomsbury base in London.¹ The Christie's catalogue foregrounds the drawings in particular on its title page amongst the designs, books and other effects of the late architect, describing them as the works of

that distinguished Artist and Civil Engineer, The Athenian Reveley, Dec[eased], consisting of His Well-Known Topographical views and Drawings of the celebrated Remains of Antiquity, which were accurately measured and delineated by him during a Journey through Italy, Egypt, and Greece, in the Years 1785 and 1786; the Whole accompanied with numerous Remarks in M:S: by himself, which render them highly Curious and Valuable to the Lover of the Arts and Classic Antiquity.²

Even allowing for the auctioneer's hyperbole, we learn from this that at the time of his death Willey Reveley was widely reputed a notable artist and 'Civil Engineer', that he was well known for his first-hand experience of classical antiquities, about which he had made numerous (and curious) remarks, and that he was the second late eighteenth-century British figure to have acquired the sobriquet 'Athenian'.

Unlike the far better known James 'Athenian' Stuart, however, the Athenian Reveley's name has left little trace during the two centuries of antiquarianism and architectural history that have followed his untimely demise in his fortieth year. Indeed, the few graphic works by Reveley listed as surviving – in the latest edition of Howard Colvin's *Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600–1840* – do not even include the drawings now at Yale, only two of which appear previously to have been published.³

It must be admitted straight away that Reveley's watercolours are not of the outstanding quality of those by his contemporaries who specialised in the medium. In the Mellon Centre's Brinsley Ford Archive there is a note by Sir Brinsley himself on Reveley's drawing of the Temple of Ceres [actually of Athena] at Paestum (now in the Victoria and Albert Museum) stating that: 'It looked very prosaic when hung next to the Dramatic Ruins of Paestum by J.R. Cozens'.⁴ Reveley's claims on posterity rest less on his abilities as draughtsman and *vedutista* than they do on his singular personality and outlook on architecture and topography. Our knowledge of these characteristics is due in large part to the survival of his barely studied 'Manuscript material for [a] Dictionary of Architecture, and of a journey through Italy, Greece, Egypt etc.', a 331-folio vellum-bound volume now at the Royal Institute of British Architects.⁵ This eccentric work, mostly written in neat but with numerous pastings in, is only partly an attempt at a comprehensive dictionary. More particularly it represents an attempt by Reveley to expound personal opinions he had gained during his European and Mediterranean travels. Thus the only entry under the letter 'J' is a neat copied description of the 'Journey' he made in 1785 and early 1786 from Rome to southern Italy and around the Mediterranean 'with the Rt Hon. Sir Richard Worsley Bart. as his architect & draftsman'.⁶ Worsley, a member of the Society of Dilettanti since 1778, was seeking solace in antiquarian pursuits after a disastrous divorce suit of 1783. He, too, maintained a journal and also compiled a catalogue of 200 drawings connected to his itinerary, both now at the Lincolnshire Archives.⁷ From these four sources, then (referred to in this essay as Reveley's 'Journey' and 'Dictionary', and Worsley's 'Journal' and 'Catalogue'), we can build up the contexts within which the drawings now at Yale were made. There is not space here to publish them all, so reproduced in this essay are only those that were made in Rome (where Reveley and Worsley met), or that can be certainly identified as belonging to the early part of their

expedition, that is up to July 1785, when Reveley's Journey breaks off after the pair reached Rhodes. The greater part of Reveley's observations in Athens and Greece more generally has to be inferred from comments made elsewhere in the Dictionary, from his work in editing the third volume of James Stuart's and Nicholas Revett's *Antiquities of Athens* (published in 1794), and from Worsley's Journal and Catalogue. This material, along with Reveley's observations of things seen in Egypt and Turkey, will be left to a subsequent article.

Willey Reveley's cruelly curtailed life has left relatively few details for the modern-day architectural historian, but previous accounts that have been given contain some loose ends that are worth picking up.⁸ Born in Yorkshire on 14 March 1760, he became a pupil of William Chambers in London in 1777 and a student of the Royal Academy Schools from the same year. From July 1781 to December 1782 he was an Assistant Clerk of Works at his master's Somerset House, then under construction. Chambers, who had himself studied in Italy in the early 1750s, was insistent upon the necessity of travel as the means by which British architectural students should complete their educations, and this doubtless explains why, by 1784, Reveley was to be found living at Rome. There he met Thomas Maynard Hesilrige of Hoxne Hall, Suffolk, who in turn recommended him as draughtsman to Worsley.⁹ The two men set off from Rome on their expedition in February 1785, Worsley not returning until April 1787, by which time he had continued northwards from Turkey, reaching as far as St Petersburg. Reveley, however, had quarrelled with his patron – it appears early in 1786, since he was back in Italy by May of that year (the date given on the reverse of his drawing of the Temple of Ceres at Paestum). By the autumn of 1786 he was again resident in Rome.¹⁰

In the Eternal City in the Spring of 1788, and now resident in Piazza Mignanelli adjacent to Piazza di Spagna, Reveley became involved in one of the more sensational incidents to befall any travelling British architectural student. As Elizabeth Cooper wrote to her common-law husband, the amateur artist and collector George Cumberland, on 23 April of that year:

There is one peece of news which I can not help telling you. Revly [h]as been found in bed with Miss James by the Father and thay whare both obligd to run naked to his Lodgings at 11 o Clock at Night. Revly had not so much as a Shirt on for the Father had torn it quite of and poor Miss nothing but her Shift. They whare marrid the next Night by an English Clirgeman hear and there is a

Subscription amongst the Ladys to by her some cloths for the Father will not give her anything and he [h]as not a shilling in the w[orld]. What will become of them god knows but it is such a long story that I can not tell you half of it.¹¹

The young woman with whom Willey had been caught *in flagrante delicto* was Maria James who, after his premature death, would marry John Gisborne, move back to Italy and become intimate with Mary and Percy Bysshe Shelley, inspiring the latter to write his poetic 'Letter to Maria Gisborne' in 1820. It is to Mary Shelley, as well as to a memoir of 1832 written by Maria herself, that we owe an account of both her early life and of her years married to Reveley.¹² She had been first abandoned with her mother then effectively kidnapped by her derelict merchant father by whom, Mary Shelley reported, she was 'left to run wild as she might, and at a very early stage had gone through the romance of life'. John James had brought Maria to Rome in 1785, aged 15, where she studied painting under Angelica Kauffman prior to her liaison with Reveley. Mary Shelley does not report the exact circumstances of the shot-gun marriage, suggesting instead that James 'refused to consent to the match, only, as it would seem, as an excuse for giving his daughter no fortune'. The absence of a dowry, coupled to the fact that Reveley's father outlived him, left the couple (and the two children very soon born to them) seriously impecunious. Maria estimated that they lived in London on about £140 per annum and, as late as 1796, Reveley complained to the Committee overseeing construction of his design for All Saints' Church in Southampton that 'the delay ... in paying my bill is cruel & underserved ... & having more than £1000 due to me from various persons I have not five pounds in the house'.¹³

Reveley's relatively short career as an architect does not appear to have been a great success. The church in Southampton was probably his most important building, and he is also credited with the design of two minor country houses and gate lodges at Parham and Stourhead.¹⁴ However, he lost major commissions for the County Infirmary at Canterbury (where he quite reasonably objected to the Building Committee's proposal to turn over his designs to a local builder for execution) as well as the new Pump Room at Bath, and the Christie's sale catalogue of his effects includes design drawings for numerous other unfulfilled projects. As has been seen above, the sale catalogue does not refer to Reveley as an architect but rather as an 'Artist' and 'Civil Engineer'. The latter title perhaps derived from the plans he had submitted to Parliament in April 1796 for wet docks on the River

Thames.¹⁵ The former – together with the epithet 'The Athenian Reveley' – doubtless comes from the authority on Greek antiquity he enjoyed among London *cognoscenti*, acquired as a result of his European drawings and as the editor for the third volume of *The Antiquities of Athens*, a role for which he was chosen by James Stuart's widow after the death of William Newton, editor of the second volume. Reveley's own obituary, appearing just five years later in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, stated that he had 'rather an awkward way of letting loose his real opinions; and had habituated himself to a sarcastic mode of delivering them ... not calculated to render himself popular [and influencing] many, who were disposed to employ him, to seek architects of more pliant and accommodating dispositions.'¹⁶ The directness of Reveley's speech perhaps related (if not to his Yorkshire upbringing) then to the radical politics that he and Maria shared. As Mary Shelley reported, Reveley

joined the liberal side, and entered with enthusiasm into the hopes and expectations of political freedom, which then filled every heart to bursting. The consequence of these principles was to lead to his acquaintance with many of their popular advocates, and among them with [William] Godwin and [Thomas] Holcroft.¹⁷

Reveley also met Jeremy Bentham whilst travelling and, indeed, assisted him in realising the Panopticon in 1791–92.¹⁸ It might be noted, however, that Reveley's liberal outspokenness was not coupled to any cynical exploitation of the established or the wealthy classes, for the obituary in *The Gentleman's Magazine* also reported that he was 'a man of strict integrity in all his dealings, and the little eccentricities of his character had no tendency to weaken the main supporters of it.'

