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Abstract

In, Out, and Again: Reading and Drawing John Soane’s Lectures at the Royal Institution of Great Britain (R.I.) (1817 and 1820)

This thesis shifts existing scholarship on the lectures of the architect John Soane (1753-1837) from previous examination of them in architectural history as a set of written texts illustrated by drawings, towards a new understanding of how such lectures operated as events with associated textual documents, and as part of a nineteenth-century performance practice of architecture. Considering Soane’s lectures as a form of performance practice, and drawing on performance studies as a methodology for the practice of history, this thesis argues for greater acknowledgement of the active role of the drawings in the lectures than has previously been recognised, as well as a more nuanced appreciation of the way that words and drawings were used together by the Soane office to practise and perform architectural knowledge in various ways. Through analysis of new primary archival evidence related to Soane’s lectures at the Royal Institution of Great Britain (R.I.) – evidence and lectures not yet investigated academically – I explore this lecturing practice in relation to the particularities of the oral culture of the period and within the R.I.’s existing strong ‘arts and sciences’ culture of performance that was rooted in a longer tradition of scientific demonstration.¹

With reference to existing work in the field,² I make the case for architectural history as a practice³ that is performative. Overall the performative structure

¹ See for example, Thomas Sheridan, British Education... (London: printed for R. and J. Dodsley, 1756); Sean B. Franzel and Mary Helen DuPree (eds), Performing Knowledge, 1750-1850 (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2015); Sarah Zimmerman 'Coleridge the Lecturer, A Disappearing Act', in Alexander Dick and Angela Esterhammer (eds), Spheres of Action: Speech and Performance in Romantic Culture (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 46-72; Jan Golinski, Science as Public Culture: Chemistry and Enlightenment in Britain, 1760-1820 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
of the thesis which combines ‘reading’ and ‘drawing’ with ‘in’, ‘out’, and ‘again’
becomes a way to practise, perform and play with the history,\textsuperscript{4} to compare
different actions of reading evidence (directly, contextually and
repeatedly/performatively), and to facilitate and demonstrate further
reflection on architectural historiographical processes.
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\textsuperscript{3} Jane Rendell, ‘Subjective Space: A Feminist Architectural History of the Burlington Arcade’, in

\textsuperscript{4} Rebecca Schneider, ‘Interview with Rebecca Schneider: What is Performance Studies?’, conducted by
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Introduction:
Rehearsal and Preparation
In, Out, and Again

This thesis shifts existing scholarship on the lectures of the architect John Soane (1753–1837) from previous examination of them in architectural history as a set of written texts illustrated by drawings, towards a new understanding of how such lectures operated as events with associated textual documents, and as part of a nineteenth-century performance practice of architecture. Considering Soane’s lectures as a form of performance practice, and drawing on performance studies as a methodology for the practice of history, this thesis argues for greater acknowledgement of the active role of the drawings in the lectures than has previously been recognised, as well as a more nuanced appreciation of the way that words and drawings were used together by the Soane office to practise and perform architectural knowledge in various ways. Through analysis of new primary archival evidence related to Soane’s lectures at the Royal Institution of Great Britain (R.I.) – evidence and lectures not yet investigated academically – I explore this lecturing practice in relation to the particularities of the oral culture of the period and within the R.I.’s existing strong ‘arts and sciences’ culture of performance that was rooted in a longer tradition of scientific demonstration.

This research is based on four years of observations made in the Soane Museum archive of Soane’s written lecture manuscripts and lecture drawings. Such materials were produced by the Soane office in preparation for lectures at two London institutions: at the Royal Academy of Arts (R.A.) between 1809 and 1836, which have previously been studied by the architectural historian David Watkin and seventh Soane Museum Curator Arthur Bolton;¹ and at the scientific establishment of the Royal Institution of Great Britain (R.I.) in 1817 and 1820, lectures which have never been closely studied before. I take these latter, neglected and shorter series of R.I. lectures as the focus of this thesis,² showing how Soane consciously considered his performance and delivery, and how he combined word and


² The first series of R.I. lectures took place on 7 June and 14 June 1817, whilst the second series took place on 27 May, 3 June, 10 June and 17 June 1820. See dated manuscripts for these lectures: SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 1-2, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817). Soane Case 158, Lectures 1-4, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1820).
drawing whilst preparing, performing and reflecting on such lectures for
and at this particular institution.

In the following thesis, I show how Soane’s performance practice of lecturing
architecture can be productively read through concepts of performance and
performativity. Performance and performativity were later conceptually
framed by twentieth- and twenty-first-century historians and theorists such
as Rebecca Schneider, Dorita Hannah, Olav Harsløf and J.L. Austin, but they
also seem to have been in circulation in various, differing forms in the early
nineteenth century. I explore evidence for Soane’s lectures in relation to this
latter context in several ways, including via consideration of primary evidence
of Soane’s own engagement with and participation in a prominent discourse
concerning contemporary public speaking – that of the Elocutionary
Movement, which actively debated and theorised issues of vocal delivery,
among which were Thomas Sheridan’s theories of delivery and the primacy of
speech over writing, and John Thelwall’s exploration of elocution. On the
other hand, I consider existing scholarship drawn from literary, art and
science history, as well as from performance studies, which has explored the
operations and significance of performance and demonstration cultures, as
well as historically specific concepts of performativity at work in the
nineteenth century. In so doing, my enquiry into Soane’s lectures as a
performance practice of architecture draws from and extends existing
scholarship that often broaches the subject of the public lecture; this
scholarship includes work by literary historians Sarah Zimmerman, Judith
Thompson, Patricia Howell Michaelson and Angela Esterhammer, art
historian Trevor Fawcett, and science historian Jan Golinski. Examining the
lecture within the same period but in a largely German-speaking context, I
also here draw from the work of artist Sybille Peters and cultural historian
Sean Franzel. Indeed, as Franzel and German literary historian Mary Helen
Dupree write in their book *Performing Knowledge, 1750-1850*:

> The period between 1750 and 1850 was a time when knowledge and its modes of transmission were reconsidered and reworked in fundamental ways [...]. Exploratory attempts to shape these new experiences abounded across a wide range of institutional and cultural settings, including public experiments and scientific spectacles, theatrical and scholarly presentations, and the founding and reform of a variety of cultural and educational institutions. The public status and pedagogical function of scholarship, science, and the arts were gaining access to newly discovered knowledge.
and becoming familiar with the idea that this knowledge had the potential to transform the self and the world.³

In addition to considering primary and secondary evidence and literature for the wider oral culture in which Soane’s lectures participated, this thesis also draws attention to the importance of recognising the specificity of the R.I.’s institutional context as a setting for understanding his lectures there. As I researched the first two decades of the R.I. (which was established in 1799), I noticed that there were several vital factors concerning this institution at this particular historical moment which marked it out as different to the R.A., the other organisation where Soane lectured. The R.I. was the first of a number of London ‘institutions’ which, as cultural historian Jon Klancher has noted, forged ‘a new kind of learning organisation with unprecedented public impact’ and were different to the older ‘societies’ and ‘academies’, particularly in terms of their semi-public nature, lay audiences which included women, and specific interaction between the ‘arts and sciences’ (a phrase which, Klancher shows, was used then).⁴ As science historian Frank James and architectural historian Anthony Peers have written, the R.I.’s primary activity of lectures – housed within a purpose-built lecture theatre that also formed the centre-piece of its Georgian townhouse premises on Albermarle Street – aimed towards a new public exposition of science and, ‘Follow[ing]...the strong eighteenth-century tradition’, began by ‘stag[ing]...spectacular and entertaining, not to say dangerous demonstrations of scientific experiments’.⁵

Significantly, the lectures at the R.I. were not only on what we would now class as science subjects.⁶ Indeed, from 1804, five years after the R.I. was established, a concurrent programme of lectures in literature, the belles lettres, elocution, music, moral philosophy and painting also began. Famous speakers such as Samuel Coleridge attracted particular attention for their spoken performances, which have been described by other historians as ‘designed’⁷ and through ‘us[ing]...the arts of performance... manipulate[ed]’.
speech and gesture',⁸ and as forming a literary public lecture 'genre' and practice which, according to Sarah Zimmerman, had developed out of a tradition of extemporaneous radical speaking.⁹ This thesis considers the R.I.’s interwoven ‘arts and sciences’ lecturing culture at the R.I. It argues that such a context starts to inform a new approach to consideration of Soane’s lectures on architecture, viewing them as both an art and science and as a nineteenth-century performance practice of architecture.

This study of Soane’s lecturing as a performance practice uses performance history, theory and practice to consider and read architectural history. Interrogating these disciplinary intersections in detail has led me to explore the ways in which the historical evidence contained in the R.I. lecture manuscripts and drawings, as well as the meaning of Soane’s lectures and lecturing practice, becomes activated, questioned, and open to being read in new ways. It should be noted that the intersection between architecture (and/or design) and performance has been explored in detail recently,¹⁰ and a growing number of architectural writers and critics use concepts of performance and performativity to research and write about various dimensions of architecture’s past and present.¹¹ While work on the practice of

⁹ Sarah Zimmerman, ‘Coleridge the Lecturer, A Disappearing Act’, in Alexander Dick and Angela Esterhammer (eds), Spheres of Action: Speech and Performance in Romantic Culture (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 46-72, 51.
architectural history has a twenty-year history, studies which focus on the interface between architectural history and epistemological and methodological issues concerning performance are now starting to emerge. However, there has been no study to date which scrutinises the relation between performance and the performative in the practice of architectural history. My thesis explicitly scrutinises this territory and proposes architectural history itself as a performative practice, while at the same time drawing direct inspiration from the aforementioned writers in such closely related adjacent discussions. In particular, I draw on the work of Jane Rendell, who, in addition to her work on the idea of architectural history as a practice, developed 'site-writing' as a practice which emphasises the performative and spatial qualities of critical writing.

Whilst studying Soane’s lectures, three key terms – ‘practice’, ‘performance’ and ‘performative’ – have become particularly important for working between architectural history and performance history, theory and practice. In turn, two composite terms have arisen, that of ‘performance practice’ and ‘performative practice’, which, together with ‘practice’, ‘performance’ and ‘performative’, I apply in specific and differing ways both to Soane’s lectures and to my own architectural historical enquiry (outlined in some detail in the first section of this introduction, ‘Conceptual Framing’). My understanding of these terms is also reflected in the methods of my practice of this mode of architectural historical enquiry and writing. Three methods of architectural history were developed during this project in direct response to the process of

---


observing specific issues in the R.I. manuscripts and lecture drawings. These methods are transcription, the re-enactment of lecture drawing facsimiles, and the harnessing of the live qualities of reading and encountering material evidence in my written descriptions of the archival work that I have conducted.

To summarise, this thesis makes a contribution to knowledge through its study of new primary archival material relating to Soane’s R.I. lectures, through the use of performance history, theory and practice as a way of reading this architectural historical evidence, and through the methods I develop to conduct and write about the enquiry itself as well as to position architectural history as a form of performance and performative practice. In accordance with these different levels of the research, my thesis examines the implications for architectural historical knowledge and practice of extending the call made by theatre and performance historians, such as Rebecca Schneider and Diana Taylor, to use performance studies itself as a methodology for doing history. This thesis in turn takes up the implications of this question for architectural history, asking how performance studies can influence a methodology for doing architectural history. In so doing, my research picks up on Schneider’s assertion that ‘performance studies is an invitation to put ideas into play’, at the same time as taking into account ‘the reality effects that playing has’.

Each of the three methods noted above that I have introduced for the first time in this thesis – namely, transcription, re-enacting the lecture drawing facsimiles, and adopting a live approach to reading and writing the history – play with the possibilities of showing to the reader the process of the practice of reading and questioning evidence. Moreover, they have been developed specifically in response to the observations in the manuscripts and lecture drawings for Soane’s lectures as a performance practice. In simultaneously exploring within each of these methods the evidence which is to be read and the act of evidencing it, I draw from performance historian Heike Roms’

translation and reflections on the German artist Sybille Peters’ research,\(^6\) where concepts of performance and performativity are recognised to be at the heart of a Western notion of ‘evidence’. Offering one of the only English translations of Peters’ study of the history of the academic lecture as a performance,\(^7\) itself a key reference for this thesis, Roms writes:

It is as a result of its twin roots in philosophy and rhetoric that ‘evidence’ has emerged as an ambiguous term, sliding as it does between a thing done and a thing doing, or between reference to the production of knowledge and to its presentation: while as a noun ‘evidence’ is commonly associated with proof, as a verb ‘to evidence’ is also synonymous with ‘to show’ or ‘to demonstrate’. We may call this evidence’s performative conundrum: in order for something to serve as a proof it needs to be presented or, we might say, performed as such. But the act of performing evidence – whether that be carrying out a scientific demonstration, laying our one’s finding in a conference paper or composing a written argument – exposes that any proof, however rigorously conceived, is never a given certainty but rather the product of (often complex) actions of construction, representation and persuasion.\(^8\)

In addition to the three methods of the practice of this architectural history, which play an active role in exploring the notion of evidence as performed, I also propose to make a further contribution to knowledge through the performative structure of the thesis itself. Following this extended introductory chapter, the thesis is split into two main ‘parts’: Part I: Reading, in which I engage with the R.I. lecture manuscripts, and explore differing concepts and practices of reading; and Part II: Drawing, in which I engage with the lecture drawings shown at the R.I., and explore differing concepts and practices of drawing. Then, at a more micro-level, I combine the words ‘in’, ‘out’, and ‘again’ with the words ‘reading’ (in Part I) and ‘drawing’ (in Part II) to create a performative sub-structure which – following the ideas described by Roms above – both presents the evidence in the manuscripts and drawings encountered at different stages of the project, and evidences the processes of reading this evidence.

---

\(^6\) Sybille Peters, Der Vortrag als Performance (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2011).


Whilst initially emerging from this process of research (rather than being applied onto it), the motif of ‘in, out, and again’ has subsequently become a more formal conceptual framework to practise, perform and play (following Schneider) with the history, to compare different actions of reading evidence (directly, contextually and repeatedly/performatively), and to facilitate further reflection on historiographical processes. Whilst the sub-structure of Parts I and II is derived from the same ‘in, out, and again’ logic, this manifests slightly differently in each part to reflect the different processes and actions of reading that occur in each case. In Part I, where the lecture manuscripts are examined, I move through a simple tripartite structure, with sections respectively entitled ‘Reading In’, ‘Reading Out’, and ‘Reading Again’. In Part II, where the lecture drawings are examined, I adopt a more varied structure of four sections consisting of ‘Drawing In’, ‘Drawing Out’, ‘Drawing In’, ‘Drawing Out’, which are then concluded by a final section entitled ‘Drawing Again’. The research and writing in Part I constitutes the first piece of work I conducted in the project, which in turn directed the performative structure of the thesis as a whole. The structure of Part II subsequently evolves that of Part I, reflecting a later stage of the project, and also its different processes of repeatedly cross-reading the lecture drawings with other written documents, including the previously studied lecture manuscripts.

The first section of Part I, entitled ‘Reading In’, explores the action of reading silently into a piece of written evidence, whilst the following section, ‘Reading Out’, explores the broader context of nineteenth-century practices of reading aloud. In ‘Reading Again’ I explore the process of reading evidence in the manuscript again through the practice of transcribing, which I develop with reference to Rebecca Schneider’s theories of re-enactment.19 Through acts of writing the manuscript again, I re-enact the original acts that went into the original writing of it, as well as the scene(s) of its construction through a number of different hands. I argue that these acts of transcribing and ‘reading through writing again’ themselves play an active role in enabling historical evidence and conditions for reading evidence for Soane’s lectures in ways that are not possible when the manuscript is submitted to a more conventional silent reading (without the accompanying act of transcribing).

---

In Part II, which shifts to an exploration of the lecture drawings, I adopt a similar approach to that of Part I by considering what it means to read a drawing or a set of drawings on their own, and then in context. But this time, instead of using a tripartite structure (of ‘in’, ‘out’, and ‘again’), the majority of Part II consists of repeating the action of focusing ‘in’ and ‘out’ more than once in order to accommodate a more intense, repeated action of directly and contextually reading the lecture drawings. In the repeated ‘Drawing In’ sections, I explore different ways of drawing in, or drawing close, when reading the lecture drawings, at the same time as considering what it means to be ‘drawn in’ by the drawings whilst reading them. I also reflect on how these lecture drawings may have drawn in the audience when they were encountered in the R.I. lecture theatre. In the repeated ‘Drawing Out’ sections, I draw out to consider other archival evidence (including the lecture manuscripts) and secondary literature; together, these enable the lecture drawings to be situated more broadly in both Soane’s practice and other nineteenth-century performance practices. In the concluding section of Part II, entitled ‘Drawing Again’, I discuss how I used life-sized facsimiles of the lecture drawings to ‘re-enact’ the lectures within the current space of the R.I. lecture theatre, in conjunction with reading aloud the words of the R.I. lecture. This activity, which I have called a ‘practical history seminar’, was carried out in April 2016 with fifteen other people to re-enact aspects of Soane’s use of the lecture drawings and to explore the relationships between words and lecture drawings. It formed part of a performance practice in a manner that is different to reading and imagining the lecture drawings in the archive.

