Planting ‘Italian gusto’ in a ‘Gothick country’: the influence of Filippo Juvarra on William Kent
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After a lacklustre attempt to become a painter, William Kent (1685–1748) developed a career as a garden designer, working mainly for Lord Burlington and other patrons in his circle. His gardens represent some of the earliest gardens of a style that became known as the ‘English Landscape Garden’, exemplified by Stourhead in Wiltshire, Rousham in Oxfordshire and Stowe in Buckinghamshire; so named in part because, in the past, scholars have pointed to landscape painting as the primary influence on the creation of this new style.

The idea that the landscape garden is a representation of the ‘natural’ landscape belongs to a later period, that of Horace Walpole at the end of the eighteenth century. However, Walpole applied it retrospectively to designers like Kent in an effort to prove that the garden designers of the early eighteenth century had been aiming for an ideal that ultimately would be achieved by the ‘high’ phase of landscape gardening, the Picturesque School. In addition, Walpole, as well as Joseph Addison and Alexander Pope, argued that the landscape park was a purely English invention, quite at odds with the European style of gardening, which was stereotyped as the symmetrical parterres and neatly clipped box-hedges of gardens such as was to be found at Versailles. Walpole’s viewpoint was subsequently accepted as fact in much garden history written during the twentieth century.

In recent years this point of view has fallen from favour. Laurie Olin, for example, has criticized the way landscape painting has been considered to be not simply a possible influence on some gardens of the period, but the sole influence on all gardens. Yet despite this criticism, the idea that these gardens were three-dimensional representations of landscape paintings has remained popular. For example, an article published in 2002 dealing with a project at Stourhead that involved the reconstruction of various lost eighteenth-century structures referred to the garden as ‘a living Claudian landscape’, in spite of the fact that the project involved the recreation of various later eighteenth-century features, including a Turkish Tent and a Steel Bridge, which never appeared in the landscapes of Claude. Clearly there were other influences at work within these eighteenth-century English gardens. Olin convincingly demonstrated the influence of the park-like vigne of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italy, such as the Villa Madama in Rome, but the theatre has been proposed also. Susan Lang suggested that, in addition to Italian gardens, Kent was influenced by the theatre he had known in Rome during his time spent in Italy, and John Dixon Hunt has also pointed to Kent’s close involvement with theatre as a possible influence on his garden designs. Yet despite the general acceptance of Kent’s involvement with theatre both as a spectator and designer, we still lack a clear idea of exactly how this may have impacted upon his garden designs.

In this paper, therefore, I shall present a way of approaching Kent’s garden designs that focuses on his experiences in Rome and his subsequent position within the musical and theatrical milieu of Lord Burlington. I shall explore the influence of Italian set design upon the garden style that Kent introduced to England in the 1720s, and go from there to the wider question of the ‘theatricality’ of the English Baroque garden.

In 1720 Kent, newly returned to England from Italy, wrote to his patron, Burrell Massingberd, that ‘I keep my little room only twice a week [then] I go to the operas where I am highly entertained and then
think myself out of this Gothick country'. Kent was clearly dissatisfied with England after his long stay in Italy, which took place from 1709 to 1719. During his time in Italy, Kent often wrote of his intention to introduce ‘ye Italian gusto’ to the arts of England, and it seems that, back in ‘Gothick’ England, Kent was pining for Italian culture by recalling his theatrical experiences in Rome. In England, Kent was at this time much engaged with garden design. If his mind was so focused on his memories of Italian opera, as this passage suggests, it is likely that the garden style he introduced into England in the 1720s was shaped in some way by his experience of Italian opera, where garden sets were not uncommon.

The leading set designer in Rome during the first half of Kent’s stay there was Filippo Juvarra (1678–1736). Between 1708 and 1714 Juvarra was architect to Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni, and during this period his work consisted almost exclusively of designing sets for operas. These sets were for operas staged in Ottoboni’s private theatre in his residence, the Palazzo della Cancelleria, and for operas sponsored by the cardinal at the public Teatro Capranica. Juvarra also worked for other patrons as a set designer, including Queen Casimira of Poland. Kent was deeply involved with the artistic community in Rome at this time. He studied at the Accademia di San Luca, where Juvarra was teaching architecture between 1707 and 1709, and then again in 1711 and 1712, and he won the second prize in the second class in painting at the Concorso Clementino of 1713. During this time Kent also attracted the attention of Cardinal Ottoboni. In 1716, Kent wrote to Massingberd that:

I cannot do less then to inform you of my success with Cardinal Ottoboni though, [I] am ashamed’d for fear it should be thought vanity, you know at Rome its the custom to expose pictures at feasts, I having done mine which happened to be a great subject, reps’t: Cyrus king of Persia a given liberty to the Jews to return to Jerusalem to build the temple, I was desir’d to expose it at the feast of the St Rock [San Rocco] which I did and by good fortune was lik’d both by the Italians and English that was here, the Cardinal made me a handsome present and took it (it) now hangs up in his house ... the Cardinal ... told me when I return [from a tour of Lombardy] I shall do another ...  