Professional disappointments and financial insecurity lay, however, in the unforeseen future for Willey Reveley when, aged 24, he was brought to the attention of Sir Richard Worsley in Rome. At the start of his own travel Journal Worsley noted, on 11 February 1785: 'Before my departure from Rome on my intended tour through Greece & Egypt I engaged Mr Reveley an English artist then at Rome to accompany me, to make drawings of architecture, & the most interesting Ruins.'¹⁹ Of the respective accounts kept by the two men, Reveley's Journey is the more anecdotal, frequently making references (mostly negative) to personal circumstances such as travelling or sleeping conditions, or food. It appears

to have been transcribed much as originally written – but we should bear in mind that Reveley was probably keeping separately the detailed architectural notes on which he later depended when compiling his Dictionary. Worsley's Journal is more focused on recording antiquities and natural phenomena. Frequent references to and quotations from classical texts, not to mention the consistently neat hand, suggests that Worsley's account was not just transcribed but significantly elaborated at a later date. Indeed, Worsley's description of Lecce opens on 7 March 1785 by stating that 'I was detained until the nineteenth by Mr Reveley's being seized with an ague.'²⁰ Since Worsley cannot, on 7 March, have anticipated the twelve-day delay he was about to endure as a result of Reveley's indisposition, we can only conclude that the Journal, as we have it, was written up in retrospect.

Worsley's reference to Reveley's illness is one of the relatively few instances where he made specific mention of his travelling companion – and Reveley rarely mentions his patron either. Thus we get little sense of the relationship between the two men and little insight into the grounds for the breach between them that occurred, probably in Constantinople early in 1786. According to a letter in the Mellon Centre's Brinsley Ford archive by the late Lindsay Boynton,

Reveley wrote in detail to Hesilrege concerning the terms he had made with Worsley. These letters were later forwarded to the Earl of Bradford as Worsley's trustee, and extracts made. The extracts survive, but they were intended to show Worsley's movements only, and omit all details about the arrangements and quarrel.²¹

The unspecified details of the argument are germane to the problematic issue of the provenance of the drawings now at Yale, because their history is equally mysterious. What is known for certain is that Paul Mellon purchased them (in 1960) from the New Haven dealer C.A. Stonehill, who in turn had acquired them from Maggs in London, where they had been in 1959.²² They were in an album of 71 drawings entitled 'Views in the Levant', and recent study of this album's contents by Jonathan Yarker has established that it contained material specifically connected with Worsley's monumental publication of his collection, the two-volume *Museum Worsleyanum*, completed between 1794 and 1800.²³ Most of the Reveley drawings can be correlated with descriptions found among the 200 images listed in Worsley's 'Catalogue containing an accurate Description of the original Drawings / taken on

the spot / in the Travels of the Right Honorable Sir Richard Worsley Baronet ...'.²⁴ However, as was stated at the start of this essay, many of the drawings at Yale also correlate with the descriptions of 116 drawings that were in Reveley's estate at the time of his death in 1799, where they are listed as 'Valuable and highly curious Views of the most celebrated Monuments of Antiquity [which] were made on the Spots by the late Mr. Reveley during his Journey through Italy, Aegypt, and Greece, in the years 1785 and 1786'.²⁵ Moreover, Reveley's obituary in *The Gentleman's Magazine* explicitly stated that, having parted from Worsley 'on some difference', Reveley had 'retained his own drawings, which he afterwards exhibited to his particular friends.' The Athenian must, indeed, have had many particular friends, for the writer added that his collection of drawings was 'universally known to all the lovers of art, and admirers of classic Antiquity'.²⁶

There is only one conclusion that can be drawn as to why the images now at Yale have a Worsley provenance, which is that Sir Richard must have bought them back at the 1801 Christie's sale of Reveley's effects. This suggestion cannot be confirmed absolutely, but three points may be made in support of it. First, it is known that at the turn of the nineteenth century Worsley was trying to regain works of art he had collected whilst British Resident in Venice from 1793–97, lost when a ship transporting them to England was seized by a French privateer and the goods sold in Spain. News of this loss reached Worsley in early 1801, just at the time of the sale of Reveley's effects.²⁷ Second, Worsley's Catalogue of drawings is clearly no more contemporary with his mid-1780s travels than is his Journal in its present form. It is copied out neatly and contains both retrospective comments as well as some descriptions that correspond almost verbatim with the text of the Journal. Finally, whilst both Reveley's 116 drawings and Worsley's 200 appear broadly arranged according to their mutual travel itinerary, the sequence in Worsley's Catalogue sometimes precisely follows that of the lots in the Reveley sale. For example Lot 42 in the Reveley sale contained drawings 55 and 56 (showing respectively the door of the Temple of Bacchus on Naxos and the Church of the Panagia on Paros, figs. 95 and 96 here) and these became numbers 81 and 82 in Worsley's Catalogue.

As may be seen, then, the numbering of the drawings in the respective Worsley and Reveley lists is not the same and, to make matters still more complicated, a third set of numbers unrelated to either appear on the top left corners of some of the drawings at Yale.²⁸ Whilst we can be sure from the Christie's sale catalogue that Reveley had made

at least 116 drawings during his travels with Worsley, the latter's Catalogue never mentions Reveley; but it does contain references to works involving the authorship of others. Number 29, for example, was a 'View of Mount Etna in Sicily taken at sea about ten miles distant March 30th 1785 ... finished with many others at Rome in the latter end of the year 1787 by Il Signor Del drago [presumably the *vedutista* Antonio del Drago], when the late eruption of Mount Etna was added copied from a drawing made with accuracy on the spot'.²⁹ Other drawings were identified as by a Venetian artist living at Cairo, a Turk at Mecca, a Greek artist at Constantinople and two Russians (an engineer and an officer).³⁰ Most interesting of all, however, was the inclusion by Worsley of no fewer than 20 (or possibly 21) drawings that he apparently owned made by William Pars in 1765, when travelling as draughtsman to the Society of Dilettanti's Ionian expedition led by Dr Richard Chandler.³¹

Worsley, as has been mentioned, had become a member of the Society of Dilettanti in 1778, joining at a time when serious antiquarian enquiry among the membership seems to have gained the upper hand over more social activities. Certainly he made several references to *Ionian Antiquities* in his Catalogue of drawings. Indeed, on the very first page he included a quote from the fourth page of the preface to the first volume of that publication (1769) on the value even of fragments of Greek sculpture in giving evidence of ideas of proportion and symmetry 'at that happy period of Taste'. On the same, opening page of his Catalogue, Worsley also quoted from the eighth page of James Stuart's introduction to the first volume of *The Antiquities of Athens*: 'I have taken none of those Liberties with which painters are apt to indulge themselves, from a desire of rendering their representations of places more agreeably to the Eye & better pictures.' He then quoted from Stuart's and Revett's 1748 'Proposals' for the *Antiquities*, as given in footnote on page five of the preface to their first volume: 'the best verbal descriptions cannot be supposed to convey so adequate an Idea of the Magnificence and Elegance of Buildings, the fine form, expression, or proportion of Sculptures; the beauty and variety of a Country, or the exact scene of any celebrated action as may be formed from drawings made on the spot with diligence and fidelity by the hand of an artist.' Finally he added his own comment that 'the Figures in the several drawings are designed to give an Idea of the size without recurring to the Measures'. It is clear, then, that when preparing in Rome for his expedition to the eastern Mediterranean, Worsley was seeking a draughtsman who could be depended upon primarily for topographical accuracy. He was not

concerned to make detailed measurements (as the Dilettanti's Ionian trip had been, in recruiting Revett alongside Pars), and he was not particularly concerned that the artist should be good at representing the human form (since figures were to be included principally for scale). Evidently, of the students available for hire in Rome in late 1784, Willey Reveley fitted this bill.

As has been seen, Reveley was recommended to Worsley by Thomas Maynard Hesilrige, but it is quite probable that Worsley required – and obtained – some proof of Reveley's artistic abilities prior to their departure together from Rome in February 1785. Worsley's Catalogue of travel drawings begins, in fact, with six views of Venice and one of Padua. There then follow eight views of Rome and two at Tivoli before one reaches the Arch of Trajan at Benevento, the first drawing definitely made by Reveley as he and Worsley headed south through Italy together, now to be found in the British Museum.³² Of the eight views showing Rome, three descriptions correspond with drawings that are now at Yale.³³ These are numbers 9, 10 and 13 in the Catalogue: 'The Temple of the Sun and Moon as seen from the Amphitheatre'; 'The ancient Gate leading to Tibur, now Porta St. Lorenzo'; and 'View of the Ruins of the Temple of Minerva Medica, the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, and the Villa Negroni' (figs. 84, 85 and 86). The authorship of these images cannot be attributed to Reveley with certainty for, whilst they embody some of the character of his draughtsmanship (for example in the handling of masonry and in the palette of figs. 84 and 85), the spikey foliage detailing and quite sophisticated *staffage* appear to be by another hand. Figure 84 also has gum applied to the surface, a technique that is not found in other drawings by Reveley (although it is possible that he could have deployed it more easily in watercolours finished in a studio in Rome than when travelling in the field). Figure 86, meanwhile, is in grey and brown wash only with ink detailing, and a grid of faint pencil lines suggests it was 'squared up' for engraving, again unlike any of Reveley's other surviving drawings.³⁴ As has been seen above, however, in the case of his view of Mount Etna, described by Worsley as 'finished with many others at Rome in the latter end of the year 1787 by Il Signor Del drago', Reveley was presumably not averse to collaborating with other artists and may, indeed, have done so in these instances in order to strengthen his case for Worsley's employment.