Important, there is also a historical logic to the way I have approached concepts and practices of reading and drawing which, it is important to note, have different meanings in 2017, compared to the how they were used and understood two centuries ago, in 1817 and 1820. Similarly, my use of the terms ‘word’ and ‘drawing’ to describe the respective verbal and visual components of Soane’s lectures also has a logic which comes primarily from Soane’s own recorded use of these terms in his practice of lecturing. I have decided specifically to use ‘word’ over ‘text’ to describe the verbal aspect of his work and connect this to reading. This decision results from the fact that, firstly, the term ‘word’ more effectively encapsulates the meanings of both the spoken and written, and secondly, that it prevents confusion with my use elsewhere of the term ‘lecture text’ to describe one among a number of different types of written text in the lecture manuscripts. Likewise, I have
chosen the term lecture ‘drawing’, which was the term most frequently used by the Soane office, in preference to other names for the same documents referred to by other historians, such as lecture ‘illustration’, favoured by David Watkin, and lecture ‘diagram’, preferred by Arthur Bolton.\footnote{Watkin, ‘Soane and his lecture illustrations,’ \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, 396-408; Bolton, \textit{Lectures on Architecture}.}

This \textit{Introduction} develops over nine sections. The current section, ‘\textit{In, Out, and Again}’, introduces the thesis, its research contexts, methods and overall structure. The next section, ‘\textit{Conceptual Framing}’, is an extended summary which introduces my research aims and questions, and conceptually frames my use of key terms throughout the project. I then move on to ‘\textit{John Soane’s Lectures at the Royal Institution of Great Britain (R.I.)}’, which gives a more detailed account of the institutional context of the R.I. and Soane’s lectures there. This is then followed by ‘\textit{Reading Existing Histories of John Soane’s Lectures}’, which outlines the existing historical work on Soane’s lectures at the R.A. and R.I.

The fifth section of the \textit{Introduction}, ‘\textit{Histories, Theories and Practices of the Lecture in Architecture}’, operates as a literature review of a key research context to this thesis. It explores existing discussions about the lecture, including the lecture as a performance, which have taken place within the discipline of architecture.

After this literature review, the next pair of sections focus on the methods comprising my own practice of architectural history, examined in terms of performance and the formative. In ‘\textit{Using Performance History, Theory and Practice for Reading and Practicing Architectural History}’, I provide a more detailed summary of the key ideas of re-enactment and the cross-temporality of liveness, as theorised by the performance historian Rebecca Schneider, indicating how her work has impacted upon my own reading and approach to Soane’s lectures as performance practice. In ‘\textit{Methods of my Practice, Performance Practice and Performative Practice of Architectural History}’, I start by situating the thesis in relation to the broader context of historiography and architectural history. After this, I give a more detailed account of my three methods – transcribing the R.I. manuscripts, re-enacting the lecture drawing facsimiles, and a live approach to reading and writing.
architectural history – which links back to Schneider’s ideas in the previous section and situates them in a broader methodology of performative practice.

I end the introductory chapter with ‘Summary of Parts and Sections’, which details the contents of Part I and Part II and reiterates the importance of the twin structures of reading and drawing in the broad schema of the overall thesis. It also highlights how, at a more micro-level, in, out, and again are used together to organise and perform this history.
Conceptual Framing

There are three main aims of this thesis, which respectively encompass the different historical, theoretical and methodological dimensions of my research. My first aim is to communicate new historical knowledge and evidence on John Soane regarding the significance of his lecture practice. The second aim is an extension of the first, and is to explore how performance as a lens can be used to activate the material evidence in new ways, and to consider the history and significance of Soane’s lectures as nineteenth-century forms of performance practice and performative practice. Finally, my third aim is to propose architectural history itself as a twenty-first-century practice – performance practice and performative practice – a status which, within the context of this thesis, I argue plays a critical role in reading and writing this history of the early nineteenth-century architectural lecture.

Importantly, these aims have developed in dialogue with a number of other elements: namely, the historical evidence, the performance theory, and the way that I have carried out this enquiry (which includes my encounters with both the historical evidence and theory), all of which influence and ask questions of one another, in more than one direction, throughout the project. This thesis places value on self-reflexively studying and articulating these reciprocal processes to the history which is being written. Whilst the above aims each state different kinds of contributions to architectural historical knowledge and indicate my arguments regarding practice, performance, performance practice and performative practice in relation to both Soane’s lectures and my own work, the following four sets of questions in the next paragraph emphasise the conceptual contours of the arguments which I have pursued, and further start to locate them in terms of their critical significance in this thesis. The first three questions directly expand and correspond with each of the three specific aims above. The final question – which regards the relative status and interaction between word and drawing, and text and image, both in Soane’s and my own practice – simultaneously addresses all three aims, in turn emphasising how the arguments and findings of this project cut across the historical evidence, theory and method.

My first question addresses my first (largely historical) aim, asking in what ways we can understand Soane’s lectures as a practice that both addressed the specific institutional context of the R.I. and was composed of drawings as well
as words. My second question addresses my second (largely theoretical) aim, asking what can be learnt from approaching Soane’s lectures as a nineteenth-century performance practice and performative practice, and considers how such an understanding could build on and expand existing scholarship regarding the lectures. My third question addresses my third (largely methodological) aim, asking in what different ways architectural history can itself operate as a practice, performance practice and performative practice, and what might be the historiographic value of so doing. My final question addresses all three of my aims, asking whether it is possible to propose that Soane’s lecture drawings led his words or whether the words led the drawings. In addressing this fourth question, I consider why it is important to explore the relation of Soane’s words and drawings, but also at a broader scale how relations between image and text play a role in my own practice of architectural history.

Throughout the thesis, I use the terms ‘practice’, ‘performance’ and ‘performative’, as well as several composite terms, including ‘performance practice’ and ‘performative practice’. I apply these terms to Soane’s lectures, and also to my own processes carried out as an architectural historian. Such definitions actively arose from my encounters with the primary archival material (these encounters are described in both Part I: Reading and Part II: Drawing), and are also combined with my readings of history and theory relating to performance. It therefore may seem in some ways premature to outline and ‘front-load’ the meanings of these terms here.

In composing the overall thesis, I considered allowing the reader to ‘discover’ the definitions as I developed them in response to specific acts of reading and working with/through the evidence and theory. As this project specifically draws the reader’s attention to the process and practice of architectural historical enquiry, and reflects directly on the value of doing so to one’s own encounters with and the subsequent reading of evidence for architecture’s past, this makes conceptual sense, and so I have intentionally retained these qualities of ‘live discovery’ in Parts I and II.

However, at the same time, I have approached this introduction as itself operating as a form of preparation and rehearsal for the reader for the performance of history which is to come. Recognising the constructed nature of historical and academic writing and the fact that I am writing parts of the introduction after doing the research, I also then here provide simple
explanations of the way I use these terms in the section which follows. These explanations in turn operate as a conceptual framing for the thesis as a whole. To some degree the decision to order my discussion in this way is a strategy that seeks not to overburden or ‘apply’ the theory to the observations and readings I have made of the evidence. Whilst at specific points in Parts I and II I address specific theoretical ideas and questions also set out in this ‘Conceptual Framing’ section, this is done only after they have been raised by or generated through encounters with the material evidence itself. The remaining writing of the ‘Conceptual Framing’ comprises two sub-sections, each further sub-divided into four ‘modes’ (as I term them). The first discusses Soane’s activity of lecturing ‘as practice’, ‘as performance’, ‘as performance practice’ and ‘as performative practice’, whilst the second explores my own architectural historical enquiry ‘as practice’, ‘as performance’, ‘as performance practice’ and ‘as performative practice’.

Soane’s Lectures

as Practice

The *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) cites several different meanings for the word ‘practice’, beginning with: “The carrying out or exercise of a profession”21 – a meaning which would certainly have meant something to Soane. Indeed, in his R.I. lecture texts, by continually writing phrases like ‘to practice Architecture’22 and ‘the practice of Architecture’,23 Soane used the word ‘practice’ both as a verb and noun in this sense of to ‘carry [...] out or exercise’ the architectural profession.

A second meaning given by the *OED* configures ‘practice’ as:

The actual application or use of an idea, belief, or method, as opposed to the theory or principles of it; performance, execution, achievement [...].24

---

22 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 1, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817), 7.
24 OED Online, '2a. practice, n.', accessed 25 April 2017,
Related to this (but this time not articulating a specific relationship with or distinction to ‘theory’), a further meaning is offered as a part of this second definition:

The action of doing something; method of action or working.25

We can see that Soane also used these meanings of ‘practice’ within his R.I. lecture texts – this time to signify the practical domain of the architect, or the activity and knowledge that comes with construction and actual building, and which also includes other professional factors such as the budgeting and finance of a project. Writing in the second R.I. lecture of 1817, Soane elaborates on what constitutes the ‘practice’ of architecture, distinguishing it from that which is studied by a student of architecture. He writes: ‘the delightful visions of early youth must now give place to the knowledge of materials, the solidity and practicability of execution, to the shackles of building in a great City, to the restraint of economy!’26 Shortly after, in the same discussion, Soane further articulates this concept of ‘Practice’, by more explicitly contrasting it with ‘Theory’. He elaborates:

[...] if, forgetting the difference between Theory & Practice, fired with the recollection of the triumphal Bridges of the Ancients he lets loose his imagination and offers such a design as this, [at this point in the lecture manuscript, the instruction for a lecture drawing to be shown of a Triumphal Bridge is noted] the result would be that his design must be treated as a theoretical vision, as a pleasing picture, or as a mere Portfolio drawing. A still further elucidation of the difference between theory and practice is strongly marked in the following designs for a Senate House; [here, a corresponding drawing which consists of Soane’s own design for Senate House designed on his Grand Tour is noted to be shown] the first composed, like the Triumphal Bridge as a study, in quiet moments when the youthful mind unsickled with the frequent disappointments of a professional life, was only occupied in the contemplation of the remains of Imperial Palaces, solemn

http://www.oed.com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/view/Entry/149226?rskey=MqVxKS&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid

25 OED Online, ‘2c. practice, n.’, accessed 25 April 2017,
http://www.oed.com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/view/Entry/149226?rskey=MqVxKS&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid

26 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 2, Royal Institution Lectures (1817), 44.
Temple, and magnificent Baths of the Ancients [...].

In this excerpt, the activity of engaging with the work of ancient architects and producing drawn designs based on these studied principles is conceived as a theoretical endeavour, inherently different to its ‘practice’ and the associated experience of the realities (linking back to the OED’s first definition above) of delivering and realising a building. But where does this specific use of the term ‘practice’ in relation to ‘theory’ locate the activity of lecturing architecture, an activity which, in terms of the written content of the lecture texts and depicted content of the lecture drawings, can be understood to follow Soane’s description of ‘theory’ through its promotion of the ‘recollection’, ‘imagination’ and ‘contemplation’ of both ancient architecture and other past buildings from subsequent historical periods?

But equally, as my own editorial interpolations added within square brackets in the quotation above indicate, there is also the matter of how this theory was being done between the words written (which were then spoken) and the drawings produced (which were then shown). Whilst the textual content of the lecture text (just quoted) could suggest Soane himself would have understood his own lecturing activities as ‘theory’, the words of his lecture texts’ apparently scripted relationships to specific drawings suggests a method of devising and creating instructions for their future practical performance. Could this form of visual/verbal scripting within the manuscripts prompt an approach to the same lectures as themselves a form of ‘doing’ or ‘execution’ of architecture (linking back to the second OED definition), that is, of the lectures as a form of practice in their own right? Whilst Soane does not refer directly to the ‘practice of lecturing’ in his lecture texts, he does get close to this by conceiving of them as a form of action.

Soane’s opening words to the second lecture of 1817, for example, refer in the first line to the activity and preparation of lecturing in terms of being: ‘the endeavour to discharge the task I have undertaken...’ The words ‘endeavour’, ‘to discharge’ and ‘task’ (as well as the words ‘to execute’ and ‘to perform’, which are written in Soane’s hand in the adjacent margin as alternatives for ‘to discharge’) together demonstrate an attitude, perhaps in passing (although the marginal notes suggest intention), about the doing of his lectures.

---

27 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 2, Royal Institution Lectures (1817), 45.
28 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 2, Royal Institution Lectures (1817), unnumbered page opposite page 1.
A third meaning given by the *OED* introduces the important notion of the development of conventions, habits and ways of doing something or working, iterated over time. Here ‘practice’ is described as: ‘The habitual doing or carrying on of something; usual, customary, or constant action or performance’; and, as: ‘A habitual action or pattern of behaviour; an established procedure or system’. Many of Soane’s uses of the term ‘practice’ also often encompass this sense, particularly when he makes reference to customary and established ways and methods of designing. Examples of this include references to the ‘practice of the Ancients’, which indeed as a subject underscores the discursive text of both his R.A. and R.I. lectures, as well as references to the transmission of particular ways and conventions of designing and building between specific different nations and eras (as in ‘this deviation from the practice of Egyptians was imitated by the Romans’). In his many critiques of conventions of designing buildings within his own time, Soane uses the word ‘practice’ in similar ways, both when generally setting out his objectives for the lectures (‘I trust in the course of these lectures, opinions of practice so fatal to Architecture will be fairly refuted’) and when speaking in more specific terms, for example in relation to positioning the Doric column’s large entablature over thin pilasters (‘a practice too common in the Architecture of this Country’).

If we accept my supposition above regarding a possible rationale for reading Soane’s activity of lecturing itself as a form of ‘practice’, the *OED*’s third meaning of the word – which prompts the concept of process or a way of doing or ‘behav[ing]’ developed over time – seems equally important. Indeed, the processual nature of the activity of preparing for and giving lectures does appear to have been developed through their ‘habitual’ and repeated doing between 1809 and 1836 (noting the word ‘habitual’ implies concepts of

---

31 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 1, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817), 37.
33 Note that an ‘opinion of practice’ could equally be construed as a theory. SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 1, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817), 1.
34 SM Archives, Soane Case 158, Lecture 3, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1820), 12.
repetition). My historical enquiry pursues evidence for the ways, the ‘action[s]’ and the ‘behaviour[s]’ – practical or otherwise – which appear to have become ‘customary’ by the Soane office whilst ‘carrying on’/out and ‘executing’ the lectures.

A sense of process and repetition is further emphasised through the *OED’s* fourth definition of ‘practice’, that is, as a: ‘Repeated exercise in or performance of an activity so as to acquire, improve, or maintain proficiency in it; activity undertaken to this end’. In further placing significance on the process, and drawing attention to the motivation behind a practice being to develop ways to improve its doing, we can consider the ‘activit[ies]’ of Soane’s lecture ‘practice’ not only to include those involved in the lecture events themselves (see below for further definition of lecture ‘event’), but also to imply the constellation of preparation and reflection activities carried out before and after such lectures. This thesis explores a range of evidence for the differing activities of Soane’s lecture practice which included: reading, writing, planning drawings, overseeing the production of drawings, using words and drawings together to communicate architecture, practically organising and transporting drawings, giving lectures at the R.A. and R.I., putting away drawings, and reflecting on and adapting the words and drawings between lectures. I assign the term ‘practice’ thus to the process and continuum of preparing, delivering and reflecting activities carried out before, during and after individual lectures and taking place over twenty-five years.

*as Performance*

The fact that the word ‘performance’, which is included within several of the definitions that I quote above for ‘practice’, illustrates well the ways that the two terms often contain associated concepts and share genealogies; in fact, they are very often used interchangeably. On the one hand this has made

---

36 *OED Online*, ‘4. practice, n.’ (Oxford University Press, March 2017), accessed 25 April 2017, http://www.oed.com.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/view/Entry/149226?rskey=MqVxKS&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid Note that there are a number of further meanings of the word ‘practice’ provided by the *OED* which are less relevant to this discussion of ‘practice’ in relation to architecture and Soane’s lectures including: 5. ‘The action of scheming or planning’ or 6. ‘A practical treatise; an exercise for students’ etc.
distinguishing between the terms as they pertain to the lectures of Soane difficult, whilst on the other it has forced me to be specific. Whilst I suggest that what is at stake through using the term ‘practice’ in relation to Soane’s lectures is the recognition of a process of developing a range of ways of doing and executing the lectures over time, I use the term ‘performance’ on the other hand to refer to their status and significance as an activity that was carried out in front of, and whose meaning was actively derived from the involvement of, an audience. The following discussion of Soane’s lectures as a performance considers them first in terms of mainly twenty-first-century definitions, then in terms of nineteenth-century definitions.

The architectural theorist Dorita Hannah and set designer Olav Harsløf, within their introduction to a collection of essays co-edited on the subject of ‘performance design’, helpfully define performance as:

[...] any public demonstration of actions, tasks and skills – consciously enacted and received – that encompasses dramatic expressivity, culturally codified behavior and operational competency.37

Soane’s lectures as performances can be understood within these terms: they were semi-public demonstrations of ‘actions, tasks and skills’, which took place on the stage of the R.I. lecture theatre, and were, as this thesis shows, both ‘consciously enacted’ by Soane and consciously ‘received’ as such by Soane’s ticket-buying audiences. They are historical instances of public speaking, which may be read as ‘conscious enactments’ of architectural knowledge and Soane’s early nineteenth-century views on the role of the architect, and past and (then) present architecture. Approaching Soane’s lectures as performances highlights the significance of evidence which indicates both that they were ‘dramatic[ally] expres[sed]’, and that they appear to have actively scripted the relation between the speaking of words and the showing of drawings in order to communicate architecture in particular ways. The lectures as performances can also be considered in terms of their function as public demonstrations of Soane’s authority and identity as an architect and professor, and through their participation in nineteenth-century codes of both architecture and performance.