In another letter of 1717 Kent wrote that ‘I have been with the cardinal since I came [back to Rome]’, suggesting that the artist was now resident with him. Nevertheless, Kent was not listed in Ottoboni’s household at the Palazzo della Cancelleria for 1715, 1716 or 1717, so he may have meant only that he had entered the cardinal’s milieu. Although this contact with the cardinal comes after 1714, when Juvarra had moved to Turin, Juvarra returned regularly to Rome, notably to produce a design for the new sacristy at the Vatican in January 1715, when he stayed in Rome for seven months.

An acquaintance with Juvarra may have come about also through Kent’s friendship with Sir Thomas Coke, who was mentioned regularly in the former’s letters to Massingberd. The two appear to have been close friends. While in Rome Coke engaged an architectural tutor, possibly Giacomo Mariari, and took a keen interest in architecture. For his part, Juvarra was known to English patrons. The catalogue of his works by Giovanni Battista Sacchetti, published with an anonymous life of the artist in 1847, but written around 1736, refers to ‘Disegni di piu idee fatti per diversi milordi inglesi’ made in 1716. One of these ‘milordi inglesi’ was Anthony Grey, Earl of Harrold, who, on his Grand Tour, sought critical comments from architects on the designs for the remodelling of the family mansion at Wrest Park in Bedfordshire, and to this end he sought out Juvarra in Turin in 1715. Juvarra apparently produced a new design for the house, as well as offering comments upon a design already executed by Giacomo Leoni (Fig. 15.9). Juvarra also produced two drawings for a small garden pavilion (Figs 15.10 and 15.11). Juvarra was acquainted also with Lord Burlington, although whether they met during his Grand Tour in 1714–15 or when he revisited Italy in 1719 is unknown. Burlington, however, must have been acquainted with Cardinal Ottoboni, since on his return to England in 1715 he took several of the Cardinal’s court musicians with him.

To sum up, Kent, Juvarra and Burlington belonged to overlapping circles of acquaintanceship centred on the court of Cardinal Ottoboni. All three were in Rome in the winter of 1714–15. All three met in London in 1719. In July 1719 Juvarra had left Portugal, where he was working, to visit London. He was the guest of the Portuguese ambassador for a month, and during this time was a frequent visitor to Lord Burlington. A letter of 1719 written by Paolo Antonio Rolli, an Italian librettist living in England and a member of the Burlington circle, to Giuseppe Riva recorded this visit by Juvarra to London.
The conclusive evidence of a relationship, albeit at a later date, is a volume of drawings of architectural fantasies by Juvarra at Chatsworth, from the collection of Lord Burlington, which bears a dedication from Juvarra to Burlington in 1730. Aside from these fantasies for Burlington, the designs by Juvarra for the opera Teodosio il giovane (Palazzo della Cancelleria, 1711) were copied by the English set designer John Devoto, who worked as a set designer for Handel operas. This proves that at least some of Juvarra’s sets were known in eighteenth-century London.

As Kent’s letter indicates, he had attended operas in Italy. In a letter to Massingberd, written during his Italian stay on 26 January 1714, Kent wrote that, ‘Operas are begun at Queens & Capranica’. This is a reference to the public opera at the Teatro Capranica, and to the private operas put on by the widowed Queen Casimira of Poland, resident in Rome from 1699 until her death in 1716. The Queen sponsored productions in a small theatre in her palace, the Palazzo Zuccari. In 1713 the operas performed in Queen Casimira’s theatre, which was under the direction of Domenico Scarlatti, were Iphigenia in Tauris and Iphigenia in Aulis, with music by Domenico Scarlatti and sets by Filippo Juvarra. As it seems that Kent must have seen one or both of these operas, this is a good place to begin to explore Kent’s experience of Roman theatre.