With regard to 'The ancient Gate leading to Tibur, now Porta St. Lorenzo' (fig. 85) there are no accompanying comments from either Worsley or Reveley to add



Fig. 85 ?Willey Reveley, 'The ancient Gate leading to Tibur [Tivoli], now Porta St. Lorenzo', Rome, c.1784-85, watercolour over graphite on laid paper, 32.5 x 50.2cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

to the pleasing view of the Gate from just outside the Aurelian Wall.³⁵ Figure 84, however, shows the surviving east apse of what is today recognised as the Temple of Venus of Rome, which was described by Reveley in the section on 'Temples' of his Dictionary:

Temples of the Sun & Moon near the Arch of Titus at Rome: That towards the east is supposed to be the temple of the Sun & that looking westward to be that of the Moon. Palladio says that these two temples were built by T. Tatius, King of the Romans. Part of these temples now remains, the two great niches being entire & the flank walls 5 or 6 ft high. He confesses that the fronts & all the inside ornaments except those of the great nich are his own composition his



Fig. 86 ?Willey Reveley: 'View of the Ruins of the Temple of Minerva Medica, the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, and the Villa Negroni', Rome, c.1784-85, pen and brown ink with grey and brown wash, squared in graphite, 29 x 47 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

only guide being the foundations. There are square & semicircular niches alternating in the flanks of the eastern temple withinside & compartments in the head of the great nich called losenges thus [Reveley provides a sketch] all of which I saw but could not get into the other temple.³⁶

It is interesting to note that in the 1780s (or 1790s, when Reveley's Dictionary was presumably compiled), Palladio's record of Roman temples as given in *I quattro libri dell'architettura* of 1570 continued to represent the point of departure for British architects, notwithstanding more recent advances in archaeological and topographical understanding in Rome. This may serve, in fact, as a useful reminder that the quasi-scientific approach to the naming and contextualising of ruins by

men such as Stuart, Revett and Chandler (and also Robert Wood, author of *The Ruins of Palmyra* of 1753 and *The Ruins of Balbec* of 1757) only represented one end of the spectrum of later eighteenth-century British attitudes to antiquities. The other end, as seen in the Roman studies of Robert Adam and his circle, was fragmentary, eclectic and Picturesque. Reveley's image of the Temple of Venus and Rome is relatively faithful in its topography, much as Worsley would doubtless have wished given his expressed concern to avoid the 'liberties' taken by painters. The view is framed by one ground-level arch of the Colosseum; the unexcavated podium of the Temple is depicted as a rolling terrain of scrub and small trees; the Romanesque bell tower of S. Francesca Romana rises above the lozenge-coffered east niche. By contrast, a view made from almost exactly the same point by Charles-Louis Clérisseau for Adam (now in the Clerk of Penicuik collection) entirely removes the medieval bell tower and conventual buildings.³⁷ Reveley's only possible tampering, by comparison, appears to have been the removal of the unsightly retaining wall that, in Clérisseau's view, ran across the east end of the site of the Temple's podium, and it is possible that this could have been overgrown in the thirty years that elapsed between the two views having been made.

A fourth Roman view in the collection at Yale (fig. 87) is of the same type as figs. 84 and 85 – including the use of gum as in the former – and may thus represent another instance of collaboration by Reveley with a local artist. It does not, however, correspond however with any of the images described in Worsley's Catalogue, appearing to show a view taken in a south-easterly direction near the Porta Maggiore, looking along the inside of the Aurelian Wall. The inner side of the Gate itself, in its large rectangular form, appears centre left, then to the right of that the ruins of the so-called Temple of Venus and Cupid, followed by the church of the S. Croce in Gerusalemme, with its twelfth-century bell tower (the clock face in the penultimate storey) and its 1743 west façade replete with roof-line statuary. The largish house in the right foreground would seem to be the Villa Conti, to judge from Giambattista Nolli's famous plan of Rome of 1747 which corresponds quite well with this view. However, the wall that can be seen between the Porta Maggiore and the Church is harder to interpret. Possibly it could be intended to represent the Aqueduct – of Claudius, according to Nolli – that ran south-west from the Gate, or the wall of the Villa Conti and Garden of S. Croce that he shows. What is clearer is that, at the right extreme of the drawing, the



Fig. 87 ?Willey Reveley, *The Aurelian Wall, Porta Maggiore, the Temple of Venus and Cupid and the Church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme, Rome, c.1784-85*, watercolour, 31.6 x 48.7 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

Aurelian Wall continues in the Anfiteatro Castrense area, and that the hills seen in the distance on the left are the Tiburtine.³⁸

On 12 February 1785 Worsley and Reveley left Rome to begin their expedition, following the old Via Appia south through Albano, Velletri and Terracina, and entering the Kingdom of Naples at Fundi. Their route then brought them south to Capua and Caserta, where they made an extensive study of the new royal palace designed by Luigi Vanvitelli. From there they took a diversion to the east in order to visit Benevento and study the Arch of Trajan. Then, having bypassed Naples, they proceeded south along the east side of Vesuvius to Salerno and from thence via Eboli to Paestum, where they arrived at four in the afternoon of 20 February.



Fig. 88 Willey Reveley, 'A Perspective View of the three ancient Temples at Posidonia or Paestum', 21-24 February 1785, watercolour with pen and grey ink over graphite on laid paper, 36.5 x 51.9 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

This was a signal moment in the life of Reveley – his first encounter with the ancient Greek architecture from which he would later gain his sobriquet 'The Athenian'. Moreover, as so few of his drawings made in Athens or the Greek Archipelago itself survive, his drawings of Paestum represent for us the architectural qualities that he admired in ruined Greek buildings more generally.³⁹

The collection of drawings at Yale includes two made at Paestum. The first records all three temples, looking from south to north (fig. 88). In the right foreground is the west end of the Temple of Hera I, known in the eighteenth century as the 'Basilica'. A short distance beyond that stands the largest or 'Great'



Fig. 89 Willey Reveley, 'North East View of the same Temple [Neptune/Hera II] at Paestum traced in a Camera obscura February 21 1785', watercolour over ink on board, 28.1 x 47.2 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

temple, that of Hera II – generally thought to have been dedicated to Neptune (Poseidon) in Reveley's period. Then, in the distance one sees the outline of the small Temple of Athena, thought to have been that of Ceres. The second Yale drawing shows the Temple of Neptune from the north-east (fig. 89).⁴⁰ These two views seem to correspond with numbers 19 and 21 in Worsley's Catalogue, which in turn appear to have been numbers 4 and 9 in Reveley's sale catalogue.⁴¹ (The latter is described as 'taken in a camera obscura' – one of only two mentions Reveley made of his use of this device, perhaps suggestive of its infrequency.) The sale included a further seven views of Paestum (nine in total), while Worsley's Catalogue shows that he owned five views overall.⁴²

By 1785, when Reveley reached Paestum, the three temples were hardly as unknown to the European architectural fraternity as they had been just thirty years

before. Visits to the site had started to become more frequent, and in England Thomas Major's *Ruins of Paestum*, based on surveys made by Italian, French and British draughtsmen, had been published in 1768. It is noteworthy, however, that Reveley – trained in the office of the arch-opponent of the rising tide of interest in Greek architecture, William Chambers – never mentions Major's account of the temples in his *Journey* or elsewhere in his *Dictionary*.⁴³ Instead, the book that formed the backdrop to his responses to Paestum was Padre Paolo Antonio Paoli's *Rovine della Città di Pesto detta ancora Posidonia*, published in Rome in 1784 but based on surveys made in the 1750s under the supervision of Count Felice Gazzola. Whilst Reveley may have known Paoli's book before reaching Paestum with Worsley in 1785, it was not until 1786, 'having taken it with me to Pesto on my second journey there,' that he entered into the closest of dialogues with that work.⁴⁴ Reveley made entries in his *Dictionary* under the letter 'P' for both 'Paestum' and, most oddly, 'Padre Paolo' (who appears between 'Pyramid' and the Monument of 'Philopappus').⁴⁵ He also referred to Paoli in his *Journey*, so that we cannot be sure from his own papers which of his observations on Paestum date from the 1785 visit as opposed to that made in 1786 (or from later still). Worsley's *Journal*, however, in a rare explicit mention of his travelling companion's opinions, states:

Mr Reveley speaking of the Temples observes that the Temple of Neptune has its architrave complete but not the least appearance of drops [guttae] or a fillet, such as accompany the Doric order. Therefore he concludes that there never were any such ornaments although the order is Doric[.] He adds there is not a single block of the frieze or cornice on the ground. The Temple of Juno he says is by much the most considerable, its columns being thirty feet high ... The Temple of Diana he compares to that of Neptune but says he found it in a more perfect state.⁴⁶

By the Temple of 'Neptune' Worsley was in fact referring to the Basilica, for it is of that notorious building, of course, that Reveley's own comments record: 'There being no ornament on the small part of the frieze remaining ... nor any fragment on the ground I am at a loss to guess whether it had Triglyphs or not,' and the plain entablature can be seen clearly at the right extremity of fig. 88.⁴⁷ Moreover, Worsley's Temple of 'Juno' (an inadvertently correct, if Romanised, identification of the Temple of Hera II) must be that of Neptune, which has the largest columns of the three at just over 29 feet. (Reveley's imprecision with the measurement can be excused as he doubtless had little surveying equipment to hand, although fig.

89 shows that a ladder perhaps twenty feet long had been procured.) Worsley also reverses the relationship between the small Temple (which he calls of 'Diana') and that of Neptune because it is the latter that was in a 'more perfect state'.⁴⁸ All this confusion notwithstanding, Sir Richard's comment on Reveley's early observations at Paestum show the architect's concern with issues of detailing in Doric architecture, such as whether the order could have been designed without triglyphs and whether triglyphs or guttae were cut out of the same stone as the frieze and architrave, or let in. Reveley's concern with precise observation of detail is further born out by the numerous errors in Paoli's visual record of the buildings that he seizes on in the *Dictionary*, and he even used little sketches of capitals and mouldings to illustrate his corrections.