This thesis acknowledges the broad range of well-known theoretical work in performance and theatre studies which explores the difficulties of strictly delimiting the temporal and spatial boundaries of a performance. Historians who challenge performance’s temporal boundaries include theatre and performance historian and theorist Rebecca Schneider in her work on re-enactment, 38 Marvin Carlson in his study of the haunted stage, 39 and Richard Schechner’s characterisation of performance as a form of ‘restored’ or ‘twice-behaved behaviour’. 40 These writers show how the meaning of a performance is constructed beyond the immediate ‘live’ moment in which it is enacted, and that it is indeed both predicated and reliant on previous and future acts, and is itself a form of behaviour that is repeated and rehearsed. Likewise, historians who challenge performance’s spatial boundaries include Marvin Carlson and Tim Fitzpatrick, whose work considers on-stage and off-stage relations, 41 Gay McAuley, who studies the built spaces of rehearsal, 42 and architectural historian Jane Rendell, who analyses the green room, foyer and other interior spaces beyond the auditorium of London’s Italian Opera House in the 1820s. 43

The above outlines those aspects and contexts of Soane’s lectures which conform to and/or become significant through recognising them as performances, according to the definition provided by Hannah and Harslof. In spite of this complexity regarding the status of a lecture as a performance, and the suggestion that reading the meaning of Soane’s lectures as such involves consideration of more than one time and place, it is nevertheless helpful to give some boundaries to each of Soane’s R.I. lecture ‘events’. This task, however, prompts similar difficulties. With specific reference to the temporal “length” of an event’ for example, theatre studies scholar Willmar

38 Schneider, Performing Remains.
Sauter reflects that:

[...] an event can never be limited to an exact beginning or end, because there is always a reason before the beginning and a consequence after the end. The ‘length’ of an event is eventually determined by the purpose of the investigation and therefore depends on the decisions of the observer, i.e. the researcher.  

With this in mind, I define the lecture ‘event’ – constructed specifically as a performance – as the incident and situation which occurred within the physical R.I. lecture theatre between 1-2pm, on specific dated Saturdays in May and June during 1817 and 1820. Here I consider evidence for the actions of Soane and his office helpers on the R.I. stage, the R.I. audience in attendance, and the words and drawings which were spoken and shown during these specific dated lectures. I also consider the broader social and institutional setting within which such actions and their reception took place.

As performance theorist Jon MacKenzie has written, performance studies focuses on ‘the pervasiveness of performance as a central element in social and cultural life’, and initially began in the 1940s and 1950s by employing ‘theater as a model for studying uses of language, ritual, and everyday interactions.’ Whilst the activities which performance studies (and, by extension, performance history influenced by performance studies) explores range greatly – from the ‘rituals and practices of everyday life’ to ‘avant garde performance art’ to ‘microconstructions of ethnicity’ – it should be noted that Soane’s lectures conform much more conventionally to a model of the theatre.

---


45 As theatre and performance historian Thomas Postlewait writes, ‘we should note that the event ... can be approached as an object, a text, a discourse, an act, or a performance. In other words, given our wide range of interpretive approaches, we may construct the event in several different ways.’ See Thomas Postlewait, ‘Constructing Events in Theatre History’, in Cremona (ed.), Theatrical Events, 34.


In an account by a visitor to the R.I. in 1805, Benjamin Silliman wrote:

The theatre is the room where the lectures are given. It is a superb apartment, and fitted up with great convenience. It is semicircular and contains a pit and gallery in which the seats rise row behind row. It is lighted above through a circular orifice which, whenever the lecturer wishes to darken the room, can be shut at pleasure by a horizontal screen connected with a cord. This theatre has often contained a thousand persons.\(^4^8\)

In this account, and also as can be seen in Images 1 and 2 which show a plan and section of the R.I. lecture theatre, the physical space within which Soane’s lectures took place can be recognised as aping the built format of the playhouse. Likewise, this room, even before it was designed, was always conceived of and named as a ‘theatre’.

As I mention in the opening pages of this thesis, I explore Soane’s lectures as performances not only through recent understandings of what a performance could be, as suggested by performance studies (laid out above), but also in terms of nineteenth-century definitions, such as those expounded by members of what has been termed the ‘elocutionary movement’ in Britain, who heavily theorised and practised different attitudes and approaches to public speaking and vocal performance. Such ideas ranged from Thomas Sheridan’s theories of delivery and the primacy of speech over writing to John Thelwall’s exploration of elocation. Indeed, I show how Soane acquired in published form, or came into direct contact with, the work of both these men, potentially in connection with attempts to prepare for and improve his own spoken delivery. In a further attempt to understand this historically specific culture of performance, I consider other historians’ work which examines the literature, art and science lecturers who were Soane’s peers, competitors and acquaintances, and who seemed to consciously approach the activity of lecturing as performances in specific ways.

In so doing, my enquiry into Soane’s lectures as performances of architecture is inspired by key existing studies carried out by literary historians, including Sarah Zimmerman’s work on the genre of the early nineteenth-century literary lecture as a performance, Judith Thompson’s explorations of radical public oratory and elocution during the same period, and Patricia Howell Michaelson’s study of reading aloud and speech in relation to Jane Austen. I also draw from science historians, including Jan Golinski’s and Simon Schaffer’s work on scientific lectures of the period, which they show both drew on and departed from a longer tradition of scientific demonstration and British empiricism. Examining related cultures of the same time within a largely German-speaking context, I also refer to (via performance historian Heike Roms and artist and researcher Daniel Ladnar’s translations) artist and performance studies researcher Sybille Peters’ long history of the performance lecture, and cultural historian Sean Franzel’s work regarding the interconnections between oral discourse and printed text in relation to the Romantic lecture.

*as Performance Practice*

In conjunction with considering Soane’s lectures as a ‘practice’ and ‘performance’, this thesis ultimately reads them as an early nineteenth-century ‘performance practice’ of architecture. If we approach this term as a sum of its parts, we could understand its meaning to be the Soane office’s process over time of developing ways of doing and executing the lectures, where the lectures are specifically considered as a performance. But what difference does it make to the status of the activities listed above which make up Soane’s lecture ‘practice’ (reading, writing, preparing drawings etc.), when those same lectures are conceived of as a form of performance, that is, as an

---


activity prepared for, carried out in front of and staged to be received by an audience?

As I explore through evidence contained in the R.I. lecture manuscripts and drawings in *Parts I* and *II*, Soane very much seemed to be conscious of and attentive to his own performance and delivery; and I show how this affected the ways he prepared, performed and reflected on his R.I. lectures. In particular, I show how approaching the lectures as a performance practice specifically activates the issue of the significance of the relationship between the texts or words of the R.I. lectures and their drawings. In shifting from architectural history’s existing preoccupation with Soane’s lectures’ text, demonstrated through David Watkin’s previous scholarship on Soane’s R.A. lectures, to the matter of their performance practice, this project reflects broader shifts which have occurred in the humanities over the course of the twentieth century and which are associated with the emergence of performance studies as an academic discipline, itself ‘an offshoot of Theatre Studies or Drama/Literary Departments’. As theatre and performance historian Marvin Carlson has written:

> The entire Western tradition, from the Greeks onward, considered the drama primarily as a branch of literature [...] Traditionally theatre scholarship was based upon the literary text (Aristotle’s apparent indifference to spectacle is an early and notorious example of this bias), and the actual process of the physical realization of this text, while not entirely ignored, was a matter of considerably less interest.

‘[T]he actual process of the physical realization of this text’ is a useful way of describing my own approach to Soane’s lectures as a performance practice of architecture, where not only the content of the lecture texts is studied, but also the material manuscripts are approached as evidence for a ‘process’ of scripting their future ‘physical realisation’. In comments particularly relevant to the consideration of the interface between architectural and performance

---

52 Watkin, *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought.*
history, Carlson reflects on performance studies’ spatial influence on the study of theatre.\textsuperscript{55} He writes that this new approach:

\begin{quote}
[...] was not to reject the study of literary drama but to insist that such study was incomplete unless one went beyond the literary text to consider the physical conditions of performance, the spatial realization of that text. Thus it is no exaggeration to say that the foundation of modern theatre studies was grounded upon a spatial reorientation – from the linear reading of drama to the three-dimensional staging of it.\textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

Whilst studying the architectural built space of the R.I. lecture theatre comprises an important part of studying ‘the physical conditions of [the] performance’ of Soane’s lectures, this thesis focuses on reading the relations between the spoken words and the physical drawings within this environment as a key part of their ‘spatial’, ‘three-dimensional staging’. Did the text lead the drawings or the drawings lead the texts during both the process of backstage preparation and in terms of what happened on-stage, when spoken words met physical drawings in the lecture itself? By making an architect’s performance practice, or the Soane office’s ‘process of the physical realization of this text’, the focus of enquiry within this architectural history, and not rejecting the study of the contents of the lecture texts, but placing the ‘emphasis on embodiment, event, interaction and practice, rather than on text alone’, my study is positioned as a part of the broader ‘performative turn’ which has resulted from performance studies’ subsequent, significant influence on almost all other areas of the humanities.\textsuperscript{57}

\textit{as Performative Practice}

In 1955, within lectures at Harvard, the philosopher J.L. Austin interrogated language’s active capacities, focusing on the specific case of what happens when language is spoken, and coining the term ‘performative act’. Later published in the book \textit{How to do Things with Words}, these lectures formed the basis of Austin’s extremely influential theory of ‘speech acts’, which

\textsuperscript{55} A related discussion on the shared concerns of the practices of theatre and architecture (not their practices of history) is explored by Juliet Rufford in \textit{Theatre and Architecture} (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015).

\textsuperscript{56} Carlson, ‘Space and Theatre History’, 195.

\textsuperscript{57} Bala, ‘The Entangled Vocabulary of Performance’, 18.
attempted to unpack the complex abilities of some words to ‘do things’ and achieve various kinds of actions through their spoken enunciation and uttering within particular circumstances. As Austin put it towards the beginning of this study:

What are we to call a sentence or an utterance of this type? I propose to call it a performative sentence or a performative utterance, or, for short, ‘a performative’. The name is derived, of course, from ‘perform’, the usual verb with the noun ‘action’: it indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action [...].\(^58\)

An equally famous Austinian concept which expands this idea concerns the distinction he made between such ‘performatives’ and ‘constatives’. Whilst ‘performatives’ are words that can themselves constitute actions or, as architect and writer Doina Petrescu describes, which ‘bring into being that which it names’\(^59\) (with classic examples being a promise, or the words ‘I do’ said in marriage, or a legally binding spoken declaration),\(^60\) ‘constatives’ are utterances that do not achieve actions in the same way but instead passively report, state or merely convey information.\(^61\) Whilst Austin in turn questions his own separation of these two categories, suggesting that all language is in fact performative,\(^62\) the concept that words can do different things to a greater or lesser degree, and depending on the circumstances, is nevertheless a significant one. Together with sociologist Erving Goffman’s theories of social behaviour and the social self as negotiated through a form of intersubjective performance, Austin’s linguistic theories concerning the efficacy of language to perform actions is credited as a key influence in the post-second-world-war development of the discipline of performance studies.\(^63\) Indeed, whilst Austin’s study explored spoken utterances only, the suggestions made within it were far reaching, extending to the question of what could be the capacities of other kinds of language\(^64\) and forms of social

\(^{60}\) See, for example, Austin, How to do Things with Words, 13.
\(^{61}\) Austin, How to do Things with Words, 12.
\(^{62}\) Austin, How to do Things with Words, 16-17.
\(^{64}\) Whilst Austin’s study focuses on the use of spoken language, he also suggests that writing too is a form of utterance or performative act which issues actions: Austin, How to do Things with Words, 8.
and communicative behaviour to likewise perform actions and issue effects.

Austin’s notions of performative language have influenced my own reflections on the possible ways in which the words of Soane’s lecture texts may have elicited specific actions or meanings through being expressed in spoken form during his lectures. Whilst Austin’s theories belong to the twentieth century – over one hundred years after Soane’s lectures – it is still possible to use his ideas to conceptualise in a general sense that the circumstances and way Soane’s words were spoken probably affected their meaning; through the act of speaking the text, something may have been done. The question of how and what was ‘done’, however, or what kind of ‘doings’ were at stake in these lectures, are questions I ask of the lecture manuscripts and drawings, and consider through evidence in other documents such as audience accounts. Similarly, the idea that a drawing – another form of language – may also have had capacities to perform actions has also been useful for thinking about the ways in which Soane’s lecture drawings may have enacted specific meanings (architectural or otherwise) during their performance to an audience. The degree to which such drawings not only describe or reflect their architectural subject matter, but also actively construct it through the way they were drawn, or shown, or the situation of the performance of the lectures, offer productive and plausible ways of reading Soane’s lecture drawings, which I address in this thesis.

Whilst I engaged initially with ideas of the performative through Austin – alongside starting to engage with the evidence in Soane’s lecture manuscripts and drawings – I also began reading the work of a number of literary historians, such as Angela Esterhammer, Patricia Howell Michaelson and Olivia Smith, who argue for the recognition of a longer history of speech acts going back to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.65 This work identifies specific treatises written during this period whose discussions of language show remarkable resemblances to Austin’s theory of speech acts,66 at the same time as exploring a wider circulation of such ideas, including, for

---

example, the ‘British preoccupation with issues of contract and obligation’ and the project of the French Revolution that made it ‘a punishable crime to utter words that threatened to cause controversy among revolutionary forces’.67

In the following thesis I address a range of scholarship from literary and art history, performance studies and the history of science which in differing ways explores the existence, direct theorisation and practising of ideas regarding performative language and demonstration in the period in which Soane was lecturing, a period which is often associated with the public lecture. The idea that speech and drawing combined could perhaps not only describe architecture and reflect the architectural messages that each offered, but could also have the active capacities to make or do something additional through being performed together, has emerged as the focus of this thesis. This approach has been influenced by twentieth-century concepts of the performative and by those in circulation during Soane’s lifetime, but it takes shape and gains a specificity through closely observing the lecture manuscripts and lecture drawings, and reading such documents through one another over time. The degree to which Soane was aware of ideas resembling a performative conception of written or spoken words, or drawing – that is, the degree to which his lecturing could be explored strategically as a ‘performative practice’ – remains a question throughout this thesis.

Architectural History

as Practice

Important to positioning the significance of architectural history as a ‘practice’ within this project is to explain that I approach historical enquiry from the point of view of the practitioner. This has been influenced strongly by my training in art, or more specifically in the practice of drawing, before I studied architectural history. The specificity and value of this trajectory has only properly come to the surface through reflecting on my own teaching of architectural history and theory to architecture students. Whilst my conceptualisation of historical enquiry in this manner has been critically reflected on and (to some degree) theorised within this doctoral project,

originally this approach was developed intuitively. Such an intuitive approach to architectural history as a practice manifested in features such as: an interest in the process of reading the past and particularly in imagining the ongoing spatial shape of the enquiry; being fascinated by history and the archive as constructed and the historian’s work and actions as forms of making; treating the visual and material properties and form of historical evidence as equally important to its textual qualities and content; assuming images to be able to make an argument as effectively as, or in dialogue with, words.

Approaching architectural historical enquiry as a ‘practice’ thus incorporates some of the *OED*’s definitions of the term discussed above, which I have already shown activate specific dimensions of Soane’s lecturing. By highlighting my own enquiry as a ‘practice’, for example, I mean to draw attention to the ‘execution’ or doing of the project of architectural history, and to the development of ‘ways’ of doing the project over time. Whilst comparable meanings of the term ‘practice’ manifest in studying Soane’s process and ways of doing his lectures over twenty-five years (that is, Soane’s architectural lecturing practice as an object of enquiry), approaching my own architectural history enquiry as a form of ‘practice’ means I explore and foreground to the reader the process of doing the history, and I reflect on this process to the history that is written (that is, my own practice as self-reflexive object, but also method, of enquiry).

Whilst the list above in the first paragraph of this section describes the interests which underscore and motivate my practice of architectural history in general, there are a number of different activities which make up my practice or doing of the history in this specific project, including: reading, writing, archival work, reading images, reading between words and images, and using words and images (on the page and in spoken presentations) to communicate the history of Soane’s early nineteenth-century lecturing practice. The thesis structure – described in the opening pages of this introduction – both reflects and facilitates reflection on this process and the different stages and activities of practising the history of the nineteenth-century architectural lecture.