Around seven of Juvarra’s sketches have been identified securely as connected with these two operas. A sketch for Scene I of Iphigenia in Tauris shows a body of water surrounded by trees with a ship approaching from the left, a classical temple with a columned portico and a dome reminiscent of the Pantheon rising behind (Fig. 16.1). This drawing resembles a...
view at the garden of Stourhead in Wiltshire, with its ‘Pantheon’ by the lake (Plate 16.1). This comparison is not the usual one made between works of art and this view at Stourhead. More commonly Claude Lorrain’s Coast View of Delos with Aeneas in the National Gallery, London, is invoked, and it is assumed that Henry Hoare was inspired by this image to create the view of the Pantheon in his garden. (In fact, Hoare owned copies of two paintings by Claude in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj in Rome, and although one of them, the View of Delphi with a Procession, is related in composition to the Coast View of Delos with Aeneas, it does not make reference to the Pantheon.)

Further, the only contemporary reference that links the painting with the landscape at Stourhead refers to Gaspard Dughet, not to Claude. Hoare wrote in a letter that a view of Stourhead, once completed, ‘[w]ill be a charming Gaspard [Dughet] picture at the end of the water’. Hence, in spite of the visual similarity between Claude’s paintings and views at Stourhead, there is no concrete evidence that Hoare intended to recreate scenes from particular paintings by Claude. Neither do we have any record of Kent taking a particular interest in landscape painting. In his letters he stated that he had acquired ‘landskips’ for his patron, but he did not express a direct engagement with landscape imagery in the way that he engaged with the theatre, or with the works of Correggio in Parma, or the pages written upon the work of Giulio Romano at the Palazzo del Te.

On a formal level, the similarity between the Juvarra set and the Stourhead ‘view’ is very close. Is it reasonable to connect the two images, or is the connection merely fortuitous? The Stourhead temple was erected in 1754, six years after Kent’s death, but it may well have been designed earlier. There is no direct evidence as to who designed the Pantheon, but it appears to have been a collaborative effort, involving Hoare, his architect, Henry Flitcroft, and Kent. If Juvarra’s theatre set, filtered through Kent, did play a role in the conception of the site, then we might like to reconsider the emphasis on the iconographical programme of the garden that flows from connecting the structure with either Claude’s Coast View of Delos with Aeneas, or the View of Delphi with a Procession, which has dominated art historical accounts of Stourhead.

Kenneth Woodbridge, after reviewing the possible designers of the Stourhead Pantheon, supported his preferred option — that Flitcroft and Hoare collaborated — by reference to an account of the iconographical programme of the garden, which, he argued, was based on Virgil’s Aeneid. Woodbridge observed that the view ‘bears more than a casual relation’ to Claude’s painting, which illustrates an episode from the third book of the Aeneid. He pointed out that the inscription ‘procul, o procul est profani’ on the Temple of Flora further round the lake comes from the sixth book of the Aeneid; hence, he concluded, the path around the lake symbolizes Aeneas’s journey. This has set the direction of research for most subsequent scholars. However, if the idea of a Pantheon beside the lake derives, however indirectly, from Kent’s experience of Juvarra’s set, it provides little encouragement for such an iconographical account, since the set design represents the Temple of Diana on the island of Taurus where Iphigenia, rescued from being sacrificed herself, is now a priestess preparing unfortunate travellers for sacrifice to Diana.

A set for the pendant opera, Iphigenia in Aulis, provides a more direct link to William Kent’s garden design. This set design shows an army encampment (Fig. 16.2), with in the centre a large tent shown with its curtains drawn aside so that a view of a distant city can be glimpsed beyond. The tent acts like a second proscenium, repeating the stage curtains. We find in Kent’s designs for landscape gardens a number of similar motifs. One drawing, not connected with an extant garden structure, shows a grand tent (Fig. 16.3), while another shows a tent to be erected over a river (Fig. 16.4). Both designs have echoes of Juvarra’s set design. Such campaign tents later became a feature of landscape gardens, where they are usually identified as Turkish tents. One was recently reconstructed at Stourhead during 2002, based upon the structure described by F.M. Piper on his visit to the garden in 1779: he stated that it was positioned so as to provide a view across the lake to the Pantheon. A similar tent was constructed at Painshill Park in Surrey in 1760. Kent’s drawings would appear to constitute some of the first proposals to incorporate tents into garden design, and may derive directly from his experience of these Roman operas.

If we move now beyond these two operas to Juvarra’s designs for opera sets and Kent’s garden design more generally, there are many other intriguing connections. For example, designs for groves with small circular temples and obelisks appear both in Juvarra’s designs for the stage and those by Kent for gardens. Although we only have direct evidence of Kent attending the operas of 1714, we must assume that he...
Fig. 16.2. Filippo Juvarra (1678–1736), Encampment, set design for Iphigenia in Aulis, performed in Rome, in the theatre of the Queen of Poland, 1713. Pen and ink. Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, Ris. 59/4, fol. 69 (1). (Photo: Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale.)