There was, however, a larger purpose to Reveley's close and minute observations of the Paestum temples – which was nothing less than an attempt to understand the nature of early Greek Doric design, an understanding that would later play a part in an extraordinary public attack that he was to make on his former master, Chambers. By the 1780s the issue of whether the city of Paestum had been founded by the Etruscans or as a Greek colony was under heated discussion, the particular architectural dimension of this debate being the question of whether or not the Basilica was a Greek temple at all. To Paoli it was an 'Atrio Etrusco', as Reveley noted,⁴⁹ but he had read the histories of the city offered by Diodorus Siculus, Strabo and Pliny and was dismissive in his *Journey* of Paoli's conclusions:

The principal information concerning Paestum as far as I have been able to understand Padre Paola's book which is written in the most elegant and abstruse Italian language is, that we know hardly any history at all concerning it. He does not prove a single fact that he asserts about its foundation by the Etruscans, his chief argument being the similitude of the architecture of the temples to Etruscan works which is preposterous as they are evidently of greek architecture & certainly built long after the foundation of the city.⁵⁰

Later, under the 'Paestum' entry in his *Dictionary*, Reveley returned to this point, saying that the temples were in any case not 'erected at the foundation of the city ... nor are they all of the same age evidently.'⁵¹

Having subsequently travelled widely in Greece and the Archipelago, the issue raised by Paestum for Reveley was not one of the temples' Greek identity but rather

one of their chronology. This marks him out in the eighteenth century as an early authority on the history of Greek architecture. He did not need to find comparative aesthetic reasons outside of architecture before accepting that these temples were designed by Greeks (as did Johann-Wilhelm Goethe when he visited Paestum in 1787), nor did he subscribe to an idealistic notion of Greek design incompatible with its rapid progress to Periclean excellence that led so many of his contemporaries, including Paoli, into historical error. In his *Journey* Reveley opined:

Padre Paolo ... says if Architecture such as we call Doric had its rise in Greece why do we not see some examples of that heavy ancient style before the art was refined to the proportion of the fine greek doric (Diss. 3rd. 51) Note that there are two examples one near mount Laurium in attica & the other at Corinth. WR.⁵²

The Temple at Corinth later formed the basis of chapter 7 in the third volume of Stuart's and Revett's *Antiquities of Athens* (edited by Reveley), where it is described as 'built before architecture had received the improvements it afterwards did in the time of Pericles'.⁵³ Worsley's *Journal* records that he and Reveley visited it in May 1785. Both the plan and elevation of the surviving columns and entablature (also without triglyphs) that features as plate II in the *Antiquities* and the details of the order at large (plate III) were drawn by Reveley, so he knew the ruin very well.⁵⁴ He took both this mid-sixth-century BC temple and the probably contemporary Basilica at Paestum to be representative of the early working out of the Doric formula. The mid-fifth-century BC Temple of Neptune, by contrast, which 'has the principal and most striking marks of Greek architecture', he rightly understood in relation to the refinements of the nearly coeval Parthenon. Three pages in his *Dictionary* were devoted to puzzling over similarities between the two monuments (for example the column diameter to height ratios) and differences (such as the unusual arrangement of fourteen columns in the flank at Paestum). Although Reveley appreciated that the Temple of Neptune had originally been covered with stucco to imitate marble, his final observation was that 'this building is now of a beautiful orange tint,' a point he succeeded in capturing well in fig. 89.⁵⁵

It was Reveley's understanding of the origins and progress of Greek architecture that led him, when editing the third volume of *The Antiquities of Athens* in the early 1790s, to a polemical attack on his erstwhile master, Chambers. Sir William

had, in 1791, produced the third edition of his *Treatise on the Decorative Part of Civil Architecture* (first published 1759), to the preface of which he added those condemnations of the growing trend of Greek Revivalism that had long been in his mind. In order to counter this modern practice, Chambers felt the need to criticise ancient Greek architecture and defend what he saw as the refinements introduced by the Romans and followed in the Renaissance. Never having seen a Greek building himself, Chambers was dependent for his understanding of Greek architecture on books – and especially on what Reveley referred to in his preface as the 'imperfect specimens of Le Roi' (Julien-David Le Roy's *Ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce* of 1758).⁵⁶ For Reveley, who had travelled so extensively in Greece and the Archipelago and who had studied Greek buildings so intently, Chambers' attack was insupportable. He countered his former mentor's arguments on many points, in one instance using his experience of Paestum to good effect. As part of a list of supposed defects in Greek design, Chambers had focussed on 'their temples with a range of columns running in the center to support the roof; contrary to every rule, either of beauty or convenience.'⁵⁷ Reveley provided a footnote:

Of this I believe there is but one instance in all the antiquities now remaining, which is a temple at Pesto. This edifice, by the proportions of its order appears to be of the highest antiquity. ... It can be no proof of general ignorance in the Greeks, that one temple of this kind has been built in one of their distant colonies; ... As we have no accounts in any authors of this species of temple, this most likely is the only one ever built, though Sir William finds it convenient to represent this as one only of a number of the same description.⁵⁸

As has been suggested earlier, Reveley had probably been encouraged to travel in the Mediterranean by Chambers, who advocated the importance of direct experience of architecture from the time he drafted Royal Academy lectures in 1770 until he incorporated that advice in the third edition of his *Treatise*. Reveley could scarcely believe how completely Chambers had departed from his own principle in attempting to justify a visceral but unqualified dislike of Greek architecture and, whilst we may see his counter-arguments as another instance of the injudicious plain-speaking for which he was renowned, there is no doubt that he had the facts on his side.

Reveley's first encounter with Greek architecture at Paestum was not, however, accompanied by warm feelings towards the place itself, which he discovered 'abounds with snakes, vipers, knats & other venomous animals', or towards its hardly more civilised inhabitants, who 'will bully & might murder any person if they chose it, for it is out of the way of all justice or enquiry.'⁵⁹ Neither were he and Worsley blessed with good weather whilst there, for they were detained until 25 February and Reveley recorded that 'so much rain fell during our stay that the River Sele overflowed its banks, which rendered it impassable in the ferry boat for four of the five days we stayed there.'⁶⁰ None the less, they managed to return to Salerno and Avellino in order to cross to the east coast of Italy. The journey over the Apennines took them via Ariano (Irpino) and Bovino, running the gauntlet of banditti in the mountainous woods along the way. At Castellucio they had their first view of the distant Adriatic, and from there they proceeded to Cerignola and then to the coast at Barletta. The most notable object in this town was the colossal antique bronze statue standing against an outer bay of the Duomo, much as it does today. Reveley's small drawing of this sculpture (fig. 90), made on 2 March, is remarkably uncouth, but it is evident from his Journey account that this was its intended effect:

In the market place is the bronze statue of Herakleus according to Swinburn but by others thought to be that of Constantine which I rather believe, as it holds a cross elevated in his right hand; in his left holds a globe. It is 17 feet 3 inches high and of the most execrable sculpture. I drew it although the cold was excessive & it snowed during the time, as well as I could, & endeavoured to give an idea of the barberous style of it. It was found in the sand near Barletta in the year 1491.⁶¹

From Barletta he and Worsley proceeded along the Adriatic coast to Bari and then to Brindisi, where they arrived on 6 March. The monument that captured their attention there was the pair of Roman columns near the harbour, on the top of which fires were lit to produce a bifurcatory line as a navigational guide to ships' captains. Reveley's drawing (fig. 91) not only records the columns but, uniquely among those now at Yale, presents a descriptive tablet and scale bar at its foot, as though the work were intended for engraving. Below this Reveley has written 'Taken on the spot March 7 1785' and signed it. The inscription and the text on the



Fig. 90 Willey Reveley, 'Sketch of a Colossal Statue in Bronze of the Emperor Constantine measuring seventeen feet three inches in height ... in the Publick Place at Barletta a city of Apulea', 2 March 1785, watercolour, 21.3 x 14.9 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

tablet feature almost verbatim in Worsley's Catalogue, where the drawing was number 26, although Worsley did not of course mention Reveley's signature. In his Journey, Reveley described the columns in the following terms:

Two columns were erected here by Augustus Caesar, on which lights were placed to shew the entrance of the harbour. One of them still remains entire, it is of the corinthian order raised upon a pedestal & finished with a circular architrave which held the light: the capital is composed of a single row of leaves, & over it in the center of each face is a Triton & a Syren alternately & at each angle two Syrens which support the abacus[.] The whole is of cipolino marble



Fig. 91 Willey Reveley, 'The Columns of Augustus at Brundisium [Brindisi]. Lights were anciently placed on these columns to shew the Communication between the Harbours. Taken on the spot March 7 1785', pen and black ink and watercolour, 41.6 x 27 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

the shaft plain & but little diminished & the base attic; at 22 feet 6 ins distant is the pedestal & the base of the other column the upper part having been thrown down by an earthquake in 1456, which destroyed the greater part of the city. The columns stand on a line so that on entering the harbour you look between them. ... Here I had a severe fit of my fever, but the next morning I went out & drew the columns; I guess them to be about 70 feet high in all.⁶²

In addition to fig. 91, Reveley made a detailed study of the remarkably designed 'Capital of the column of Augustus at Brundisium drawn on the spot from the Ground', giving the dimensions of the pedestal and the distance between the pair of columns on the reverse. This survives in the volume of Reveley drawings now in Sir John Soane's Museum.⁶³ It is not clear, however, that his verbal description of the capital figures is entirely correct, since the pairs of figures under each corner protrusion of the abaci possess muscular male torsos (these can still be seen in the original, although now further weathered) and are more likely to be sea beasts than sirens.