---

As sociologist Andreas Reckwitz wrote in 2005:

A ‘practice’ (Praktik) is a routinized type of behaviour which consists of several elements, interconnected to one other: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge. A practice – a way of cooking, of consuming, of working, of investigating, of taking care of oneself or of others, etc. [...] 69

Whilst Reckwitz is attempting to define a ‘theory of social practices’, 70 which can in turn be used to theorise and inform what and how practices can be studied by the historian, his description is equally relevant for characterising and thinking through how and of what historical enquiry itself constitutes a form of practice. Here, I highlight the reference to the ‘routinised’ nature of any practice – that is to say, to the establishment of ways of doing something, developed through doing them repeatedly, over time. The second thing to highlight is Reckwitz’s defining of a practice as a series of ‘elements’ which are ‘interconnected’ – what I have already described in relation to Soane's practice as a ‘constellation’ of activities. In a similar way, it is the relationships between the activities of reading, writing, archival work, etc., which have been repeatedly carried out over time, that defines my practice or way of doing this architectural history. A further relevant issue to highlight in Reckwitz’s definition is the range and type of the ‘interconnected’ activities which make up a practice: these encompass both physical and conceptual activities (‘bodily activities, forms of mental activities’), alongside technical knowledge, affective experience and reason (‘know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge’). Reckwitz’s definition is useful for not binerising thinking and doing, and for reminding one that practice encompasses both activities. One of my aims for this doctoral project which studies architectural history as a practice is to assert that it is not only an intellectual and objective endeavour (as history has traditionally been conceived), 71 but also equally involves practical, embodied and creative forms of research. 72

71 For reference to the development of history in the nineteenth century as ‘a science capable of objective statements’, see Jonathan Hill, A Landscape of Architecture, History and Fiction (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 105.
72 See Rebecca Schneider, Theatre & History (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 33-36.
Indeed, as the philosopher Elizabeth Grosz has written with respect to the unbalanced status of concepts of mind over body in the history of philosophy, ‘As soon as knowledge is seen as purely conceptual, its relation to bodies, the corporeality of both knowers and texts, and the ways these materialities interact, must become obscure.’ Whilst Grosz, writing from a feminist perspective, is making the case that there are other emotional, embodied and subjective ways of conducting and understanding philosophy, I have found her words to be equally relevant for their suggestive implications for the practice of architectural history. As soon as we approach our readings of both the past and the material evidence which mediates it as ‘purely conceptual’, the historical ‘knowledge’ derived from such readings, and its relationships with the subjectivity and affective encounter between the historian and the material studied – as well as ‘the ways these materialities interact’ – does indeed seem to remain ‘obscure’. These questions are particularly relevant to the historian of past performances or performance practices, for, as Schneider writes, ‘the stickiest issue’ with respect to the intersection between the practices of performance and history ‘concerns the place of historical evidence in relation to the living body and its passions.’

**as Performance**

In this project, approaching architectural history as a ‘practice’ places emphasis on the process and significance of the specific ways of carrying out and executing the enquiry. However, as soon as we start to consider who these activities and processes of architectural history are carried out or executed for, and who witnesses them, a concept of performance in the sense of an action carried out for, and whose meaning partly involves, an audience is prompted. Considered in Hannah and Harsløf’s aforementioned terms, I frame architectural historical enquiry as a performance in the sense of being the ‘demonstration of actions, behaviour and skills’ of encountering, reading and telling evidence for the past. This ‘audience’ includes myself and the archivist whilst encountering material in the archive (reading and handling as a performance), the reader to whom this historical enquiry is told (writing

---


74 Schneider, *Theatre & History*, 60.
and using images as a performance), as well as a more conventional audience to whom I have demonstrated the archival material and my encounters with the evidence in more live settings and presentations (speaking and showing as a performance).

Reflecting on the experience of carrying out historical work in terms of being a form of performance where ‘the archive itself becomes a social performance space, a theatre of retroaction’,75 Schneider points out: ‘Whether you are sitting at your desk, in your armchair, or in the archive or library itself, any text or material is encountered “live”, so to speak, in time.’76 Here, Schneider is foregrounding how the ‘cross-temporal’77 but also spatial encounter with the past via the material evidence itself is important to and informs the history which is to be written and ‘performed’ in the present. Whilst the historian R.G. Collingwood foregrounded the intellectual status of the historian’s labour of re-enacting evidence in the present in order to imagine the past,78 as historians Iain McCalman and Paul A. Pickering note: ‘He did not envisage re-enacting the past emotionally or physically’.79 In contrast to this, here we see Schneider focusing on the significance of the physically situated and embodied experience of this process of history as re-enactment as carried out by the historian.

It is helpful in this discussion about architectural history as a performance to draw a relationship between Schneider’s foregrounding of the historian’s physically situated and embodied ‘live’ encounter with evidence (in an archive, library, chair), and that of other theoretical perspectives from performance and theatre which highlight the importance of recognising the physical and spatial setting of performance on its meaning. Australian performance scholar Gay MacAuley, for example, highlights that, alongside liveness, the physical space within which the performance is performed and received is the other condition which gives a performance its status as a ‘performance’: the space is the condition that enables and makes possible the

---

75 Schneider, Performing Remains, 104
76 Schneider, Theatre & History, 43–44.
77 Schneider, Performing Remains, 37
79 Iain McCalman and Paul A. Pickering, ‘From Realism to the Affective Turn: An Agenda’, in Iain McCalman and Paul A. Pickering (eds), Historical Reenactment: From Realism to the Affective Turn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 4.
simultaneous presence of the performer and spectator.\textsuperscript{80} In her work, MacAuley highlights the importance of recognising the ways in which particular material settings, locations and spatial formats not only heavily affect a performer’s actions (for example, their staging), but also construct the audience’s experience, and inform and structure the kind of engagement which is possible between performer and audience. Such material contexts also reflect and enforce institutional and social power relations, which may also play a role in this interaction, as well as the operation and meanings of the performance.

I explore the differing roles of the temporal but also spatial and built environments of the archive, the page, and the stage in each of the differing types of performances of this architectural historical enquiry, which I cite above. Relating to these ideas is Schneider’s concept of ‘Architectures of access’, which she defines as the built spaces, institutional codes and materiality of the encounter and evidence encountered, which together play active, specific roles in informing and structuring the readings that we are able to make of the past. As she writes:

Architectures of access (the physical aspect of books, bookcases, glass display cases, or even the request desk at an archive) place us in particular experiential relations to knowledge. Those architectures also impact the knowledge imparted. Think of it this way: the same detail of information can \textit{sound}, \textit{feel}, \textit{look}, \textit{smell}, or \textit{taste} radically different when accessed in radically different venues of via different media (or when \textit{not} told in some venues but told in others).\textsuperscript{81}

Within Part I and Part II, I pay attention to the ways in which these ‘architectures of access’ impact the reading I was able to perform of Soane’s lectures via the evidence in the R.I. manuscripts and lecture drawings.

\textsuperscript{81} Schneider, \textit{Performing Remains}, 104.
as Performance Practice

As with the logic I use to move from performance to performance practice in the case of Soane’s lectures, I also ask the following question: what effect does approaching my own activities of architectural history as a performance, and form of demonstration and ‘evidencing’, have on the status and significance of that practice of architectural history? Indeed, here I consider the performance practice of architectural history to mean the ways and methods of performing, both developed over time and in relation to their ‘architectures of access’, whilst reading and handling, writing and using images, and speaking and showing. In positioning architectural history as a form of performance practice, I draw attention not only to the ways developed for demonstrating the evidence to the audiences cited above (its performance), but also to the improvisation and playing with the evidence (its preparation).

as Performative Practice

As I have already noted, Austin’s theory of the performative offers important ways for considering the relationship between words and drawing in Soane’s lectures. However, Austin’s theories do not only suggest a way of thinking about what such relationships meant then to Soane and his various audiences, but they also help to consider how words and images meet, and what this meeting might mean now. How does my own practice of connecting and bringing into contact specific words (copied from the lecture manuscripts) and images (reproduced from the lecture drawings) in various ways actively participate and intervene in, or enable the interpretation of, evidence for Soane’s own practice of using words and drawings? I have continually deliberated over the significance of these present meanings regarding Soane’s lecture words and drawings to their historical provenance. As this cross-temporality of reading meaning between words and drawings then from the position of now suggests, the relationship between past and present is a key place where a concept of the performative also comes to be at stake within this project.

In the opening words to their classic 1994 edited collection of essays which addressed the blurring of concepts of performance and performativity, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Andrew Parker posed the questions: ‘When is saying something doing something? And how is saying something doing
something? If we translate these questions of ‘when’ and ‘how’ is ‘saying something doing something’ over from the context of performative spoken utterances to that of the domain of evidence, the question might become: when and how is evidencing something doing something? In ways that link to Roms’ description of Peters’ work – which I cite at the beginning of this thesis, and according to which ‘the act of performing evidence... exposes that any proof, however rigorously conceived, is never a given certainty but rather the product of (often complex) actions of construction’ – here the point becomes about the use and deployment of evidence as being an act of enunciation in itself. Can reading, writing about, imaging and imagining evidence of the past have capacities to do things to the past? How can this be demonstrated to the reader?

Further developing Austin’s concept of the performative and speech act theory is the equally influential work of the feminist theorist Judith Butler, who in the 1980s and early 1990s, influenced by Jacques Derrida’s deconstruction, shifted the focus of Austin’s discussion from the domain of language and towards the performance of social acts and their capacities to construct gender. Whilst still often concerned with the use of language and words, and their power and force within specific circumstances to act, in Butler’s move towards issues of bodily acts, matters of gender identity, and political speech, there was also an associated shift in terminology from that of ‘performative’ to ‘performativity’. Whilst the ‘performative’, as outlined above within my conceptual framing of Soane’s lectures, indicates words and sentences which perform actions through being spoken (and are often compared with descriptive, ‘constative’ language), with the move to the term ‘performativity’, as Sedgwick and Parker wrote in 1994, came ‘a powerful appreciation of the ways that identities are constructed iteratively through complex citational processes’.

---

It is Butler’s deconstructive drawing of attention to the processes of meaning-construction as those which occur over time specifically through the iterative repetition of particular norms and acts that designates my own approach to studying the process of historical and historiographical enquiry as a form of ‘performative practice’. On one level – as I have already described in relation to the term ‘practice’ – this thesis focuses on articulating what happens to an understanding of Soane’s lectures through the repeated practice and performance over time of reading evidence contained in the lecture manuscripts and drawings. Importantly, however, architectural history as ‘performative practice’ does not just take into account my own personal process and engagement with the past through the evidence (although it does value this self-reflexive knowledge). Indeed, it equally focuses on considering and questioning the role of different power relations and value systems (word and drawing, text and image, theory and practice) of the archive, architectural history, and historiography of Soane scholarship and his lectures – which are also at work, structuring and influencing such processes of reading.

Together with reading Soane’s lectures through the discipline of architectural history, and that of performance history, theory and practice, and considering the differing things these different perspectives engage with and activate in the same evidence, this thesis shows and performs how this and indeed all architectural history is produced socially, institutionally and disciplinarily. As the architect and researcher Katarina Bonnevier writes: ‘performativity is a critique of the idea of essence, and underlies how meaning is crafted in the process of making’.87 I incorporate these two concepts of performativity – as critique and as the iterative process of how meaning is made – within my own approach to architectural history as ‘performative practice’.

87 Bonnevier, *Behind Straight Curtains*, 84, fn. 4. Italics in original text.
John Soane’s Lectures at the Royal Institution of Great Britain (R.I.)

The following section explores the R.I.’s institutional context and audience as well as Soane’s existing connections with this institution, and it considers what bearing these aspects had on Soane’s approach to lecturing there.

In June 1817, proposing ‘to shew the utility and national importance of architecture’, John Soane delivered his first two lectures at the Royal Institution of Great Britain (R.I.). Three years after this first series of two lectures, Soane was invited again by the R.I. to deliver a second series of four more in May and June of 1820. In these six lectures, across the two years, Soane largely traced the ‘progress’ of building from antiquity and, by focusing on the subject of ‘first principles and returning to origins’, advocated for a rational evolution of architecture developing from the primitive hut. Throughout the lectures he compared the antique and modern which so gripped architectural discourse from the mid eighteenth century, continually returning to the question of how modern architects could draw from the example of the ancients, without recourse to copying, and, more often than not, by referring to and analysing a wide range of then-contemporary and mostly London buildings and their attached design practices, which Soane viewed and critiqued to be inadequate in various ways. Foregrounding the skills and sensibilities of the architect as arbiter of this correct architectural transmission of learning from the architectural examples of the past, he attacked architecture’s perceived lower status in public life and campaigned against the lack of educational provision at the R.A., especially as compared with sculpture and painting. Throughout these various rhetorical levels of his account of architectural history, punctuated with reference to buildings from Soane’s London, and in conjunction with his assertions about the central role and greater professionalisation of the architect and architecture in society, he constantly weaved the public significance and uniqueness of his own project of architectural education and endeavours to amass and grant access to his own model and cast collection at his home at Lincoln’s Inn Fields.

The first series of two R.I. lectures took place on 7 June and 14 June 1817, whilst the second series of four lectures took place on 27 May, 3 June, 10 June and 17 June 1820. See dated manuscripts for these lectures, SM Archives, Soane Case 157 and Soane Case 158.
On the far-left side of Image 3 of Richard Horwood’s 1792 map on the next page, we can see number 21 Albemarle Street, which the R.I. occupied at this point, to the west of Old Bond Street. As science historian and Head of Collections at the R.I. Frank James and architectural historian Anthony Peers show in their history of the R.I.’s changing built spaces over time, this plot was longer than the others on the street and was created by extending the townhouse of number 20 at different points over the eighteenth century.\(^9\)

The R.I. quickly became famous for its activities of scientific public exposition as well as for its innovative scientific equipment and collections. Writing on a trip to London in 1805, a man named Benjamin Silliman from Connecticut, on paying a visit to the R.I.,\(^9\) noted that: ‘The institution has become quite celebrated, and for two or three years past, has made more noise than any other in Europe’.\(^9\) He continued, by writing that:

Now, public lectures are delivered in the institution on different branches of science, and particularly on natural philosophy and chemistry. [...] A number of contiguous houses in Albemarle Street have been so connected as to form one building, and this contains the numerous apartments of the Royal Institution. There are rooms for reading the journals and newspapers; others devoted to the library, which is already considerably extensive; others to the philosophical apparatus, the lectures, the minerals, the professors, the cookery, servants etc.\(^9\)

Historians such as Morris Berman and Alexandrina Buchanan have shown how the R.I. both responded to and further facilitated shifts in science in Britain, from the aristocratic or ‘gentleman amateur tradition’ associated with the Royal Society at the time, to a professionalised and public pursuit.\(^9\)

Image 3
Image 4
As James and Peers write, ‘[f]ollowing the strong eighteenth-century tradition, the Royal Institution began to stage spectacular and entertaining, not to say dangerous demonstrations of scientific experiments.’ Indeed, as demonstrated in the institution’s founding aims cited above, as well as in Silliman’s report, it was the lecture in particular which was identified by the founders of the R.I. as the primary medium through which a new access to and provision of scientific and technical knowledge for a lay audience was to be realised. Popular lectures on experimental and natural philosophy were delivered by first Professor of Chemistry Thomas Garnett in 1800-01, followed by his successor Thomas Young between 1801 and 1803. One of these two lecturers is represented in James Gillray’s famous caricature shown in Image 4, which, as James notes, provides ‘evidence of the way’ the discovery (but also I would add staging) of scientific discoveries at the R.I. strongly ‘captured the public imagination’ of the time. From 1802, Humphrey Davy, as third Professor of Chemistry, gained celebrity status as ‘an immensely popular lecturer’, which ‘firmly established the Royal Institution as a popular venue for first rate lectures’ and, as Golinski notes, ‘reoriented the institution’s program of public education toward a fashionable middle- and upper-class audience.’ As Berman writes: ‘It is difficult to recapture the excitement that Davy generated over science at this time. By 1804 the demand on the part of the Proprietors to watch Davy actually at work was so great that one of the laboratory walls had to be torn down to accommodate spectators.’