Fig. 16.3. William Kent (1685–1748), Design for a Royal (?) Tent. Pen and wash over pencil. London, Victoria & Albert Museum, E.387-1986. (Photo: © V&A Images.)

regularly attended the Roman opera seasons during his time in Italy, and so it is plausible to search for further inspirations for Kent’s gardens in Juvarra’s other set designs.

The opera *Il ciro*, with sets by Juvarra, was performed in 1711, when Kent was resident in Rome. The design for Scene III exists in two versions. The first shows ‘A Temple prepared for Sacrifice’ (Plate 16.2). In the foreground is a small altar, behind which stands a circular temple with six pairs of Solomonic columns and a small domed roof. This tempietto is set within a sort of amphitheatre, the scene is surrounded by trees and a cloth ceiling hangs above the tempietto. The second drawing also has a small altar in the foreground with a circular tempietto behind (Fig. 16.5). This example evokes Kent’s Temple of Ancient Virtue at Stowe, where a small circular temple with single evenly-spaced Ionic columns and a small domed roof nestles amongst bushes and trees (Fig. 16.6).

A version of this temple also appears in much the same form in a number of other designs by Kent, including several showing his proposal for a cascade upon the hillside at Chatsworth, in Derbyshire (Fig. 16.7), and the Chiswick cascade (Fig. 16.8), and also a design for ‘Buildings on lawn’ for the gardens at Badminton House. Although such temples have other obvious sources, such as the Temple of Vesta at Tivoli, there is an undeniable affinity between the set
designs by Juvarra and Kent’s ideas for temples within wooded groves. Furthermore, there are a number of circular temples in the sketches by Juvarra dedicated to Lord Burlington in 1730, which show that such imagery was part of Juvarra’s repertory, and may have flowed from there to Kent.

**GARDEN DESIGN AND THEATRE**

Kent was clearly inspired by the theatre designs he encountered during his Italian sojourn. Furthermore, Kent’s involvement with two of the greatest musical patrons of the early eighteenth century, Ottoboni and Burlington, would have ensured that his perception of the classical and mythical past was more likely to have been shaped by attendance at the opera than by landscape paintings. For us, today, landscape paintings by Claude present a more powerful image than do the preparatory sketches and engravings by which we know eighteenth-century opera sets. But if we try and imagine the sets as they first appeared, as magnificent backdrops to operas, we can begin to understand how influential they must have been. One of the best images in this regard is Giovanni Paolo Panini’s view of the interior of the Teatro Argentina painted in 1747 and showing a performance of a secular cantata (Plate 1.2). 48

In order to try to recreate the nature of the early eighteenth-century theatrical experience, and the effect this may have had on garden design, we need...
some basic concepts. The obvious terms are ‘theatrical’ and ‘theatricality’, but the usages of these terms are problematic. Is a theatrical art one that has the style of a dramatic performance, one that is showy and spectacular, one that is assumed, or artificial, or one that invokes spectatorship? It can be all or any of these things, and its very imprecision makes it difficult to work with. Besides, the term ‘theatrical’ has so many negative connotations that it distorts our understanding from the start.

Instead, what I propose is to discuss Kent’s garden designs in terms of the ‘Theatre-esque’. This term obviously takes its cue from the concept of the ‘Picturesque’. At its simplest level, the Picturesque garden contains qualities ‘after the manner of painters’. A handful of statements concerning the ‘Picturesque’ qualities of the Early English landscape garden have been brought to bear on them. These include Pope’s statement that ‘All gardening is landscape painting. Just like a landscape hung up’[^5][^49], or Hoare’s aforementioned statement that one view of Stourhead, when completed, ‘will be a charming Gaspard [Dughet]’[^50].

Consequently ‘Theatre-esque’ must be defined as art that takes ‘after the manner of theatre’. But what elements constitute the Theatre-esque? These elements may include such formal derivations as I have proposed, but they may also extend into ways of experiencing the garden. One consequence of the Picturesque approach is that it leads to considering the landscape garden as one to be taken in as a single view, or as a series of single views, each of which corresponds to a notional painting. Yet such a static experience is at odds with the actual experience of gardens, which invariably involves moving through them. Theatre, however, although using static sets based on one-point and multi-point perspectives, is an art form involving living people who move through space, a space that is partly real and partly fictive, a description that applies equally well to the Baroque garden. The concept of the Theatre-esque can accommodate the experience of movement in a way that the Picturesque cannot.

If we assume, then, that Kent’s intention was more Theatre-esque than Picturesque, other designs by Kent must be analysed in terms of this and other aspects of the concept of the Theatre-esque, both in order to understand better Kent’s influences and also to refine the concept.