Over the next few days Reveley and Worsley continued southwards, visiting Lecce and Otranto, where Reveley found that the castle 'so celebrated in Mr Walpole's novel is now a pitiful fort neither large nor strong.' This did not stop him from drawing it twice, and one version survives in the British Museum.⁶⁴ At Otranto Worsley's intention to head directly for Athens was thwarted, for he found that they were not 'able to procure a passage at this season of the year from there to Greece.'⁶⁵ Instead, on 26 March he and Reveley boarded the *San Antonio di Padua* bound south-west for Malta, initially following the southern coast of Calabria towards Sicily. The weather was bad and Reveley spent three days seasick – but he managed to put a positive spin on this, as he considered that taking no food for 72 hours had purged him finally of the fever that had dogged him since the start of the month. Spending most the time below deck also provided an unexpected *coup de théâtre* when, on 29 March, 'I came up & on a sudden saw an object so striking it had the more effect on me.'⁶⁶ This was a sublime view of Mount Etna at about 15 miles distance, covered with snow. Reveley drew the volcano then – and again on 1 April, when the *San Antonio* was in the Gulf of Catania. Both of these drawings were in the posthumous Reveley sale and were subsequently owned by Worsley, but neither are to be found at Yale.⁶⁷ Over the five days that the ship spent near the Sicilian coast, Reveley recorded making several more drawings, for which there



Fig. 92 Willey Reveley, 'View of a Mountain near Reggio in Calabria, which was broken in the manner expressed in the drawing by the Earthquake of the fifth of February 1783, together with a part of the Straights of Messina, drawn on the spot March 29 1785', watercolour, 18.7 x 58.9 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

are some candidates among those now at Yale. Only one can be identified with certainty, however. This is number 27 in Worsley's Catalogue, a 'View of a Mountain near Reggio in Calabria, which was broken in the manner expressed in the drawing by the Earthquake of the fifth of February 1783, together with a part of the Straits of Messina, drawn on the spot March 29 1785' (fig. 92).⁶⁸

The derelict state of the city of Reggio and the parlous condition of its inhabitants just two years after this major earthquake made for a sorry departure point from Italy for Worsley and Reveley as they headed south across the Mediterranean, nor could there have been more of a contrast with the tremendously impressive harbour of Malta, at which they arrived on 4 April. Quarantine restrictions prevented them from exploring on foot, but on 6 April Reveley recorded that 'Sir Rd Worsley was allowed as a particular favour to see the harbour accompanied by the Governor in his boat.'⁶⁹ Reveley made three drawings of the port, which later became numbers 19–21 in the posthumous sale of his effects and numbers 33–35 in Worsley's Catalogue. One of these is to be found at Yale (fig. 93), evidently Worsley's number 35: a 'View of the Quays, Warehouses, Health Office and the entrance of the port at Malta, taken April 10 1785'. The geography of the port of Malta is complex, but the site here is the Grand Harbour along the south side of Valetta, modern-day Quarry Wharf, looking north-east towards the open sea beyond the lighthouse at the point of Fort Ricasoli.⁷⁰ The warehouses shown by Reveley still survive, although the quays he shows now have other buildings on



Fig. 93 Willey Reveley, 'View of the Quays, Warehouses, Health Office and the entrance of the port at Malta, taken April 10 1785', watercolour with pen and grey ink on laid paper, 26.7 x 45.4 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

them. The gateway surmounted by a cross that one sees above, in the Lower Barracca Gardens, was replaced in 1810 by a neo-Greek portico dedicated to the first *de facto* British Governor, Sir Alexander John Ball, Bt. Reveley considered the harbour 'one of the finest in the world', noting on the west side (Valetta) – as fig. 93 shows – 'the sides of the Rock are cut down so as to form one line with the wall on the top of it. An amazing number of cannon point into the harbour; below the city is a fine quay with the health office & divisions for people in quarantine, & fine ware houses all, as well as the city, built of stone.'⁷¹

On 14 April, Worsley and Reveley departed from Malta on a ship called the *St. Trifon* heading for Crete, where they were to spend ten days before finally sailing for Attica.⁷² A brief trip ashore at Sunium on 7 May enabled Reveley to study the

Temple of Poseidon and to update Le Roy's 1750s account of what remained standing. Then they sailed on to Piraeus, arriving late in the afternoon of 9 May. Worsley's impatience to reach Athens can be gauged from the fact that he immediately set out to walk the five miles or so to the city, leaving Reveley to follow on horseback the next morning. Unfortunately there is a month's omission in Reveley's *Journey* from the time of his arrival in Athens (where he was immediately impressed by the completeness of the Theseion [Hephaesteion]) until 11 June and, as has been seen, hardly any of the drawings he made in Athens can be identified.⁷³ As far as the men's itinerary is concerned, however, Worsley's *Journal* supplies the deficiency. On 16 May they set off on an expedition to the west of Athens and the Peloponnese, which took them by boat to Salamina and Eleusis, then to Megara, Corinth, Argos, Sparta, Epidauros and, by boat again, to Aegina.⁷⁴ Their first visit to Eleusis thus took place on 17 May – although Reveley only recorded a short second trip they made there together from Athens on 27 June. During the latter he drew the colossal caryatid figure which, in 1785, was semi-submerged in the ground near the fragmentary ruins of the Sanctuary of Demeter (fig. 94). Of the site and statue Reveley wrote:

There are fragments of doric capitals lying about but not large enough to belong to the famous temple. There are also some ionic capitals of elegant design but badly worked. The fragment of the Statue of Ceres which is only the head & shoulders is now standing on the spot [crossed through, with 'near the bottom of the hill' written in the margin], the face is beat off; her hair is tied with a ribband behind & on her head is a circular Vessel like a basket elegantly carved with wheat ears & other ornaments.⁷⁵

Reveley made further notes about Eleusis in the 'Temples' section of his *Dictionary*, where he mentioned that the 'statue of Ceres was above 15 feet high'.⁷⁶ Worsley, meanwhile, referred in his *Catalogue* to the drawing as a 'View of the Colossal statue of Proserpina at Eleusis, drawn June 1785', noting that ears of corn were attributes of that goddess as well as of Ceres and paraphrasing Le Roy in saying that 'the drapery is of good taste, & in the manner of that of the Caryatids of the Pandroseum'.⁷⁷ During their first visit to the site, in May, however, Worsley had had a good deal more to say, as can be seen from his *Journal*, where he described the figure as



Fig. 94 Willey Reveley, 'View of the Colossal statue of Proserpina [a Priestess of the Sanctuary of Demeter] at Eleusis, drawn June [27] 1785', pen and ink and watercolour, 29.2 x 20.6 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

of the most beautiful white marble and of such fine sculpture that it has been attributed to Praxiteles, who had carved a statue of that Goddess [Ceres] in a Temple that was dedicated to her at Athens. There is only a part of the statue appearing at present, the remainder of it being buried in the earth, but from what appears in view, it must probably have been fourteen or fifteen feet high. The face of the figure has been disfigured, by time and the turks, who spare the faces of none of the antique statues or busts that fall in their way, which makes it now very difficult in Greece to find any statue or bust with any of the features of the face intire. The head dress is beautiful but singular, like a basket round which are clusters of wheat ears and bundles with flowers of poppy, the attributes of the goddess, who is said to have first taught the Greeks to sew corn at Eleusis.⁷⁸

Worsley also mentioned that ‘the Venetians attempted to remove this statue, and found it too large to take away’. Sixteen years after his visit, however, it was indeed excavated and removed by E.D. Clarke, who presented it to the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge where it can be seen today. Its pair, better preserved because unexcavated until the late nineteenth century, remains in the museum at Eleusis. The two caryatids, of pentelic marble, are now thought to represent priestesses and to have flanked the doorway to the inner courtyard of the Sanctuary of Demeter. Dated to about 50 BC, they were carved when Greece was a Roman province. The attribution to Praxiteles and comparisons with the caryatids of the Erechtheion may thus be seen as a deliberately historicising gesture on the part of the Roman colonisers, as well as a recognition of the continuing importance of the Eleusian fertility and afterlife rituals.

Reveley’s and Worsley’s Peleponnese trip occupied the second half of May 1785 and they were back at Athens on 6 June. Shortly afterwards, however, they formed a second expeditionary party for a journey eastwards from the city. For this they were joined by their French landlord at Athens, Mr Gaspary, his wife and the English Consul Mr Macree.⁷⁹ Reveley and Macree climbed Mount Hymettus on 12 June and the party continued on to Mount Pentelicus and the Plain of Marathon.⁸⁰ As has been seen, Worsley and Reveley made one further visit to Eleusis, when fig. 94 was drawn, and then prepared to journey on to Asia Minor. ‘Saturday July the first, having finished the necessary drawings, I left Athens with the greatest regret’, wrote Worsley, and Reveley was in almost total accord, departing from Athens ‘with infinite regret.’⁸¹

The early part of July saw Worsley and Reveley sailing between the Cyclades Islands, visiting Mykonos, Delos, Naxos and Paros.⁸² At the last two of these Reveley made drawings which are the latest related to his Journey to survive in the collection at Yale (figs. 95 and 96). The first, drawn on 9 July, shows the famous isolated standing doorway of the ‘Temple of Bacchus’ on Naxos, described thus in Worsley’s Catalogue:

View of the Door Case, or Gateway of the Temple of Bacchus upon a small Island or rock adjoining to the town of Naxos drawn in July 1785. Upon a small rocky Island not far from the Town, part of a Gate of white Marble is still standing among a heap of Ruins of the same stone intermixed with pieces of Granite. These according to the opinion of the Inhabitants of Naxos are the



Fig. 95 Willey Reveley, ‘View of the Door Case, or Gateway of the Temple of Bacchus upon a small Island or rock adjoining to the town of Naxos drawn [on 9] July 1785’, pen and ink and watercolour, 34.6 x 21.9 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

remains of the Palace of Bacchus, but more probably of a Temple dedicated to that God.⁸³

The following day, 10 July, Worsley and Reveley sailed to Paros. Reveley’s Journey only mentions that he saw a wall made from various fragments on a white marble



Fig. 96 Willey Reveley, 'The Church of the Panagia, virgin, or Catapoliani [Ekatontapiliani] at the Gate of Paros drawn [on 10] July 1785', pen and ink and watercolour, 24.8 x 35.6 cm, Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection

Doric temple on Paros, so for a description of fig. 96 we have to turn to Worsley:

The Church of the Panagia, virgin, or Catapoliani at the Gate of Paros drawn in July 1785. The church of Katapoliani dedicated to the Virgin which stands just without the City Gate, is the largest & handsomest in the Archipelago, and the only one with bells. It is enclosed in a Christum or Court, the inside arched, & supported by Antique columns of different Dimentions, which have been taken out of the Ruins of the ancient City of Paros, now called likewise Parechia. Some of the columns are very beautiful; & probably belonged to the Temple of Ceres, the remains of which are still visible at the Castle.⁸⁴

Located in Parikia, the Church of the Panagia Ekatontapiliani (Our Lady of the Hundred Doors) remains today both an important site of pilgrimage and example of Byzantine architecture in Greece. It stands on the site of a fourth-century church, said to have been built by order of Saint Helena, mother of Constantine

the Great, when she was delayed at Paros on her way to the Holy Land in a quest to retrieve the True Cross. The façade has been altered since Reveley's day, but he well captured the complicated design of the belfries.