---

95 James and Peers, ‘Constructing Space for Science’, 141; For the lectures’ role in the R.I. also see Sarah Zimmerman ‘Coleridge the Lecturer, A Disappearing Act’, in Dick and Esterhammer (eds), Spheres of Action, 55. For specific mention of the lectures’ role, as quoted in Zimmerman, see The Prospectus, Charter, Ordinances and Bye-Laws, of the Royal Institution of Great Britain (London: Royal Institution, 1800), 15.
It was not long in turn before the R.I. also became known for its concurrent programme of art, literature and music lectures, which, as music historian Jamie Croy Kassler has noted, were initially conceived by R.I. Treasurers Sir Thomas Bernard and Sir John Coxe Hippisley\footnote{Royal Institution of Great Britain, ‘Key Officers and Staff of the Royal Institution Since 1799’ (Royal Institution of Great Britain, 2014), accessed 20 March 2017, http://www.righb.org/our-history/people/officers-and-staff} as a means to expand and attract larger audiences in response to financial difficulties.\footnote{Jamie Croy Kassler, ‘The Royal Institution Music Lectures, 1800-1831: A Preliminary Study’, \textit{Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle}, No. 19 (1983-1985), 1-30, 5.} Indeed, as literary historian Sarah Zimmerman has written, ‘Science may have held centre stage at the Royal Institution, but the arts had an important supporting role in attracting the well-to-do audiences’.\footnote{Zimmerman ‘Coleridge the Lecturer’, 55.} From 1804, for example, lectures on the philosophy of the polite arts were given by the landscape engraver John Landseer and on moral philosophy by writer Sydney Smith, whilst the first course of music lectures was delivered by William Crotch in 1805.\footnote{Kassler, ‘The Royal Institution Music Lectures’, 5, 14-15; David Hadley, ‘Public Lectures and Private Societies: Expounding Literature and the Arts in Romantic London’, in John A. Alford and Donald Schoonmaker (eds), \textit{English Romanticism: Preludes and Postludes: Essays in Honor of Edwin Graves Wilson} (Michigan: East Lansing Colleagues Press, 1993), 43-58, 48.} In 1805, as David Hadley explores, Davy invited his friend, the poet and writer Samuel Coleridge, to lecture at the R.I., which he finally did in January 1808 on the subject of the Principles of Poetry,\footnote{Hadley, ‘Public Lectures and Private Societies’, 48. Also see Manning, ‘Manufacturing the Romantic Image’, 235.} followed by a second later series in 1811-12 on Shakespeare and Milton.\footnote{Zimmerman, ‘Coleridge the Lecturer’, 55-57.} We can see from newspapers and journals of the period that a similar combination of ‘arts and sciences’ lectures continued to be held over the following decade.\footnote{For example, Soane’s 1820 R.I. lectures occurred in the same season as lectures by John Millington on experimental philosophy, Thomas Brandy on chemical illustration, Thomas Campbell on poetry and J.B. Smith on botany. See ‘Arts and Sciences: Royal Institution’, \textit{The London Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, Etc.} (London: Literary Gazette Office, 1820), 44.} An important context to Soane’s lecturing at the R.I. is the fact that he was one of the institution’s fifty-eight original Proprietors. As is noted in the R.I. Manager’s Minute book, Soane was ‘Proposed by Mr. Sullivan’ at the second Managers’ meeting of 23 March 1799.\footnote{R.I. Archives, Manager’s Minutes, 23 March 1799, 6-7.} Whilst, as Jan Golinski notes, the activities of the R.I. overall were administered by a committee of Managers, the Proprietors (of whom there were 280 at the end of the first year of establishment) ‘subscribed a substantial sum (initially set at fifty guineas) to
acquire life-long rights to attend lectures and exhibitions, and to elect Managers.109 Less than a month after being admitted as a Proprietor (which was prior to the acquisition of premises at 21 Albermarle Street), and together with the architect Henry Holland, Soane made ‘an offer of their gratuitous assistance as surveyors’ to the R.I.,110 and he also supplied an estimate of the property, which they valued at £4,500, and an itemisation of other associated costs.111 It appears that Soane and Holland were officially appointed surveyors on 20 April 1799.112

It is possible to read between Soane’s own notes recorded in his Day Books, and the corresponding details recorded in the institutional minutes of the R.I. Managers’ Committee, regarding the circumstances around Soane being invited to lecture eighteen years after the R.I. was established. On 14 April 1817, in the Minutes of the Managers’ Meetings book, the following is recorded:

Mr Sanders having communicated to the Board that it was probable that Mr Soane would be willing to deliver a few Lectures on Architecture gratuitously, if the Managers should like proper to make any application to him upon the subject.

Resolved

That Mr. Sanders, Mr. Brande and Mr. Moore be requested to wait on Mr Soane to express the great satisfaction with which a proposal of this nature would be received by the Managers.113

In turn, a note written in Soane’s hand in his own office Day Book on 24 April, seems to say that he declined the Managers’ request to read lectures at the R.I..114

Mr Brand
Wrote to him de -
-clining to read

110 R.I. Archives, MM, 13 April 1799, 1: 18; See also James and Peers, ‘Constructing Space for Science’, 142-143.
111 R.I. Archives, MM, 13 April 1799, 1: 19.
114 SM Archives, Day Book, Thursday 24 April 1817, 127.
Lect. at the Royal
Inst. agreeably
to the request of
deputation of
Managers

The 'Mr Brand' referred to is William Thomas Brande, who was Humphrey Davy’s successor as R.I. Professor of Chemistry, 1813-1852, and R.I. Superintendent of the House, 1813-1852. It is not clear whether here Soane was ‘declining’ the R.I.’s request to read lectures per se, or whether he may have been ‘declining’ to read them specifically in exchange for no payment. The latter would corroborate with the financial emphasis of the R.I.’s plan in advance to contact Soane, quoted above and recorded a week earlier in the Minutes of the Managers’ Meetings book on 14 April. Despite this opaque situation, a few days later in same book a letter written ‘in consequence of the Resolution of the Managers’ on 14 April is recorded to have been sent by Soane, which accepted the invitation to lecture by Brande, Sanders and Moore. This letter is noted to have been addressed and dated ‘Lincoln’s Inn Fields 28th April 1817’, and records:

Gentlemen /
I am obliged by the flattering manner in which you were pleased to communicate to me the wishes of the / Committee of Managers of the Royal Institution respecting my Lectures on Architecture; – I will thank you to assure the / Committee that on all occasions I shall have great pleasure in exerting my best endeavours for the advancement of / Architectural Knowledge, and altho’ I am fearful that any thing I can say on the subject will fall very short of the / expectations you have so kindly expressed I am ready to make the attempt in one of two of my Lectures /
John Soane

---

115 SM Archives, Day Book, Thursday 24 April 1817, 127.
118 R.I. Archives, MM, 28 April 1817, 160. Note that in the quoted excerpt I have not replicated original line lengths of the handwritten text. Instead I have used the solidus symbol ‘/’ to indicate line breaks in the original document. A similar practice applies to other quoted material in this section. I clarify this point here because I largely take a different approach to indicating line lengths in Part I.
The difference in dates suggests that this transcribed letter in the Managers Minutes of 28 April is a different one to that which Soane noted he wrote to Mr Brand in his Day Book on 24 April (a copy of neither of which is in the Soane private correspondence). It is also not clear whether between the dates of 24 and 28 April Soane was persuaded to lecture, either by way of another written request or intervention in person by the R.I. or another party. It seems likely that it involved the latter; indeed, in the opening words of a letter dated 25 April sent to Soane from close friend and client Samuel Thornton, the following is written:

I mentioned to the Gov[erno]r and Dep[ut]y Gov[erno]r of the Bank the request made of you from the Royal Institution & they think it very honourable & that you will do well to comply.\(^{119}\)

Thornton had been a Director of the Bank of England since 1780,\(^ {121}\) whilst the Governor mentioned in the letter was Jeremiah Harman, and the Deputy Governor also mentioned was George Dorrien.\(^ {122}\) The contents of this letter are interesting because they indicate the social workings of the institution of the R.I. and, more specifically, the background to Soane lecturing there as being somehow linked in with Soane’s professional world and client network. Soane was architect and surveyor to the Bank of England between 1788 and 1833; but why should his clients and social acquaintances there have wanted to influence his decision to lecture at the R.I.? It is impossible to decipher the nature of the ‘request made’ of Soane, nor what exactly he is being advised here ‘to comply’ to (is it to lecture, to lecture for free, or something else?). Nevertheless, following the above transcripion of Soane’s letter in the Minutes of the Managers’ Meetings book, another note is written confirming Soane’s eventual acceptance to lecture as follows:


\(^{120}\) SM Archives, Priv Corr II.T.7.10.


Resolved That the Secretary be directed to return the thanks of the Board to Mr Soane for the communication & to request that he will arrange the days for his Lectures with Mr Brande. ¹²³

As I introduced right at the beginning of this thesis, these lectures at the R.I. are not the only lectures that Soane delivered during his lifetime. Nor are they the ones that the architect has since become most widely known for. Indeed, throughout the preceding decade from January 1809 to January 1820, Soane had also lectured to architecture students as the third Professor of Architecture at the Royal Academy of Arts (R.A.) Schools, a position he held from 1806 until his death in 1837. ¹²⁴ Soane’s twelve academic R.A. lectures, delivered as a primary professorial requirement, and constituting the main provision of architectural education at the time in Britain, ¹²⁵ were repeatedly altered and modified up to 1820. ¹²⁶ Fourteen years later, between 1832 and 1836, in the last decade of Soane’s life, these same lectures were read on his behalf by then R.A. secretary Henry Howard, whilst Soane is reported to have sat in a wheelchair at the side of the stage. ¹²⁷

What happens if we approach the process of repeatedly preparing for and performing lectures at the R.A. and R.I. as a practice and performance practice of architecture, especially if we consider the R.I. lectures’ significance

¹²⁴ Soane followed on from George Dance (1741–1825) who had been second Professor of Architecture between 1798 and 1805 but had not lectured. Dance followed on from Thomas Sandby (1721–1798) who had been first Professor of Architecture between 1768 and 1798 and delivered lectures between 1770 and 1798 whilst Soane himself was an R.A. student. For an account of Sandby and Dance’s R.A. professorships in architecture, see David Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 29–30, 40–63.
¹²⁵ At the time, the R.A. was the only place which offered a formal architectural education. In addition to attending lectures, R.A. architecture students were allowed access to the academy library and entrance to an annual design competition. See Neil Bingham, ‘Architecture at the Royal Academy Schools 1768–1836’, in Bingham (ed.), The Education of the Architect: Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Symposium of the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain (London: Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, 1993).
¹²⁶ Soane’s course of twelve R.A. lectures was split into two annual, alternating series of six lectures. For summaries of when the R.A. lectures were altered at different times, see Susan Palmer, ‘Appendix Five: Chronology of the delivery of Sir John Soane’s Royal Academy Lectures,’ in Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 731–732. See SM Archives, Soane Cases 152-156 for the dated manuscripts for different versions of Lectures 1-12, which were read aloud at the R.A. between 1809 and 1820.
¹²⁷ See Palmer, ‘Appendix Five’, in Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 731-732. Henry Howard’s reading on behalf of Soane was also reported in the press, for example, The Metropolitan, Vol. 3 (London: James Cochrane and Company, 1832). Note that these lectures, read to a later generation of architectural students, were deemed to be out of date and were received less favourably by audiences; see Thomas Leverton Donaldson, A Review of the Professional Life of Sir John Soane (London: John Williams, Library of Arts, 1837), 20.
specifically within this broader context of coming halfway through Soane’s much longer trajectory of developing ways of ‘doing’ his lectures? In relation to situating the specificity of the R.I. lectures in a broader practice and process of lecturing, a particularly pressing question arises that concerns the evidence available for understanding the connections that audiences perceived between the lectures at the two venues, as well as whether Soane paid attention to the specific aspects of the R.I. context (which were different to those at the R.A) when he prepared to lecture there. We can consider some of these issues through the printed press reports of and advertisements for Soane’s R.I. lectures which appeared in various newspapers and journals. Specifically referring to Soane’s first series of R.I. lectures, for example, the *Morning Post* wrote on 12 June 1817:

> The impression which the professor’s Course of Lectures at the Royal Academy had previously made on the students, had excited an anxious desire in the fashionable circles to witness the exhibition of the magnificent drawings which Mr Soane had prepared, and to hear the illustrations of each as presented to the view.\(^{128}\)

This newspaper account is typical of other press reports of Soane’s lectures in describing Soane’s lecturing persona at the R.I. in terms of his status as a professor at the R.A. Indeed, we are reminded that by the time Soane lectured at the R.I. in 1817, he was already a public figure, not only because of his high-profile design work and roles as, for example, architect and surveyor to the Bank of England, but also because of, and reinforced by, his lectures at the R.A. which were equally well covered by the press and had in the past attracted controversy.\(^{129}\) The above account is also typical for distinguishing between Soane’s different lecture audiences and groups of people to whom each set of lectures was aimed: the ‘fashionable’ public who made up his R.I. audience (corroborating the *Morning Post*’s account cited above), compared with the ‘students’ at the R.A. and these particular lectures’ associated pedagogical function.

---

\(^{128}\) *Morning Post*, 12 June 1817.

The *Morning Post* report is also typical for the way it foregrounds the presentation and use of drawings in Soane’s lectures, and the public’s interest in these artefacts. Art historian Trevor Fawcett discusses in detail how it was common to show visual material in art and science lectures during this period, and the ways that Soane’s practice of doing so in his lectures can be related back to earlier documented precursors of architects who showed visual material outside the context of lectures. He writes, for example, that Robert Morris ‘had experienced no difficulty in showing plans, elevations, and tables of proportion to his select Society for the Improvement of Knowledge in Arts and Sciences when he lectured on architecture in the 1730s. In the same way drawings were sometimes displayed at meetings of the Society of Antiquaries.’ But the sheer amount of drawn material prepared for and shown by Soane in his R.A. and R.I. lectures far exceeds that which was shown by Morris or other lecturers. As Watkin and others have pointed out, the watercolour medium, powerful contrasting visual appearance, and subject matter which depicted a combination of both ancient and modern buildings and his own work, drew direct influence from and indeed extended the first R.A. professor of architecture Thomas Sandby’s practice over almost thirty years of using drawings within lectures – lectures that, as I refer to above, Soane had actually attended as an R.A. student. Historians have also pointed out that Soane’s lecture drawings visually resembled the drawings which his friend Turner, who was professor of perspective at the R.A., had shown in his own lectures between 1811 and 1828.

It is perhaps not surprising then that this newspaper records the public anticipation and ‘anxious desire’ of being able to view such drawings in the R.I. lectures, which, as noted above, were open to a much wider audience than those at the R.A. Looking more closely at the short newspaper excerpt above, it is interesting to consider the way the presentation of these drawings and their relation to the words is described. The first thing to notice is the way the lecture is described primarily as an opportunity ‘to witness the exhibition of the magnificent drawings’, that is, in terms of being a visual display, to be experienced by the audience. But this is not the end of the

---

image that is conjured; indeed, the writer states that the lecture is an
opportunity ‘to hear the illustrations of each as presented to the view’. This is
an intriguing description on several levels, where the spoken words are not
referred to as ‘words’, but as ‘illustrations’ which are ‘hear[d]’. Here, the
emphasis is not placed on the reception of the lecture’s discursive or depicted
subject matter about architecture, but in terms of the audience’s experience of
the lecture which involved both the visual and the verbal combined. Could we
perhaps go further to also read – through the way the drawings are
mentioned first, and through the ways that the words are indicated to provide
‘illustrations to each’ of the drawings (and not the other way round) – that the
spoken component of the lectures is suggested to somehow be subservient to
the drawings? Probably not; indeed, the word ‘illustration’ in the early
nineteenth century – which could be used as much for words as for pictures –
signified explanation, elucidation and ‘to set forth clearly’, in turn meaning
that we could read the press report as suggesting that the words could have
served the active not passive role of explaining and clarifying the drawings.\textsuperscript{132} This author’s opinions on the relations between drawing and word are not
explicit or directly reflected upon. Whilst we cannot conclude that the words
were deemed by this audience member to always be a subservient element
within Soane’s lectures, it nevertheless seems from reading these descriptions
of this specific lecture that the visual content of the drawings (and the actions
of showing them) were perceived at some moments to \textit{lead} what was at the
same time being said in the words.

Following on from this point, I am also interested in the latent suggestions of
performance within this description. Coupled with the impressions of the
audience ‘witness[ing]’ and ‘hear[ing]’ drawings and speech, there is also the
articulation by the writer, through the words ‘to hear the illustrations of each
as presented to the view’, of spoken words being provided in response to
drawings, ‘\textit{as}’ they were shown or ‘presented’ to the audience (my italics).
Here it is relevant to consider how the conjunction ‘\textit{as}’, according to Oxford
Dictionaries, is ‘used to indicate that something happens during the time
when something else is taking place’, and/or ‘to indicate by comparison the
way that something happens or is done.’\textsuperscript{133} We could consider these sentences

\textsuperscript{132} See for example, \textit{OED Online}, ‘illustration, n.’ (Oxford University Press, June 2017), accessed 13 July 2017,
of the newspaper report in both these terms: through the first definition, by expressing the drawings being shown ‘during the time’ when speech was ‘taking place’ (and vice versa: words being spoken ‘during the time’ when the presentation of drawings was ‘taking place’?); but equally, through the second definition, as a description of ‘the way’ the drawings in relation to the words ‘happen[ed] or [were] done’.

In another press report, published a few years later after Soane’s second series of R.I. lectures in 1820, the architect James Elmes informed his readers that Soane’s:

[...] lectures were modified and suited to the occasion by being made more popular and less technical than those delivered to the students at the Academy...\(^{134}\)

From this description, we can also appreciate an awareness by reviewers of the differences between the R.I. and R.A. audiences, and of the R.I. lectures being perceived as conscious adaptations or ‘modified’ versions of the R.A. lectures, made in response to the specificity of the more (implied) lay R.I. audience and associated ‘occasion’ or event which was more entertainment than pedagogy. These press reports’ references to the ‘fashionable’, ‘less technical’ and ‘popular’ audience of Soane’s R.I. lectures corresponds with what is otherwise known regarding both the non-specialist character of the ‘arts and sciences’ lectures held in the R.I. lecture theatre during the same period and such lectures’ operation as a form of popular entertainment as well as instruction.