If we assume, then, that Kent’s intention was more Theatre-esque than Picturesque, other designs by Kent must be analysed in terms of this and other aspects of the concept of the Theatre-esque, both in order to understand better Kent’s influences and also to refine the concept.

In some sketches by William Kent for a sea-horse pavilion we see an overt similarity to theatre sets in the designs themselves. In the first of two sketches on the same sheet the pavilion appears either to sit upon the water or to be situated directly at the water’s edge (Fig. 16.9). In the second there seems to be an idea for it to be positioned at the end of a grassed avenue.
Forward of the portico there is the suggestion of a ship’s hull, from which rises a figurehead in the form of a horse, not dissimilar to the figurehead in Juvarra’s design for Scene one of *Iphigenia in Tauris*. The temple is similar in both, and in both is situated upon the water’s edge. This drawing therefore may be a conflation of two ideas from Juvarra’s set design.

This type of fantastical structure is certainly similar to the types of invention found on stage in other Juvarra sets, such as the designs for Scene I of *Theodosius the Younger* (1711) (Fig. 16.10). The sets of this opera must have been known in London as the English set designer Devoto made copies of them, possibly after a printed edition of the libretto. Here a small circular temple sits upon the waters in a port surrounded by classical buildings. Staircases from this temple lead upwards to a floating garden in the clouds. This spirit of extravagant fantasy is associated much more readily with theatre than with the Picturesque.

Another aspect of the Theatre-esque in Kent’s work is the way that he would design garden areas that clearly are intended to resemble, and even to be representations of, set designs. In these the design emphasizes the central perspective views, rather than the asymmetry that we associate with Claude and the Picturesque. An example is his design for a cascade on the hillside at Chatsworth (Fig. 16.7). Designed symmetrically, it has a strong central axis running up the hill and two inventive classical buildings flanking the cascade. A similar set design with a central perspective of a garden was made by Juvarra for the opera *Junius Brutus*. Other designs include forms typical of outdoor theatre forms, such as a sketch of a design for the exedra at Chiswick, which is very similar to exedrae found in Italian garden theatres, such as at the Villa Aldobrandini, which we know Kent visited.

Another example is Kent’s amphitheatre of orange trees, which was laid out in the gardens of Chiswick,
Fig. 16.10. Filippo Juvarra (1678–1736), Seaport with Macchina, set design for Theodosius the Younger, performed in Rome, Teatro Ottoboni, 1711. Pen and ink. London, Victoria & Albert Museum, print room reg. 8426: 14. (Photo: © V&A Images.)

Fig. 16.11. Antonio Fritz and assistants, Anfiteatro d’agrumi from Delizia Farnesiana, c. 1723. Engraving. Parma, Biblioteca Palatina. (Photo: K. Grant.)
and is depicted in a painting by Pieter Andreas Rysbrack. This closely resembles the Anfiteatro d’agrumi (Fig. 16.11) in the gardens of the Farnese villa at Colorno near Parma, which Kent had visited in 1714. This amphitheatre was constructed between 1708 and 1712, during the first phase of this garden’s design, and was designed by Ferdinando Galli Bibiena, one of the eighteenth century’s greatest set designers.

Finally, we turn to the Theatre-esque and the experience of the garden. In Kent’s illustration of his friend Pope’s garden at Twickenham (Fig. 16.12), we see two typically Kentian figures standing to the right, and the shell temple before them. But to the left the image diverges from the real, and deities descend upon clouds. A similar mix of the real and the fantastic exists in a capriccio by Kent of Hampton Court and Esher Palace (Fig. 16.13), where a man and woman stand observing the scene while a triton drives his sea horses down the river before them. Kent’s gardens sought to create an alternative reality, or a type of idealized Arcadia: an experience that would have been heightened by the visitor’s experience of the garden as a three-dimensional space. Such drawings demonstrate a fascination with the idea of the garden space as an enchanted one, in which an alternative reality could be entered into and experienced.

In conclusion, it is evident that we should read the influence of theatre set designs on Kent’s garden designs as the consequence of a desire to create, in three dimensions, the semi-pictorial world of the stage. More than this, it then represents a desire to realize the world enacted within those sets. Kent was in pursuit of a fictive world that was intended to be experienced not simply as a landscape cleverly imitating a painting, but as something that could be experienced not only by the eye, but by the other senses and by the spectator’s body itself. The visitor could move through the garden and discover a succession of scenes; but, more importantly, these scenes became spaces that could be entered, and within them the kind of dramas shown on the stage could be re-enacted. In this way, the ideal world alluded to in the garden could become as alive, or even more alive, as the world of opera, with its illusionism, special effects and singers.
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