After two days on Paros, Worsley and Reveley returned to Mykonos. There they waited for a week, hoping for the wind to change so that they could sail north-east for Smyrna. The wind continued to come from the north, however, so they changed plans and sailed south-east instead, bound for Egypt, and arriving at Rhodes on 21 July. Here Reveley's Journey abruptly breaks off – although, as has been mentioned, he was to continue in Worsley's company for at least another six months, visiting northern Egypt, the west coast of Turkey, the Dardanelles and Constantinople.

Little can Paul Mellon have known, when purchasing the 'Views from the Levant' album in New Haven in 1960, that he was obtaining what were effectively illustrations to so extraordinarily well documented an expedition as that made by Sir Richard Worsley and his feisty architect-draughtsman Willey Reveley in southern Italy and the Mediterranean in 1785–86. Through their respective memoranda a fascinating insight can be gained to late eighteenth-century British antiquarianism and social observation in the pursuit of the Grand Tour. The journey, and the collections he started to form through it, projected Worsley to his status as a leading dilettante of the end of the century. Meanwhile Reveley was transformed from being merely one of the many later eighteenth-century architectural students who broadened their educations in Rome to being the second of only two Britons to acquire – and to merit – the sobriquet 'Athenian'. His attempts, beginning notably at Paestum in February 1785, to penetrate beyond idealised notions to a truer understanding of the reality and progress of ancient Greek architecture by a combination of close observation and historical research, foreshadow the great discoveries of the early years of the nineteenth century by his successors, such as entasis and the inward inclination of columns.⁸⁵ These, not to mention the almost total dominance of Greek Revivalism in British public architecture, Willey would have lived to see had he reached the age of 70, as he might reasonably have expected to do. Instead, some catastrophic bodily event took him off at his Oxford Street residence aged only 39, right on the eve of the new century, and he quickly slipped into an obscurity from which this essay has attempted, at least in part, to reclaim him.

I am very grateful to the Earl of Yarborough for permission to quote from the papers on his ancestor, Sir Richard Worsley, Bt., now on deposit at the Lincolnshire Archives. In having prepared this essay I owe a particular debt to Jonathan Yarker, who kindly re-examined for me the drawings that form its subject during a recent study visit to the Yale Center for British Art. At the Center itself I must thank Scott Wilcox for his expert advice, and Melissa Fournier and Maria Singer for their assistance. At the Lincolnshire Archives I thank Rob Waddington and James Stevenson for their

help. I am also grateful to Sue Palmer at Sir John Soane's Museum and to Ian Jenkins and Kim Sloan at the British Museum. Clare Hornsby kindly gave me her advice on Roman topography, as did Christos Tsirogiannis on a Greek inscription on one Reveley drawing. William (Hank) Johnson kindly shared with me notes he had taken on Reveley's 'Dictionary'. To Guiland Sutherland and other former colleagues of mine at the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art and Yale University Press, I owe a debt of gratitude for all their assistance – and forbearance.

- 1 Samuel Redgrave, *A Dictionary of Artists of the English School*, revised ed., London 1878, p.353.
- 2 A copy of the sale catalogue is bound into Reveley's 'Manuscript of material for [a] Dictionary of Architecture' in the British Architectural Library (Royal Institute of British Architects [hereafter RIBA]) ReW/1. It appears to have belonged to 'Mr Gandon, No. 94 Jermyn Street' (probably not the architect James Gandon, who was domiciled in Great Portland Street 1798–99 but back in Ireland in 1801). Another copy, documenting purchases made by John Soane, is now in Soane's Museum.
- 3 Howard Colvin, *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600–1840*, New Haven and London 2008, p.857, listing drawings now at the Victoria and Albert Museum (of which there are in fact 5), a volume comprising 60 tracings and sketches of Greek and Roman ornament from the Pio-Clementino Museum and other miscellaneous items at Sir John Soane's Museum (Volume 31), which was lot 95 on day one of the Christie's sale of Reveley's effects, and an album of early (that is 1776) architectural designs sold at Sotheby's in November 1979 and again at Christie's in December 1982. In addition to the drawings at Yale missed by Colvin, there are four at the British Museum. The Yale drawing of the Temple of Venus and Rome in Rome (YCBA B1977.14.19455) was reproduced in Frank Salmon, 'The Impact of the

Archaeology of Rome on British Architects and their Work c.1750–1840', in Clare Hornsby (ed.), *The Impact of Italy: The Grand Tour and Beyond*, London 2000, p.225, fig. 2; and in Frank Salmon, *Building on Ruins: The Rediscovery of Rome and English Architecture*, Aldershot 2000, p.44, fig. 26. For the second previously published drawing see note 34 below.

- 4 Paul Mellon Centre, London: RBF/1/686. The Reveley drawing is V&A D446-1887. The Cozens is in Oldham Art Gallery.
- 5 This 'Dictionary' appears to have been the very last lot in the Christie's sale of Reveley's effects and to comprise the 'numerous Remarks in M:S: by himself' mentioned by the catalogue. It was presented to the RIBA by Thomas Leverton Donaldson in 1851. There are some variations in the handwriting at the following places: fols. 289r–293v; 297r–298v; 301r–307v.
- 6 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 165r (the 'Journey' occupies fols. 165r to 188v of the 'Dictionary' and is transcribed on the same paper as the rest of the 'Dictionary').
- 7 Lincolnshire Archives [hereafter LA], Worsley Mss. 23 and 24 (the Journal, in two volumes) and 38 (the Catalogue of images). Ms. 38 is not paginated, so references to it will be made by using the drawing number (from 1 to 200).

- 8 The principal sources are Colvin, *Biographical Dictionary*, pp.856–57, and (for Reveley's Italian years) Frank Salmon in John Ingamells, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy 1701–1800*, New Haven and London 1997, pp.807–8. The portrait of Reveley that Colvin mentions as in the possession of a C.E. Kenney (who became 'late' between the 1978 and 1995 editions) has sadly not been traced.
- 9 LA, Bradford Mss. 2/4/49: '9 Ap: 1806 ... Conference with Mr Maynard of Hoxne Hall respecting the places of Sir R Worsley's Residence in the year 1785 when he informed me that he and Sir Richard were at Rome together in 1784, and that he had recommended to Sir Richard, Mr. Reveley, an Artist, to accompany him to Greece. Mr Reveley did so; and he was with Sir Richard at Constantinople when Sir Robert Ainslie was our Ambassador there. ... Mr Reveley's Father lives in Lambs Conduit Street; and his Brother is an Attorney in that part of the Town. Mr Reveley's widow may be living.'
- 10 Paul Mellon Centre, London, Brinsley Ford Archive, RBF/1/686 file: Journal of Peter Cowling, October 24, 1786, Rome: 'In the Afternoon walk'd with Mr Reveley to the Villa of Prince Borghese.'
- 11 British Library, Add. Ms. 36495, fol. 343 (full stops have been added to the quote). Reveley and Miss James must have been known characters among the English expatriate community at Rome. Reveley certainly knew the great impresario James Byres (see RIBA, ReW/1, fols. 278v and 302v), Elizabeth Cooper's landlord during George Cumberland's absence. In a letter written earlier the same month (fol. 320), Mrs Cooper had also mentioned Sir Richard Worsley. The marriage of Willey and Maria took place on 17 April 1788, according to John James' will (cited by Howard Colvin, in his file of papers on Reveley now at the RIBA).
- 12 These accounts are both reproduced in Frederick L. Jones (ed.), *Maria Gisborne & Edward E. Williams – Shelley's Friends: Their Journals and Letters*, Norman, Oklahoma 1951, pp.3–5.
- 13 See Terry Friedman, 'Willey Reveley's All Saints', Southampton, *The Georgian Group Journal*, vol.12 2002, p.89. At this time the Reveleys were living in Lisson Street, Edgware Road, but they must frequently have moved house for in 1790 they had been at 75 Great Titchfield Street, Portland Place (*ibid.*, p.77) and in September 1794 at Southampton-row, Edgware-road (James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, ed. Willey Reveley, *The Antiquities of Athens: Volume the Third*, London: John Nichols, 1794, p.xviii).