Further distinguishing the R.I. lecturing context both from the R.A. and most other academies, societies and institutions in London at the time, and also recorded in Gillray’s print, is the fact that women were admitted.\(^{135}\) That women could obtain their own subscriptions to each lecturing season was


\(^{135}\) James and Peers note that women were not admitted to the Royal Society before 1945: ‘Constructing Space for Science’, 147. See also *Prospectus* (ref. 53), 45.
another strategic measure taken by the R.I. to increase audience sizes, not only literally increasing the pool of people to whom lectures were open, but, as Zimmerman and Russell note, additionally seeming to create an attraction – of women in public – that in turn bolstered numbers. That the presence of women in the audience constituted an important part of the entertainment of the event is continually referred to in the national press reports of Soane’s R.I. lectures. It is useful here to consider feminist histories, such as Jane Rendell’s architectural history of public gatherings in the same historical period, which explore the ways in which women were often seen as the object of the male gaze. Indeed, on 14 June 1817 the Sun commented that Soane directly addressed the women in his audience, ‘declaring the proud satisfaction which he felt on seeing so large and elegant assembly of visitors, particularly of female auditors’.

Whilst it is hard to ascertain the bearing that women in the audience might have had on the way Soane approached his R.I. lectures, inviting female friends who had not been able to come to his previous lectures – an activity which had taken up so much of his time and efforts in the previous decade – must have created another dimension to the R.I. events which did not apply in the same way in relation to the men-only R.A. audience made up of Academy students, Royal Academicians, the press and members of the public who could apply for tickets. Image 5 shows a list handwritten by Soane of people to whom tickets were to be sent for his R.I. lecture on 27 May 1820.

---

136 Kassler notes that whilst women were admitted from the beginning of the R.I. establishment, encouraging their presence at lectures was further promoted by Sir Thomas Bernard and Sir John Coxe Hippsley in 1802 to rescue the R.I. from financial difficulties: Kassler, ‘The Royal Institution Music Lectures’, 5.


138 See, for example, Sun, 12 June 1820.

139 See, for example, Jane Rendell’s discussion of the display of females in the theatre not only on stage but in the audience, as ‘related to the viewing pleasures of the male patrons’: Jane Rendell, The Pursuit of Pleasure: Gender, Space, and Architecture in Regency London (London: Athlone Press, 2002), 114–116.

140 Sun, 14 June 1817. Also, see similar account in the Morning Post, 15 June 1817.

141 As Watkin shows, the R.A. audience was also made up of upper-class men, including those who were not Royal Academicians: Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 429. For Soane’s own recording of names on his R.A. lecture manuscripts of male Royal Academicians in attendance at his own lectures at the R.A., also see SM Archives, Soane Cases 152-156, Royal Academy Lectures (1809-1819).

142 SM Archives, MBiii/1/10, May 20 1820.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Ashfield</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Cogswell</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sprague</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Park</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Nolan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lord Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Calcraft</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lomax</td>
<td>2+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Parke</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nissen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Liverpool</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Taylor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Borges</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost completely made up of neighbours, close companions and personal acquaintances, of the fourteen names written on this list, over half of the specified names are women, ranging from his housekeeper Sarah Conduitt, to friends such as Barbara Hoffland and Norah Brickenden, as well as other acquaintances such as Mrs Abbot and Lady Liverpool.\footnote{Special thanks to Soane Museum archivist Sue Palmer who has previously identified the people on this list. In addition to those cited above, this list includes John Taylor of the\textit{Sun} newspaper. We will of course never know if there were other lists made by Soane assigning R.I. lecture tickets to other people, for example professional colleagues.}

It is important too to consider the professional implications of such lectures to Soane, which must have also functioned as an advert for his own design work, to a broader audience beyond his peers at the R.A., and to have had the effect of increasing and reinforcing his authority as an architect by publicly demonstrating his architectural historical, intellectual knowledge and professorial status. As architectural historian Tim Hyde writes in his essay ‘Some Evidence of Libel, Criticism and Publicity in the Architectural Career of Sir John Soane’, Soane consciously sought out opportunities to make himself visible to the public eye, strategically manipulating this publicity and exposure for his own professional and personal gain.\footnote{Tim Hyde, ‘Some Evidence of Libel, Criticism and Publicity in the Architectural Career of Sir John Soane’ in\textit{Perspecta}, No. 37, ‘Famous’ issue (2005), 144-163. See for example press reports dated 5 and 7 May 1817 stuck into Soane’s press cutting book which looked forward to Soane’s R.I. lectures: SM Archives, Soane’s Press Cutting Book, 30.} Interestingly, press reports continually referred to the patrons of architecture who were present within Soane’s R.I. lecture audience, suggesting that the delivery of such lectures directly contributed to improving the future built environment of Britain through the way they instructed and influenced the ‘correct taste’ of those who had the power to commission it.\footnote{Morris Berman discusses the way the early R.I. reflected a broader ‘rise of a new professional class’ which played a role in ‘attitude[s] toward[s] science, especially as a factor in maintaining the social order or promoting its own interests, economic or otherwise’: Berman, \textit{Social Change and Scientific Organization}, xxii.}

A major drive and consequence of the establishment of the large number of newly forming institutions in Britain at the beginning of the nineteenth century was to facilitate men’s social association with one another and, in so doing, to solidify professional relationships.\footnote{See for example press reports dated 5 and 7 May 1817 stuck into Soane’s press cutting book which looked forward to Soane’s R.I. lectures: SM Archives, Soane’s Press Cutting Book, 30.} By the time Soane lectured at the R.I. in 1817 he no doubt would have already benefitted from the connections derived from having been a Proprietor since the institution was established. Indeed, this network of male sociability is also suggested in the
documentary evidence presented above, which indicates that Soane’s clients of the Governors and Directors of the Bank influenced his decision to lecture at the R.I., as well as through other connections with other high profile R.I. figures such as Treasurer John Coxe Hippesley, a friend and client of Soane’s whom he had met in Rome on his Grand Tour.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{147} Darley comments that Soane may have become involved with the R.I. through Hippsley: Darley, \textit{John Soane: An Accidental Romantic}, 144.
Reading Existing Histories of John Soane’s Lectures

To date, Soane’s lectures in general – that is, his lectures at both the R.A. and R.I. – have been considered as a set of written texts, served by a separate series of watercolour drawings. Soane’s lecture texts were not published during his lifetime; indeed, it was not until approximately one hundred years after his death that any of the texts of his lectures were to be found in print. As I have previously mentioned, and also outline more fully at the beginning of Part I, I use the term ‘lecture text’ to refer to the prose written in Soane’s manuscript which was read aloud in the lecture. This is to be distinguished from other types of ‘text’ written in his lecture manuscripts, such as comments, notes and instructions written in the adjacent margin.

In 1927 and 1928, Soane’s R.A. lecture texts were first published in instalments within The Architectural Association (A.A.) Journal.148 In 1929, they were published again in book form by Arthur Bolton, seventh Curator of the Soane Museum.149 In addition to the lecture texts, The A.A. Journal and Bolton’s publication also included a selection of the first known printed reproductions of the lecture drawings, which Bolton referred to as the ‘lecture diagrams’.150 Later, in 1996, another printed edition of Soane’s R.A. lecture texts was produced by the architectural historian David Watkin, entitled Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought and the Royal Academy Lectures.151 This book included Soane’s R.A. lecture texts re-edited from the same R.A. manuscripts that Bolton had also reproduced, though adopting a different editorial approach.152 Watkin also offered the first extensive analysis of the content of the different versions of Soane’s twelve R.A. lecture manuscripts and texts, which were produced and delivered at different times between 1809 and 1836. In addition to this analysis, Watkin also reproduced within his study a larger selection of the lecture drawings – images that he referred to neither as ‘drawings’ nor as ‘diagrams’, but as Soane’s ‘lecture

149 Bolton, Lectures on Architecture. Note that Bolton had also previously facilitated the publication of the texts in The Architectural Association Journal.
150 Bolton, Lectures on Architecture.
151 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought.
152 The manuscripts containing Soane’s R.A. lecture texts, which both Watkin and Bolton edited, is SM Archives, Soane Case 35–43. I discuss the differences between the editorial approach of Watkin and Bolton in Part I, at the beginning of ‘Reading Again’.
illustrations’.153 Watkin also devoted a chapter to discussing the range of lecture ‘illustrations’ that the Soane office produced (this included consideration of drawings which were shown at one or at both of the venues of the R.A. and R.I.).154

Watkin’s book is split into two ‘parts’. ‘Part One’, entitled ‘The Intellectual Preparation’, considers Soane’s relationship with the institutional context of the R.A. and explores the ‘impact’ of specific writers on Soane’s lectures. In turn, ‘Part Two’, which is entitled ‘The Royal Academy Lectures’, analyses the twelve lecture texts one by one, then the ‘lecture illustrations’, before exploring the relationships between ‘Soane’s ideas and his architecture’. ‘Part Two’ also includes a conclusion which focuses on the impact of Soane’s lectures on architectural discourse and specific architects of the time. It is here at the end of ‘Part Two’ where the copies of the R.A. lecture texts themselves are presented (texts which amount to approximately one quarter of the 732-page book). The visual reproductions of the 145 lecture drawings which are also provided are located towards the beginning of Watkin’s analysis of the R.A. lecture texts. Several appendices to the book are also supplied, including numbered lists of the lecture drawings shown in each lecture.

By way of his analysis of Soane’s intellectual preparation and the content of the R.A. lectures themselves, the overarching ‘new interpretation’ which Watkin made in 1996 regarding Soane was, in his own words, as ‘a belated and lonely English student of Enlightenment thought [...] more preoccupied than any other British architect with the ideals of the Encyclopédistes and the French Enlightenment’, and, as an individual engaged heavily in the ‘sensationalist and associational philosophy of the Picturesque movement in Britain’.155 Framing the study as ‘an intellectual biography’ of Soane,156 Watkin’s approach is to treat the reading of the various R.A. lecture manuscripts, both the texts they contain and their preparatory notes, as a

---

153 Note that the term ‘drawing’ was predominantly used by Soane to describe these images shown in his lectures. The term ‘illustration’ was also used by Soane, but to a lesser degree. Also, note that apart from a few drawings made by Soane as a student, the drawings that were shown in the lectures were made by the boys whom Soane employed in his architecture office. These issues are discussed in greater detail in Part II.
155 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 1.
means to access and narrate an account of Soane and his life through the
journey of his intellectual engagement and self-study. Exploring when Soane
encountered specific ideas, and different people such as William Chambers
and other lecturers such as Thomas Sandby, as well as buildings and other
written texts produced at particular moments, Watkin traces in detail how
the R.A. lecture texts changed and were influenced in different ways at
specific times. As part of this work of tracking Soane’s intellectual evolution
via the production of his R.A. lectures, Watkin embarked on the complex task
of analysing an extraordinary amount of written notes, drafts and different
versions of the lecture manuscripts written for the R.A., and which are still
housed within the Soane Museum archive. Together with Soane Museum
archivist Sue Palmer’s catalogue, which was published as another of the
appendices within Watkin’s study – and which outlines the vast number of
complicated and multifaceted papers relating to Soane’s R.A. lectures157 – the
book functions as an invaluable resource and key for other researchers, both
of the lectures and of Soane in general. Watkin’s analysis and study has
substantially enabled my own investigation of Soane’s lectures as a
performative practice.

It is important to note that by exploring the development of Soane’s
argument about architecture in this way over time – that is, to consider his
process of writing both notes on the books he read and different versions of
the lecture manuscripts – we could say that Watkin explores one aspect of
what I defined earlier in this thesis’s ‘Conceptual Framing’ as Soane’s
‘practice’ of the lectures (even if he does not consider or name this process in
the specific terms of being a ‘practice’). For Watkin, approaching the lectures
primarily as a set of written texts and notes for such texts allows for the
identification of the architectural ideas with which Soane engaged and which
gripped his attention over many years. Whilst the book focuses on this
written content, throughout this analysis Watkin cross-references with
mention of particular lecture drawings which depicted corresponding subject
matter.158 For most of ‘Part One’ Watkin devoted three separate chapters to
three of the most recurring subjects within the R.A. lecture texts’ content.

157 Susan Palmer, ‘Appendix Four: An Outline Catalogue of Papers relating to the Lectures on
Architecture Delivered at the Royal Academy by Sir John Soane, held at Sir John Soane’s Museum,’ in
158 Note that I analyse Watkin’s separate chapter concerning only the lecture drawings in *Part II.*
These are important to mention here because of the way they also dominate the content of Soane’s R.I. lectures.

Focusing on an engagement with writers such as Vitruvius, Antoine Laugier and Antoine-Chrysostome Quatramère de Quincy, the first of Watkin’s thematic chapters on the R.A. lecture content, ‘First Principles and the Myth of Origin’, explores the belief and interest which ‘lay at the heart of much of the Enlightenment theory with which Soane was obsessed’,\(^{159}\) and which attempted to identify and explain the origins of architecture. This often focused on the development of the Greek temple from the timber structures of the primitive hut, and advocated for a return to these first principles. The second of these chapters, entitled ‘The Architecture of Character and Sensation’, examines conflicting ideas of the period, which Soane also read, regarding how buildings could communicate their civic purpose and moral values through their ‘character’.\(^{160}\) Defining ‘character’ as the ways architecture could ‘ evoke sensations or emotions in the beholder, especially through the handling of light’,\(^{161}\) here Watkin shows how Soane was influenced by the writings of architectural theorists such as Nicolas Le Camus de Mézières,\(^{162}\) as well scholars of the picturesque such as Lord Kames and Richard Payne Knight.\(^{163}\) The last of such chapters, entitled ‘The Symbolical Language of Antiquity’, analysed Soane’s preoccupations with ‘the meaning of ornament’, which were influenced by other writers’ study of ancient architecture, particularly Baron d’Hancarville.\(^{164}\)

Four years later, in 2000, Watkin published another edition of the R.A. lecture texts in a book entitled *Sir John Soane: The Royal Academy Lectures*, which includes a short introduction to their written content and reproduces a more concise selection of 35 of the lecture drawings.\(^{165}\) This shorter softback book, with images printed in black and white, presumably functioned as a more compact and commercial alternative to Watkin’s 1996 edition and


\(^{164}\) Watkin notes Soane’s interest in d’Hancarville had ‘not previously been recorded’: Watkin, *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought*, 256-283, 256.

accompanying analysis of Soane’s R.A. texts discussed above. In 2007, Watkin then curated an exhibition at the Soane Museum, entitled *Visions of World Architecture: John Soane’s Royal Academy Lecture Illustrations*, which revolved around the lecture drawings. This show exhibited 31 drawings, corresponding extracts from the R.A. lecture texts, a preparation notebook and two models. Building directly on Watkin’s previous scholarship, it also exhibited key publications which he had read to have influenced Soane’s lectures, including Antonio Palladio’s *I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura* (1767), Marc-Antoine Laugier’s *Essay on Architecture in which its True Principles are Examined and Invariable Rules Proposed* (1755), Roland Fréart de Chambray’s *Parallèle de L’architecture Antique et de la Moderne* (1702), and John Wood’s *The Origin of Building: or, the Plagiarism of the Heathens Detected In Five Books* (1741).

In contrast to the large amount of attention that has been given to Soane’s R.A. lectures, comparatively little is known or has been written about those which were delivered at the R.I. They are widely acknowledged to have occurred and are often mentioned in conjunction with the R.A. lectures, but limited information is supplied beyond the fact that they happened at a different venue and were shorter in length. Historian Gillian Darley gives a brief account of the lectures within her 1999 biography of Soane’s life, conveying them as ‘more popular versions of the Royal Academy lectures designed for a wider public including women and given in the summer season’ and describing their built setting of the R.I. lecture theatre. Watkin also refers to them in the conclusion of his 1996 study, giving dates and noting in similar terms that they were ‘shorter and simpler than his Royal Academy lectures but featuring many of the same illustrations’. Describing how the R.I. ‘became known for its series of popular lectures on topics such as Music, Architecture, Painting, and the Fine Arts, as well as Geology,

---

166 This exhibition ran at the John Soane Museum between 12 January and 28 April 2007. See exhibition guide, which includes Watkin’s introductory statement to accompany the exhibition, and written summaries to accompany each exhibited drawing. David Watkin, *Visions of World Architecture: John Soane’s Royal Academy Lecture Illustrations* [exhibition guide], (London: John Soane’s Museum, 2007).


Chemistry, and Natural History’, Watkin goes on to note how ‘Soane’s lectures at The Royal Institution were extremely popular, especially with ladies who were excluded from his Royal Academy lectures’.\(^{170}\) This description of the R.I. lecture texts as ‘shorter and simpler’ versions of the R.A. lectures encapsulates the perception that this shorter series of lectures merely repeated content that had already been delivered at the R.A. With this in mind, I interpret that part of the reason the R.I. lectures have not been studied before results from the belief that Watkin has already carried out the job of analysing this same content. What else would there be left to study? Furthermore, through the R.I. lectures’ popularity (both in terms of their reported achievement of receiving a large, non-specialist audience, but also through the association, discussed in the previous section, of being dumbed down, made entertaining and therefore less serious), there is also the implicit suggestion throughout the historiography of Soane’s lectures that the R.I. lectures were lesser versions of the more properly academic lectures produced for the R.A.

When I first read Watkin’s 1996 book on Soane’s R.A. lectures, I made attempts to read the words of the lectures’ texts at the same time as attempting to determine at what precise points in this text specific lecture drawings were also shown. In doing so, I wanted to assess how the different buildings, landscape and other architectural subject matter covered in the R.A. lectures were being described in words, and to compare this with how the same subjects were simultaneously being visually described/represented in specific drawings. (Furthermore, I wanted to assess if the subject matter was indeed always the same.) These early encounters, which first occurred in 2010, I now understand to have been an attempt to engage with and consider the performance of the R.A. lectures through Watkin’s existing history and printed presentation of them. During these encounters of trying to consider the performed relations between word and drawing, I constantly leafed back and forth between different parts of Watkin’s heavy book. The three key parts of the book I moved between were: firstly, the R.A. lecture texts which Watkin had edited, located at the back of his ‘Part Two’;\(^{171}\) secondly, the selection of the lecture drawings which were visually reproduced, located

---


earlier in the book towards the beginning of Watkin’s own analysis of the R.A. lecture texts;\textsuperscript{172} and thirdly, lists of drawings that stated which and in what order drawings were shown within each of the twelve R.A. lectures, located towards the back of the book as one of its appendices.\textsuperscript{173}

As I continued to try to read Soane’s R.A. lectures through Watkin’s and Bolton’s books, and to engage with aspects of their performance, it was impossible to clarify the exact points of contact between the words in the lecture texts and the drawings which were shown whilst these texts were being spoken. This was partly because these lecture texts and the information about the drawings were, as stated above, physically separate in Watkin’s book. But this is not the only reason. It is also because, even when one tries to read precisely between them (word and drawing), the exact points in Soane’s written text when each drawing was shown are not in fact indicated by Watkin to the reader.

Offering some assistance in this task of identifying where the words and drawings corresponded, Watkin sometimes provides useful information regarding the drawings in parentheses within the body of Soane’s lecture text. In these instances, where Watkin offers parenthetical interpolations, his reader can view a printed copy of a specific lecture drawing (located in plates elsewhere in his book) at the point when Soane’s text is referring to the original lecture drawing (held in the Soane Museum archive).\textsuperscript{174} From this it is possible to start to compare how and what Soane might have been simultaneously communicating through the words and the drawings at specific moments, in turn enabling one to start to reflect on what was being communicated through this relationship, or to consider what happened when the words were spoken and the drawings were shown at the same time (albeit an effect that would only have existed in the mind of the audience). But, as already described, not all the lecture drawings are reproduced in Watkin’s book as plates. Considering that there were more than 800 lecture drawings shown in the R.A. lectures in total, this is not a surprising fact; however, the

\textsuperscript{172} Watkin, \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, [plates are located between] 300–301.

\textsuperscript{173} Watkin and Richardson, ‘Appendix Two: List of Soane’s Lecture Illustrations at the Royal Academy’, in Watkin, \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, 672–693. These lists reproduce the ones written in manuscript bound in volumes, SM Archives, Soane Case 35–43.

\textsuperscript{174} The first drawing referred to in this way in R.A. Lecture I is plate 34, labelled under the plate by Watkin: ‘Restoration of the Tomb of Mausolus at Halicarnassus’. Watkin, \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, 493.
result is that there are large tracts of the R.A. lecture texts in Watkin’s book which do not specify which lecture drawings were shown, and when they were shown, throughout each lecture.

It is important to highlight here that at this early stage of trying to read Soane’s R.A. lecture performances through the lens of their printed presentation in Watkin’s book, I did not know that Soane had in fact precisely indicated specific meeting points between the words and drawings in his original lecture manuscripts. Much of my initial interest in Soane’s lectures both at the R.A. and R.I. was motivated by observing how the consideration of Soane’s lectures as performances and as a performance practice seemed to itself activate the significance of the relationship between the words and drawings. At the same time, I was fascinated by the way there seemed to be a mismatch in the priority given to this relationship or to the interface between the words and drawings by Soane himself in his own manuscripts, when compared with the ways they had been later represented in print.
Histories, Theories and Practices of the Lecture In Architecture

This section starts by describing my Master’s thesis, where I first explored a historical architect’s lectures through the lens of performance studies and first encountered archival material relating to John Soane’s lectures. I then discuss the existing treatment and status of the medium of the lecture in general within architectural history. Here I explore the ways in which the architect’s lecture – one type of architectural lecture – has mainly been considered as a written text, with little consideration paid to its status and significance as a performance.

Whether approached as an instructive or pedagogical tool, a promotional vehicle, a social occasion, or a performance, ‘the lecture’ is and has been an important medium through which architecture gets talked about, narrated, visualised, historicised, practised and theorised. Alongside the discipline’s other ways of communicating, including written publications, exhibitions, drawings, models, photographs, the internet, etc., lectures can also be recognised as a further prominent form of a wider ‘complex system of media representations’ that both convey and actively construct architecture.\textsuperscript{175} Despite playing a prominent role within architectural culture in Britain since the eighteenth century, with the aforementioned Robert Morris lecturing to the Society for the Improvement of Knowledge in Arts and Sciences in the 1730s,\textsuperscript{176} and architecture lectures being given at the R.A. beginning with First Professor of Architecture Thomas Sandby between 1770 and 1798\textsuperscript{177} (and in France since the seventeenth century),\textsuperscript{178} the subject of the lecture has mostly been neglected in architectural history and theory.

As already intimated, my own research into the architectural lecture began

\textsuperscript{175} For passing references to the lecture in architecture, see, for example, Kester Rattenbury, \textit{This is Not Architecture: Architecture and Its Media} (London: Routledge, 2002), xxii; Mark Wigley, \textit{The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida’s Haunt} (London: The MIT Press, 1993), 212.


\textsuperscript{178} See, for example, the lectures of the first director of the Académie Royale D’Architecture, François Blondel, in Anthony Gerhino, \textit{François Blondel: Architecture, Erudition, and the Scientific Revolution} (London: Routledge, 2012), 48.
during my Master’s at The Bartlett in 2009-10, and during this time I specifically became interested in the significance of architects’ lectures as forms of performance. As part of this work I visited the Soane Museum archive and looked at Soane’s R.A. lecture manuscripts and lecture drawings, although I did not write about this subject in my final MA report. Indeed, whilst my doctoral project has gone on to directly examine Soane’s lecturing oeuvre, specifically considering it as an early nineteenth-century practice and performance practice of architecture, and paying close attention to the institutional and performance context of the R.I., in my Master’s thesis I took a different approach. In this earlier research, I chose to read and write about a single lecture performance event, delivered by the modernist architect Le Corbusier, within another specific institutional and historical context, that of the Architectural Association (AA) in the mid-twentieth century.

More precisely, within my Master’s study I became interested in reading two events held at London’s AA: firstly, Le Corbusier’s 1947 lecture (mentioned above); and secondly, a later 2008 public symposium, which, through a range of talks by historians, archivists and former students, set about recalling and commemorating the by-then famous and mythologised 1947 lecture by Le Corbusier. In so doing, I was interested in exploring what could be known of this single lecture event through different written audience reports which appeared in the press at the time, and reading these (sometimes conflicting) accounts of the spoken content in conjunction with a number of accompanying drawings which Le Corbusier drew in front of the audience, some of which still exist within the RIBA archive. Whilst my interest in the interface between the written and drawn architectural lecture continues from my MA into the work which I have carried out in relation to Soane in this thesis, the practices of drawing, writing and performing drawings and words in the lecture manifest completely differently in these different historical periods. Whilst Le Corbusier spoke without a script and drew diagrams of his architectural ideas and urban philosophies live in front of the audience (albeit

---

381 RIBA Drawing Collection, FRA/CORB/1-4, Le Corbusier, ‘Lecture diagrams, made to illustrate the lecture “The Golden Section”, given to mark the Centenary of the Architectural Association, by Le Corbusier’ (1947), 4 Sheets.
heavily repeating what he said and drew), Soane’s practice of lecturing conformed to different codes and contexts of architecture, performance and decorum, reading his lecture texts aloud from the page, and showing pre-prepared drawings influenced by the Beaux-Arts school.

Using video documentation of the 2008 spoken presentations as evidence for reading Le Corbusier’s lecture, I approached the AA’s 2008 commemoration of the 1947 lecture as a type of ‘re-enactment’, and (potentially) as being as revealing, as written published sources from the time. Treating these public acts of speech as playing an active role in performing the history of Le Corbusier’s lecture and its afterlife, I argued that the words in the symposium and their telling played a specific performative role in altering and constructing the significance of the lecture and relationship between Le Corbusier and the AA. I outline details of my own MA Report here not only to reference previous relevant research, but also as an artist might outline their previous work as playing a role in informing their current creative practice.

In architectural historian Adrian Forty’s review of Shundana Yusaf’s 2014 Broadcasting Buildings: Architecture on the Wireless, 1927–1945, he refers to the ‘the long-standing tradition of oral communication in architecture through the form of the lecture’,\textsuperscript{182} which he points out Yusaf did not acknowledge in her book exploring how architecture had been spoken about and disseminated on the radio in Britain. He writes: ‘Radio was in a sense a continuation, and updating for a wider audience, of architecture’s conventional means of conveying ideas... a very particular form of the lecture, deprived of visual aids...’\textsuperscript{183} Whilst the architectural radio broadcast is beyond the scope of this thesis, Forty’s brief reference to its precursor – the lecture – as ‘architecture’s conventional means of conveying ideas’ is useful, particularly for indicating its dominance in the period prior to the existence of live media such as the radio, which is indeed when Soane’s lectures took place. Elaborating on the weighting that has been placed by architectural history on the lecture as a \textit{written} production, Forty further comments:

\begin{quote}
But although we can read the texts of Soane’s \textit{Royal Academy Lectures}, Blomfield’s \textit{The Mistress Art}, or Le Corbusier’s \textit{Precisions},
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{183} Forty, ‘Broadcasting Buildings’, 124.
we have little idea how they were performed (though Tim Benton’s *The Rhetoric of Modernism* gives us a glimpse). Yet performances they were, in a craft that has long been cultivated by architects, and which they continue to cultivate.384

Here Forty observes that, whilst there is a broad range of architectural history books on historical architects’ lecture texts that belong to various historical periods and architectural contexts (here Watkin’s and Bolton’s editions of Soane’s texts are referred to in passing), from this body of previously published material little is given away to the reader or researcher about ‘how’ such written texts ‘were performed’. Whilst Forty does not go into detail about what constitutes the ‘performance’ of a lecture, within the context of his review of Yusaf’s book we can assume that one of the things he is highlighting is its oral and spoken status and significance. Furthermore, Forty’s reference to one of the differences between the oral medium of the radio and that of the lecture as being the lecture’s use of ‘visual aids’, suggests that another of the ways Forty is indicating that ‘we have little idea how they were performed’, concerns how other elements (such as images, drawings, models, and other visual or audio aids) were used and played a role in communicating architecture to the lecture audience.

Whilst Forty does not explicitly say here what the value of the architect’s lecture as a performance is, I interpret that he is suggesting that the performance of the lecture impacted and played a role in its architectural meaning, and that such meaning cannot be accessed or encountered by reading the content of the lecture text alone off the page (as it has been largely presented to date in architectural history). But, there is also another level to Forty’s words which suggests further contours to the matter of the lecture’s significance as a performance, and which activates specific issues relevant within my own study. On one level, his description of an architect’s performance of a lecture as a ‘craft’ suggests that constructing the performance itself becomes a form of making and designing, whilst the choice of the word ‘cultivated’ indicates a strategic and conscious use of the performance – its spoken form, content and visual aids – for a particular purpose, developed and repeated over time.

---

Considering the relative ease of reproducing in print the written text remaining from or developed after an architect’s lecture, compared with the task of representing both its intended and received meanings when it was performed, it is perhaps not surprising that the architect’s lecture as a text has come to be emphasised, and more readily transmitted and reinforced over time. Furthermore, it is of course important not to forget that a written lecture text can be an extremely valuable record of a broad range of things in its own right: reflections and teachings on an architect’s own theories and practices of design or their attitudes on the work of others; evidence for conformity to and/or deviation from a particular architectural movement or design philosophy; and revealing insights into specific engagements and positions by that architect on matters of history and architecture’s past. All of these important dimensions, as discussed in the previous section, have been analysed through Soane’s lecture texts by Watkin. An architect’s written text can also clearly provide a different kind of insight from one that can be read from the same architect’s buildings; and indeed, if the architect has not produced other writings, then such lecture texts can operate as especially valuable documentary source materials for considering their work. But there is also something significant about the specificity of the lecture text as compared with other kinds of written texts produced by architects. Whilst it is not possible to generalise between all architects’ lectures and time periods, which vary greatly in terms of formality and are often informed by institutional context and contemporary social codes, often a lecture text can adopt a more informal, anecdotal or conversational approach to the subjects discussed. Similarly, a lecture text can retain aspects from its situation of originally being written to be delivered, in a different manner to the way a writer might address their readers in a book. This could include for example an explicit acknowledgement of the co-present, seated audience within the written text, or reference to what that audience will physically look at and/or hear within the lecture.

Whilst a great many twentieth-century architects’ lecture texts have been published in printed form, we additionally often have access to video documentation, sound recordings and photographs for such lectures which took place during this period, as well as first-hand accounts by audience
members who attended them.\textsuperscript{385} Whilst these different forms of media present their own limitations for capturing a performance,\textsuperscript{386} we must also recognise that they nevertheless also often afford a greater – to use Forty’s words again – ‘idea’ of ‘how’ these twentieth-century lectures ‘were performed’, especially when compared with earlier nineteenth-century examples, such as Soane’s lectures, which rely solely on reading textual evidence. We could thus say that the lack of knowledge about the ways architects’ lectures of the past ‘were performed’ is down to more than one kind of factor: firstly, that there is a lack of evidence, often because of the ephemerality of the medium; but secondly, that there has also been a lack of interest in the lecture as a practice and performance, and this question has not been prioritised by historians.

In contrast to the vast majority of nineteenth-century architects’ lectures which are accessible only via textual documentation, and most twentieth-century architects’ lectures which occurred in a period when filming was possible but not always common for all lectures, today’s cultural and educational institutions connected (not only) to architecture frequently record, disseminate and archive their lecture videos online as a matter of course.\textsuperscript{387} Indeed, we can readily engage with ‘how’ an architect’s lecture ‘was performed’, sometimes even on the same day the lecture was given. In July 2015, the ArchDaily journalist James Taylor-Foster framed the ‘online lecture’ as ‘similar to the podcast... an easy, often entertaining way of absorbing knowledge and the opinions of thinkers and practitioners from around the world.’\textsuperscript{388}


\textsuperscript{386} Note that the arguments I play out above in relation to the problems of accessing the architectural lecture through different forms of documentation relate strongly to those also discussed in the history of performance art. See for example, Matthew Reason, \textit{Documentation, Disappearance and the Representation of Live Performance} (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

\textsuperscript{387} The AA’s extensive online archive of lectures, for example, goes back to 1968: \textit{Online Lecture Videos} (AA), accessed 6 October 2016, http://www.aaschool.ac.uk/PUBLIC/AUDIOVISUAL/videoarchive.php

There are several key exceptions where the status of the architect’s lecture as performed has been addressed in differing ways and which provide important research contexts to my own project. For example, in her work on the theme of time in the drawings of C.R. Cockerell, architectural historian Anne Bordeleau explores drawings which were produced for Cockerell’s lectures at the R.A. The architectural historian Tim Benton’s 2007 study also considers lecture drawings, focusing on Le Corbusier’s lectures (which Forty also makes reference to above) between 1924 and 1965 in Europe and South America, and exploring Le Corbusier’s argument structures, rhetorical techniques and art of persuasion through documentary, drawn and film evidence. Indeed, my own Master’s report directly built on Benton’s scholarship by approaching his spoken contribution to the aforementioned 2008 symposium event at the AA as a performance of architectural history in its own right, and considering it within my analysis of the historiography of Le Corbusier’s 1947 AA lecture event (an event that Benton had not investigated as part of his wider study). The lecture features in a different way within artist, architect and researcher Katerina Bonnevier’s architectural history work. She does not investigate the lectures of past architects like Bordeleau or Benton, but instead uses the lecture as a performative writing device within her queer architectural history of Eileen Gray’s building E. 1027, the literary salon of author Natalie Barney at 20 rue Jacob, and author Selma Lagerlöf’s home Mårbaka (to be further discussed in the next section). The sociologist Albena Yavena has also written about the lecture as part of her research into ‘the architectural presentation’. In this work, Yavena focuses on the range of presentations of the architecture office OMA – from pitching, to selling a design to a client, to presenting work to the public in various contexts during or after the execution of a building. Here, Yavena considers the role of the physical setting, the approach to the form and content of the words spoken and accompanying visuals and objects shown as

---


191 Bonnevier, Behind Straight Curtains.

factors considered by OMA in their approach to presenting, and the impact that these aspects can have on the audience and architectural messages received. The architectural curator and critic Shumon Basar has also approached the lecture by hosting a conversation event on the subject as part of his first series of *FORMAT* events held at the AA, which has focused on its past and current role in disciplining architectural knowledge.¹⁹³

Using Performance History, Theory and Practice as Lens for Reading and Practising Architectural History

This section focuses on current perspectives from performance history, theory and practice, particularly the work of the theatre and performance historian Rebecca Schneider, which have influenced this project both in reading Soane’s lectures and in practising the history. I begin by focusing on the difficulties and challenges faced by historians who study in the present the apparently ephemeral cultural form of performances and performance practices from the past, and I consider how such perspectives have influenced my own approach to reading Soane’s lectures via evidence in the R.I. lecture manuscripts and drawings. I then shift to exploring discourses related to those explored in the former by focusing on Schneider’s theories of liveness and practices of re-enactment. This sets out key theoretical issues which I then pick up again in the following section regarding the specific methods I have developed within my own performative practice of architectural history.