- 14 Richard Colt Hoare, who corresponded with Reveley when in Italy from 1788 to 1791, recorded having built ten lodges at Stourhead and Reveley sent designs for more than one of these in December 1797 (see Kenneth Woodbridge, *Landscape and Antiquity: Aspects of English Culture at Stourhead 1718–1838*, Oxford 1970, pp.131 and 153).
- 15 Reveley was one of eight people to submit schemes. His three proposals were the most ambitious, involving huge diversion works for the Thames between Woolwich and Wapping. The Committee considered him an 'architect and engineer' (a fellow competitor was Samuel Wyatt, described just as an 'architect') and Reveley's ideas were said to be 'novel, grand and captivating' – but not practicable (see Joseph Broodbank, *History of the Port of London*, 2 vols., London 1921, vol.1 pp.85 and 87. See also *The Monthly Magazine*, vol. 7 Part I, July 1799, p.147, for the statement that Reveley's ideas for the port were 'nearly ready for publication' (at the time of his death). Lindsay Boynton reported seeing Reveley drawings for the port on exhibition at the Guildhall in 1975 (Paul Mellon Centre, London: RBF/1/686).
- 16 *The Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. 69 Part II, July 1799, p.627. See also Redgrave, *Dictionary* (1878), p.353: 'he was eccentric, expressed his opinions sarcastically, and did not succeed to the measure of his abilities.'
- 17 Jones, *Maria Gisborne*, p.4. Godwin, himself widowed since the death of Mary Wollstonecraft in 1797, proposed marriage to Maria within a month of Willey's death.
- 18 J. Bowring (ed.), *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, vol. 10, 1843, pp.251–52. Bentham described Reveley as having 'an admirable pair of hands' but evidently appreciated Maria still more highly.
- 19 LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 2. The following day Worsley reported leaving Rome with 'Mr Reveley an English architect' (*ibid.*, fol. 3).
- 20 LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 33.
- 21 Paul Mellon Centre, London, RBF/1/686 file: letter from Lindsay Boynton to Brinsley Ford, 21 October 1975. Worsley's sister had married the Hon. John Bridgeman (named Simpson from 1785), and their daughter Henrietta was his heir. Since Henrietta was a minor when Worsley died in 1805, her paternal uncle Orlando Bridgeman, later 1st Earl of Bradford, acted as trustee.

- 22 YCBA File information, courtesy of Scott Wilcox.
- 23 Jonathan Yarker has pointed out that the 'Views in the Levant' album contained, in addition to the Reveley drawings, the highly finished drawing by Luigi Schiavenetti of Nathaniel Marchant's carved headstone intaglio of the 'Death of General Wolfe' (YCBA B1977.14.19417) which appears at the end of the second volume of the *Museum Worsleyanum*, as well as an unattributed watercolour of the cottage by the sea on the Isle of Wight to which Worsley retired in 1797 (B1977.14.19393). Plate 95 in the *Museum* shows the caryatid figure ('Ceres') from Eleusis that Worsley first saw with Reveley, but the plate is not based on Reveley's drawing (fig. 94 here).
- 24 LA, Worsley Ms. 38. In fact the Catalogue only contains 198 drawings, the numbers 145 and 149 being omitted, and by no means were all of the drawings 'taken on the spot' in the 1780s (or, therefore, by Reveley).
- 25 These drawings comprised the last set of lots of the Christie's sale, and it is noted that 'they are more fully described in a M.S. Catalogue, to which Reference may be made, according to the Numbers added to each Lot.' This 'M.S. Catalogue' has not been identified.
- 26 *Gentleman's Magazine*, July 1799, p. 627.
- 27 For a recent account of the fate of Worsley's paintings see Jonathan Yarker, 'The Last Resident: Richard Worsley, Lucien Bonaparte and his Collection of Venetian Paintings', *The Burlington Magazine*, January 2012, pp.37–43. Worsley's Journal itself (LA, Worsley Ms. 23) has a note inside the flyleaf saying that it was purchased from a sale at Malaga in 1806 – so that Worsley had it with him in Venice and it was returned to his estate after his death in 1805.
- 28 For example the two Paestum drawings at Yale (figs. 88 and 89 here) are clearly numbered 13 and 14 top left, whereas in the Reveley sale catalogue Paestum views fall between numbers 3 and 11 (lots 2–10) and in Worsley's catalogue between numbers 19 and 23.
- 29 One might infer from this that, back in Rome in 1787, Worsley commissioned Antonio del Drago to complete drawings from his own sketches (Worsley was a competent draughtsman himself) in order to replace those Reveley had retained or, since Reveley was also in Rome in 1787–88, that Reveley allowed del Drago to work on his drawings. In the Reveley sale catalogue, numbers 17 and 18 were indeed two views of 'Mount Etna, drawn at sea', the latter 'drawn at 15 miles distance'.
- 30 LA, Worsley Ms. 38, nos. 93–94 and 115–116 (the Venetian artist), 123–124 (the Turk), 178 (the Greek artist), 184–186 (the Russians). Moreover, Lady Berwick reported from Venice in 1795 that Worsley (British Resident there 1793–96) 'has a very valuable collection of drawings taken on the spot in Sicily & Greece' (Paul Mellon Centre, London: RBF/1/686).
- 31 For a recent article on Pars and the Ionian expedition see Ann Gunn, 'Paul Sandby, William Pars and the Society of Dilettanti', *The Burlington Magazine*, April 2010, pp.219–27. Worsley is not mentioned there, but in the Yale collection are what appear to be Pars's initial 1765 views of Sunium (YCBA B1977.14.19424), which is an early version of British Museum Mm,11.8, and of the Sacred Cave of Archidamus (B1977.14.19437), an early version of British Museum Mm,11.6 (their corresponding Sandby aquatints are also present at Yale). Finally there is a Pars view of the Temple of Jupiter Panhellenius on Aegina (B1977.14.19425), which has not worked up equivalent in the British Museum. These three drawings were numbers 39, 73 and 76 in Worsley's Catalogue.
- 32 British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, 1894.0516.17 (purchased by the Museum from Robert Jackson). This view, showing the east side of the Arch, was number 1 in the Christie's sale catalogue of Reveley's effects and became number 18 in Worsley's own Catalogue.
- 33 The only items at the Christie's sale of Reveley's effects that might correspond with these views, however, were lot 10 on Day 1 (which contained 'Fourteen of Roman Antiquities and Views in Italy' but these were 'Outlines' only, not watercolours), and Lot 11, which was the 'Pantheon at Rome, and 2 others in Colours'.
- 34 This drawing was reproduced in Andrew Wilton, *The Art of Alexander and John Robert Cozens*, New Haven, Yale Center for British Art, 1980, plate 2 (catalogue 141, where it is dated to c.1740 and said to be by an anonymous artist).
- 35 There is a very similar view of 1885 by Ettore Roesler Franz from an almost identical vantage point in the Museo di Roma [in Trastevere], Inventario: MR 119.
- 36 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 311.
- 37 For the comparative illustrations and a discussion see the two works by Frank Salmon cited in note 3 above.
- 38 I am very grateful to Clare Hornsby for her assistance in placing this location. Of the other remaining views of Rome recorded in Worsley's Catalogue, Number 11 is a 'View of the Claudian Aqueduct and the Reservoir over Porta Nevia'. Porta Nevia was a Gate in the Servian Wall of Rome just at the south-west corner of the Baths of Caracalla (and thus near the western end of the Aqua Claudia), mentioned by Varro and Festus but not surviving in the eighteenth century. Number 12 was a drawing 'taken from a window of the saloon in the Villa Negroni taking in the Temple of Minerva Medica, the Aqua Claudia and Frascati' on 30 May 1787 according to Worsley, who was evidently residing at the Villa Negroni after returning to Rome from his expedition (Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p.1019, cites Worsley's letter of 20 September 1787 thanking the Accademia di San Luca for his election as Honorary Member as addressed 'Dalla Villa Negroni').
- 39 Reveley's sale catalogue lists 23 drawings made in Athens, only one of which can be identified with certainty: an oblique view of the Doric portico in the Agora (number 38: 'An exact S.W. View of the Agora or Temple of Augustus', which survives as V&A 116-1877 (illustrated in Sigrid de Jong, 'Rediscovering Architecture: Paestum in Eighteenth-Century Architectural Experience and Theory', PhD diss., University of Leiden 2010, p.107, fig.1.20). Dated June 1785 on the mount, this drawing was evidently number 65 in Worsley's Catalogue, but its subsequent sale history has taken it elsewhere than Yale. The Yale collection does, however, contain two other drawings that may represent structures in Athens: YCBA B1977.14.19410 and B1977.14.19406. Reveley's sale catalogue lists, in a single lot, numbers 32 and 33, 'View of a Ruin at Athens, agreed by Stuart, Revet, and Chandler, to be the Gymnasium of Ptolemy; also a Ruin with Inscription, supposed to belong to the preceding.' These images and descriptions appear to correspond with numbers 63 and 68 in Worsley's Catalogue.
- 40 The north-east corner of the cornice and pediment is seen to be broken off in fig. 89, whereas the south-west corner can be seen entire in fig. 88. Also, in fig. 89 one can see a few pen strokes at the left which indicate the position, to the south, of the Basilica [Temple of Hera I] which Reveley decided to omit.
- 41 LA, Worsley Ms. 38, no. 19: 'A Perspective View of the Three ancient Temples at Posidonia or Paestum'; and no. 21: 'North East view of the same [Great] Temple at Paestum traced in a Camera obscura February 21 1785.' The Reveley sale catalogue number 9 was 'N.E. view of the same [Central or largest Temple] taken in a camera-obscura.' Number 4, however, the general view, mentions that 'N.B. The Tree is added, but the Rest of the Drawing is accurate.' It is not clear that fig. 88 includes the added tree.
- 42 In addition to the two drawings at Yale, two more Reveley drawings of Paestum survive at the Victoria and Albert Museum: V&A, D.446-1887 and D.140-1888 (both illustrated in de Jong, 'Rediscovering Architecture', p.106, fig.1.19). The former shows the Temple of [Athena] from the north-west (far less of the west pediment survived than the east into the eighteenth century). Reveley's catalogue mentions two views of that temple (numbers 5 and 6), but they were said to be from the south-east and south-west respectively. Worsley's Catalogue (number 22) was a 'South West View of an ancient Temple at Paestum, supposed to have been dedicated to Diana, drawn on the Spot Feb 21 1785.' The second V&A drawing, dated May 1786 on the back and thus made during Reveley's second visit to Paestum, shows the north side of the Temple of Neptune [Hera II]. It corresponds with number 8 in his catalogue: 'View of the North Side of the Central or largest Temple at Pesto. The tree is added.' Here the tree is very prominent at the right edge of the drawing (see note 41 above). Worsley did not have this view.
- 43 This is notwithstanding the fact that Chambers owned a copy of Major's book (and also Stuart's *Antiquities* and the first edition of Julien-David Le Roy's *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce* of 1758 (see David Watkin (ed.), *Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons, Volume 4: Architects*, London 1972, p.125).
- 44 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 244v.
- 45 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 229r.
- 46 LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fols. 22–23.
- 47 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 247r.
- 48 Reveley noted that there was a temple of Diana near Paestum, mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (RIBA, ReW, fol. 171r).

- 49 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 247r.
- 50 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 171r.
- 51 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 244r.
- 52 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 171v.
- 53 Stuart and Revett, ed. Reveley, *Antiquities*, vol.3, p.41.
- 54 Worsley's Catalogue (number 77) lists a 'View of a Doric Temple at Corinth built before the Time of Pericles' but, as there was no drawing of Corinth in the Christie's sale of Reveley's effects, this may have been drawn by someone else.
- 55 RIBA, ReW/1, fols. 245v–246v. On fol. 245r Reveley found it harder to appraise the small Temple of Ceres, in part because of its ruinous condition but also because of features that he struggled to reconcile with his understanding of Greek architecture: 'It is difficult to say when this temple was erected. The proportion of 6 to 13 cols: is Greek, as is also the general appearance of the cols: but not entirely. The disposition of the triglyphs is roman, & the pitch of the pediment approaches more to Roman than Greek.'
- 56 Stuart and Revett, ed. Reveley, *Antiquities*, vol.3, p.xi.
- 57 Stuart and Revett, ed. Reveley, *Antiquities*, vol.3, p.xiii.
- 58 Stuart and Revett, ed. Reveley, *Antiquities*, vol.3, p.xiii. Covering the same point in the Dictionary (RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 247r), Reveley observed that Le Roy had erroneously identified the Temple of Jupiter Panhellenius on Aegina as similarly having an uneven number of columns 'in the front' (see Robin Middleton and David Britt, *Julien-David Le Roy: The Ruins of the most Beautiful Monuments of Greece*, Los Angeles 2004, p.232, n.12).
- 59 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 171v.
- 60 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 172r.
- 61 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 173v. In his Catalogue, Worsley compared the statue's 'crown of laurel ... or perhaps of oak' to that of the figure of Constantine at the Capitol in Rome, and also opined that 'the cross in the Emperors hand is modern' (LA, Worsley Ms. 38, number 24). Reveley's reference is to Henry Swinburne, *Travels in the Two Sicilies 1777–80* (first edition London: J. Davis for P. Elmsly, 1783–85; second edition 1790).
- 62 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 175v. Worsley's Catalogue contains a closely similar description, but adds that the right column had collapsed during the earthquake of 1456 and had been subsequently sold to the people of Lecce (LA, Worsley Ms. 38, number 26). This information is repeated in Worsley's Journal (LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fols. 32–33). Worsley also mentions a modern inscription on the base of one column which might, potentially, relate to the inscription tablet on fig. 91.
- 63 Sir John Soane's Museum, Volume 31, no. 59.
- 64 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 177r; British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings 1927.0712.8. Lot 13 in the 1801 Christie's sale of Reveley's effects included 'Two W. Views of the Castle of Otranto', but Worsley's Catalogue does not include the Castle at all. The version in the British Museum must be a third one, because its provenance suggests that Worsley presented it to Horace Walpole, through the agency of Elizabeth Lady Craven, with whom he was at Constantinople in April–May 1786. Walpole discussed the drawing, Reveley's authorship and Lady Craven's presentation of it, in a letter of 17 January 1788 (and, in engraved form, it appeared in editions of *The Castle of Otranto* from 1791). See Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p.251.
- 65 LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 37.
- 66 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 177r.
- 67 The drawings were reversed chronologically as numbers 17 and 18 in the Reveley sale catalogue but are put back into order as 29 and 30 in Worsley's Catalogue. See note 29 above for discussion of the possible subsequent history of number 29.
- 68 Conceivably this is the drawing described by Reveley as 'a view of the castle & coasts of Calabria & Sicily looking towards the Streight of Messina' (possibly number 16 in his posthumous sale catalogue: 'S. View of the Streight of Messina.'). It is odd, however, that he should not mention – as does Worsley – a feature as distinctive as the spectacularly fractured mountain. Reveley also described making 'two views of Reggio one as we were in front of it & the other while at anchor' (RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 177v). One of these must have been number 28 in Worsley's Catalogue: 'East view of the city of Reggio drawn from the ship March 30 1785.' Reveley's own sale catalogue has, as number 14, a 'S.W. View of the City of Reggio in Calabria Ultra, drawn from the sea March 30th 1785.' YCBA B1977.14.19447 is a candidate for one of these views of Reggio, which Reveley described as 'a city of considerable length close to the sea on a gentle slope backed by bare mountains forming a beautiful object. Only one of its seven churches is now standing and that has a clumsy tower shook awry' (*ibid.*, fol. 177v). That description applies more obviously, however, to a Reveley drawing of Reggio now in the British Museum (Department of Prints and Drawings, 1878.0713.1277, purchased in 1878 from J. Hogarth & Sons). On 2 April Reveley drew Syracuse whilst becalmed off the shore, 'but being very far off it was but just perceivable' (*ibid.*, fol. 178r). The Syracuse view could be YCBA B1977.14.19398.
- 69 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 179v.
- 70 The other two views were more panoramic: number 33 took in the Castle St Angelo, the three cities of Vittoriosa, Burmola and Senglea as well as well as the Custom House and quays of Valetta; number 34 took in the point of Castle St Elmo but also Fort Ricasoli, the northern part of Vittoriosa and Castle St Angelo.
- 71 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 178v. The Castle St Angelo, on the opposite side of the city, was also 'built on a rock cut down', with four rows of batteries pointing to the harbour mouth. Reveley provided a long translation describing the harbour by a French officer.
- 72 YCBA, B1977.14.19402 appears to correspond with Worsley's Journal description of a Turkish cemetery just outside Canea on Crete (LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 54). Reveley also described the cemetery (including the 'turband' headstones that feature on the drawing), but he does not say that he drew it (RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 180r). Moreover, the single drawing of Crete listed in both Reveley's sale catalogue (number 22) and Worsley's Catalogue (LA, Worsley Ms. 38, number 36) was a view in the port at Canea.
- 73 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 184v is left blank. For details on Reveley's Athenian drawings see note 39 above.
- 74 LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 138.
- 75 RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 187r. Figure 94 was number 55 in the posthumous sale of Reveley's effects.
- 76 These notes occur in two sections: RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 265r and fols. 266r–v.
- 77 LA, Worsley Ms. 38, number 74. See Middleton and Britt, *Le Roy*, p.428.
- 78 LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fols. 141–142. For Worsley's inclusion of this statue in the *Museum Worsleyanum*, see note 23 above.
- 79 LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 206. Reveley recalled that the 'family' additionally included Gaspary's brother-in-law, Mrs Gaspary's sister Mlle. Miette, and a Dr de Villoison (RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 186v). The attractive Mlle. Miette evidently caught Reveley's eye, for his pencil profile portrait of her was 'drawn at Athens June 1785' (Sir John Soane's Museum, Volume 31, no. 44).
- 80 YCBA, B1977.14.19416 is very possibly the drawing made at Marathon listed as number 72 in Worsley's catalogue (LA, Worsley Ms. 38): 'South west view of the Plain of Marathon/ drawn June the 15 1785.'
- 81 LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 224; RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 187r.
- 82 YCBA B1977.14.19399 possibly shows 'Magdalena, one of the common Greek women of the Isle of Miconi in the dress of the country drawn July 18th 1785' (LA, Worsley Ms. 38, number 80). However, that portrait is said to show the figure 'front & back', so the drawing might rather be number 119, 'A drawing of a Maddalena, one of the people that go about the streets of Cairo singing the praises of Mahomet, drawn from life August the 5th 1785.'
- 83 LA, Worsley Ms. 38, number 81. The description relates closely to that in Worsley's Journal (LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 238). Reveley's Journey merely records that, at six in the morning on 9 July, 'we saw the door architrave of the temple of Bacchus of white marble which stands up although there are no vestiges of the other parts of the temple' (RIBA, ReW/1, fol. 188r). As has been seen, the drawing was number 55 in Reveley's sale catalogue, part of the same lot (42) as the Church of the Panagin on Paros.
- 84 LA, Worsley Ms. 38, number 82. The wording from the Catalogue here is almost verbatim that of Worsley's Journal (LA, Worsley Ms. 23, fol. 241) and, as has been seen, the drawing was number 56 in Reveley's sale catalogue, part of the same lot (42) as the Temple of Bacchus on Naxos.
- 85 See Frank Salmon, 'C.R. Cockerell and the Discovery of Entasis in the Columns of the Parthenon', in Frank Salmon (ed.), *The Persistence of the Classical: Essays on Architecture Presented to David Watkin*, London 2008, pp.106–23. Entasis and the inward inclination of columns were both announced in print for the first time in the supplementary, fifth volume of *The Antiquities of Athens* in 1830, although their actual discoveries date to the second decade of the nineteenth century.