As with the previous ‘Conceptual Framing’ section, I have chosen to use this section as a place to introduce the theory with which I have engaged throughout this project, keeping the analysis of the R.I. manuscripts in Part I and the lecture drawings in Part II as a place to foreground the self-reflexive historical thinking and questioning process rather than theorisation. Whilst I have already identified, through Carlson’s observations (about the influence of performance studies on considering the physical factors of a past theatre production), the issue of ‘the spatial realisation of the text’ as a key factor to be addressed through recognising Soane’s lectures as a performance practice of architecture, the following section tends to highlight the equally important issue of the *temporality* of different kinds of performance and its practice.

A particularly influential theorist for this research is the performance historian Rebecca Schneider, a scholar who has significantly impacted debates since the early 2000s regarding the historical transmission of live performance, the relationships between performance and the archive, and the challenges faced by present historians in grappling with objects and practices from the past which were themselves ‘live’. Schneider’s theoretical point of view that ‘performance remains’, or that performance is actually defined through its capacities to repeat, not just through its material remains, has been vital for situating and interpreting questions that I had and still have
regarding Soane’s lecturing practice, and which have been prompted through encounters of reading his lecture manuscripts and drawings. Initially publishing these ideas in 2001 within her famous and often cited article ‘Performance Remains’, Schneider further evolved such positions over the following decade, culminating in her influential 2011 study of the cultural practice of re-enactment: *Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment*.¹⁹⁴

One of the things that Schneider’s theory of ‘performance remains’ does is to foreground the repetitive nature of performance, rather than its one-off unreproducibility. In so doing, Schneider’s historiographical project is explicit in declaring its specific aim of challenging (but more importantly, of complicating) the dominantly held perspective in art history since the 1960s according to which, almost in opposite terms, performance ‘disappears’. As Schneider noted in 2001:

> The definition of performance as that which disappears, which is continually lost in time, vanishing even as it appears, is a definition that has gathered steam over the last 40 years. Such a definition is suited to the concerns of art history [...] where performance seems to challenge object status and seems to refuse the archive its privileged, ‘savable’ original. In this context, performance seems to offer disappearance [...]¹⁹⁵

Here Schneider is also directly critiquing specific aspects of the performance studies scholar Peggy Phelan’s highly influential claims that ‘Performance’s being... becomes itself through disappearance’ and ‘occurs over a time which will not be repeated’.¹⁹⁶ Indeed, whilst Schneider takes issue with the view of Phelan and others that performance is ephemeral, vanishing and therefore cannot ever be recorded, she nevertheless acknowledges that individual live performances are performed differently each time, stating that ‘performance


(or actions, or acts) remain – but remain *differently*.\(^\text{197}\) Put in a slightly different way, Schneider asks: ‘in privileging an understanding of performance as a refusal to remain, do we ignore other ways of knowing, other modes of remembering, that might be situated precisely in the ways in which performance remains, but remains differently?’\(^\text{198}\) To develop this theory of the historical transmission and transformation of performance through time, she focuses on asserting that an important dimension of performance and theatre practice is its virtue of being repeated.\(^\text{199}\) Indeed, Schneider argues, that whether it is through the process of rehearsing for a performance on stage, or performing a part in a play on more than one occasion, or playing a part which others have played before (as so often is the case in the theatre), repetition and some kind of transmission through this repetition takes place. As she writes in her book *Theatre & History*, whilst a performance on the stage is enacted live in the ‘present moment’, the practice of this performance occurs across a broader period of time:

> Often a theatre artist uses or manipulates embodied traditions of theatre art (preserved through live practice and in-bodied knowledge passed down through generations) to impact stories on the stage, and more often than not those stories or plays come from a time before the present moment of production.\(^\text{200}\)

I have actively negotiated throughout this project the conundrum that, whilst many aspects of Soane’s lectures and the performance practice through which he prepared and performed them are inevitably lost, other dimensions remain. I have also considered the fact that, whilst we could consider Soane’s lectures as a series of gradually amended and adapted written texts, or as a series of individual events performed on different occasions, there also seems, to quote the scholarship of performance historian Diana Taylor, to have been a ‘repertoire’ at work over the course of doing the lectures.\(^\text{201}\) Indeed, the lecture manuscripts and drawings not only serve as important documentation for such past performances, but they also materially participated in those

\(^\text{197}\) Schneider, *Performing Remains*, 104. [Italics in original quote.]
\(^\text{198}\) Schneider, ‘Performance Remains’, 101.
\(^\text{199}\) Schneider, ‘Performance Remains’, 102.
\(^\text{200}\) See Schneider, *Theatre & History*, 10.
performances. The most obvious example of this is the way in which the lecture drawings comprise an important material and visual component of the lectures. But such a view can also be applied to approaching the R.I. lecture manuscript, which materially scripted the delivery of the lectures – the spoken words – before and during the lectures. I am interested in what Schneider’s work offers for unpicking questions about what aspects of the lecture manuscripts and drawings remain and continue to remain – both during and since Soane’s lifetime – and how these remainders can be read in the present. Here, I am also interested in the way Schneider’s critique of art history’s previous tendency to position ‘performance as that which disappears’ plays out differently in relation to architectural history, and which, whilst having many of the same concerns of art history regarding the visual and spectatorship, crucially also includes questions of spatial production, representation and experience, and patterns of use that are not only concerned with the looking. In turn, I have become concerned with what the remaining material of the lecture manuscripts and lecture drawings could tell us not only of the six lecture events and performances at the R.I. in 1817 and 1820 but also of the architectural practice associated with the activity of preparing and performing for lectures – a practice taking place before, during and after such lectures were delivered on stage, and one which was repeated over time. Furthermore, Schneider’s focus on the material afterlife of both performance and live practices also leads me to raise questions regarding how Soane’s lectures have materially remained in the John Soane Museum archive over time, and to consider the significance of studying this institutional afterlife to the history and knowledge of the lectures.

By attempting to identify how and what of performance is transmitted materially – which, Schneider argues, happens in different ways both through the live body and through documents and objects in the archive – she shows that there is as much at stake in the matter of what lives on after the performance as in the question of what is lost. Indeed, as performance historian Heike Roms theorises, Schneider’s focus on how performance remains after the performance (rather than, vis-à-vis Phelan, how it disappears and resists being ‘saved, recorded, documented’ 202) exhibits a
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broader archival turn or ‘archive fever that is currently gripping performance scholarship’.203 This may seem incompatible with the qualities of ‘performance and archive’, which, as Gunhild Borggreen and Rune Gade write, ‘are often understood as opposed to each other, one representing the fleeting and ephemeral, the other signifying stability and permanence.’204 Roms, however, shows that theories of the material transmission of performance – also explored by other historians such as Joseph Roach and Diana Taylor205 – shift the historian’s focus from the question of the possibility of recovering a one-off authentic event performed on stage (and the efficacy/inefficacy of the performance documentation to give access to the event), to considering how the archive could evidence what happened over the course of repeating it over time. In other words, focus is directed to how the material transmission of performance could evidence the practice associated with this process, as well as the different kinds of material means via which such a performance practice transmitted in the past and still remains. As Roms writes in relation to her own performance history work:

[...] instead of focusing on a single performance event, and the problems or possibilities of its audio-visual reproduction in documentation, the archive compels us to consider an extended artistic oeuvre and the manner in which its remains are cared for.206

Roms is writing about the context of twentieth-century performance art and its audio-visual documentation, which is different to my enquiry on Soane’s nineteenth-century lectures and the textual and drawn evidence for these lectures on architecture. However, whilst the historical period, disciplinary context and evidential material is different, I still draw something significant methodologically from Roms’s observations that exploring the archival afterlife of a performance event(s), ‘compels us to consider’ Soane’s ‘extended’

---


architectural and performance-related ‘oeuvre’, or the practice of preparing and performing the lectures over time. The linking of performance with the capacities to remain and with processes of archiving has correlated strongly for me with aspects of Soane’s lectures which architectural history has not addressed but which can be observed in the evidence, that of a creative practice of repeating versions of similar lectures, and the speaking and showing of the same and similar words and drawings over time. Here I have been continually fascinated by the possibility of reading a form of embodied and spatial architectural knowledge which is suggested by and between encounters with the actual manuscripts and drawings in the John Soane Museum archive.

In addition to highlighting the creative ‘oeuvre’ or practice of performance, Roms also draws out in the excerpt above how the idea of performance-as-remains, or performance as having the capacities to be (partially) archiveable, leads the researcher to consider the significance of how such remains are ‘cared for’ and catalogued, as well as the implications of recognising these kinds of later activities in the archive on the history of the lectures as a performance practice. Roms asks: ‘(how) does the archive care for performance’s legacy/ies?’ Significantly, a large part of the following project studies the processes of archiving and the ‘archival practices’ which have pertained and continue to pertain to the R.I. lecture manuscripts and drawings. This includes studying the treatment of the same R.I. manuscripts and drawings by previous architectural historians, as well as reflecting on the shifting and differing value systems of text and drawing which surround previous engagements with Soane’s lectures at particular moments in the past. This also includes studying changes to the ways such lecture manuscripts and drawings have been catalogued in different ways over time, and how they have changed in material distribution and physical organisation and location across the three buildings of 12-14 Lincoln’s Inn Fields over the course of two hundred years.

Schneider forges her theory of performance as not completely vanishing, and as remaining, but remaining differently – not only via the domain of the theatre and concept of the theatrical. She also situates it within a broader context of ideas concerning repetition which she shows to be at work within

Western conceptions of time and representation. Here she states: ‘all representational practice, and indeed all communicative behaviour, is composed in reiteration, is engaged in citation, is already a practice of re-enactment’. In so doing, she also links to (and, in turn, troubles) well-known earlier theorisations of performance and performativity already mentioned in this Introduction, for example performance studies theorist Richard Schechner’s ‘twice-behaved behaviour’ (and his associated statement that ‘Performance means: never for the first time’), and gender theorist Judith Butler’s concept of ‘sedimented acts’, which, Schneider argues, are involved in enabling the social construction of gender. Referring to the ways both of these theorists and their ideas approach the construction of social reality, behaviour and identity as performed through iterational processes which occur over time, Schneider questions the assumption that performance and the category of ‘live’ only occur in, or as ‘a matter’ of, the ‘present’. She writes:

Is the live really only a matter of temporal immediacy, happening only in an uncomplicated now, a ‘transitory’ present, an immediate moment? Is a ‘maniacally charged present’ not punctuated by, syncopated with, indeed charged by other moments, other times? That is, is the present really so temporally straight-forward or pure – devoid of a basic delay or deferral if not multiplicity and flexibility? Does it not take place or become composed in double, triple, or multiple time – especially if performance and the ‘sedimented acts’ that comprise the social are always a matter of ‘twice-behaved behaviour’?

Coming out of her work on performance remains, Schneider also powerfully advocates for the work of the historian to be recognised as a form of re-enactment and ‘live’ practice of performance, where ‘liveness’ is approached, in the terms of this quotation, not just as a condition of the present, but as involving more than one temporality. In her short study Theatre & History, she explores the ‘tangled relations between the terms, practices, ideas, and aims embedded in [the] compatriot – but often oppositional – arts and acts of time’ associated with both the theatre and history. In so doing, she

208 Schneider, Performing Remains, 10.
209 Quoted in Schneider, Performing Remains, 10, 126.
210 Schneider, Performing Remains, 10, 127.
211 Schneider, Performing Remains, 92.
provocatively brings ‘the supposedly “live” practices of performance’ and theatre into contact and productive interaction with ‘the “no-longer-live” historical past’ that is the conventional domain of the historian, showing these practices to be not so different.  

In a related way, and building on her previous theory of ‘performance remains’, Schneider argues that all historical practice (be it carried out by the conventional historian, artist, or American Civil War redo-er) is a form of re-enactment or live repetition: it is an inherently reconstructive activity which involves the ‘replay of evidence (photographs, documents, archival remains) back across the body in gestic negotiation.’

In so doing, and in ways that overlap with the art and performance historian Amelia Jones, Schneider focuses on the affective and embodied experience and performance of making any historical enquiry itself, as offering forms of knowledge about the past, as well as also explicitly running counter to the so-called ‘hard facts’ of traditional history, or that which is captured in written documents. In particular, and further linking with the quotation above, Schneider attends to the temporality or ‘entangled’ status of time during the activity of re-enactment (again, of the historian or otherwise). In so doing, she draws out the punctuating, improvisational and ‘inter(in)animate’ qualities of one time in another time as experienced and intervened in through the actions of participants in the re-enactment. In words that could be applied to a theatrical practitioner on the stage, amateur re-enactor on the battlefield or, as she argues, the historian, Schneider reflects: ‘Whether reencountered via “acting out” or “working through”, the past is given to lie ahead as well as behind – the stuff and substance limning a twisted and cross-hatched footpath marked re-turn.

Challenging traditional perspectives of history as linear, singular and distanced, Schneider proposes a different kind of historical knowledge

212 Schneider, Theatre & History, 3.
213 Schneider, Performing Remains, 9.
215 Schneider, Performing Remains, 14.
216 Schneider, Performing Remains, 22.
through the practice of re-enactment that is incomplete, constructed and performative (in the sense of being made in the present and actively altering the past) – a form of knowledge that is characterised through ‘the tangle of then in now.’\textsuperscript{217} Even more radically, Schneider makes the case that through re-enactment there is potential and critical value in the strangeness and inadequacies of the copy which is made through re-enacting. Here, linking to ideas of the way a past performance remains but remains differently, Schneider draws attention to the productive shortcomings of the re-enactment activity to redo the past, describing this in terms of ‘the curious inadequacies of the copy, and what inadequacy gets right about our faulty steps backward, and forward and to the side.’\textsuperscript{218}

Schneider’s theories on the practice of the historian as a form of re-enactment and ‘cross-temporal’ performance practice\textsuperscript{219} have heavily influenced the methods which I discuss in the following section. In my experience, the temporality of encounters with the evidence contained in the R.I. manuscripts and drawings has been complicated, whereby any present encounter with these materials has subsequently also become past. Indeed, as a historian I have not only attempted to continually retrieve the original past events and practice of Soane’s lectures under investigation, but I have also had to retrieve in the present my own previous reconstructions of the evidence in and outside the archive. Equally, in writing my reading of the past, I have simultaneously had to project forward into the future, to when a future audience (the reader) will engage with my written performance. This means paying attention to the live encounter the reader will have with the written account or interpretation of the evidence, ‘staging’ this future encounter accordingly. As I show in the following section, this involves paying attention to how the cross-temporal liveness of my own encounters with Soane’s lecture texts and drawings could be replicated for the future reader.

\textsuperscript{217} Schneider, \textit{Performing Remains}, 10.
\textsuperscript{218} Schneider, \textit{Performing Remains}, 6, 86.
\textsuperscript{219} Schneider, \textit{Performing Remains}, 37, 57.
Methods of my Practice, Performance Practice and Performative Practice of Architectural History

This project of architectural history addresses the question of the significance of Soane’s lectures considered as a practice, a performance, as performative – and coming out of this, as an early nineteenth-century performance (and potentially performative) practice of architecture. The following section begins by situating this thesis within a wider field of historiography and largely feminist architectural history. It then progresses to setting out the three main methods of the thesis which I have developed, linking back to the previous section which discussed the performance history and theory of Rebecca Schneider.

A key methodological influence for this project has been the work of the philosopher of history R.G. Collingwood, who explicitly foregrounded the practice of history as a form of detective work, carried out by the historian in the present. Art historian Amelia Jones describes how Collingwood’s approach to the past as actively made through its ‘re-telling’ in the present exemplifies a notion of history and historical practice as (what we would now understand to be) ‘performative’. She usefully points out here, that these ideas, which Collingwood was developing in 1928 lectures, and which he later published in 1946 and 1956, were contemporary to related theories in other disciplines, for example of his Oxford colleague Austin’s more famous linguistic performative, and of Goffman’s articulation of social behaviour as ritualistically enacted.

While I initially came to Collingwood through performance history and theory’s recent appraisal of his work, it has been reading this historian’s

220 As I have already noted, these ideas played a role in the development of performance studies in the mid-twentieth century. See Jones, ‘Introduction’, in Jones and Heathfield (eds), Perform, Repeat, Record, 40.

221 Austin’s lectures were delivered in 1955 and published in 1962: Austin, How to do Things with Words.


ideas in their primary form – specifically those written in *The Idea of History* – that has deepened my own thinking while self-reflecting on the process of architectural historical enquiry. Collingwood’s questioning discussions of ‘How, or on what conditions, can the historian know the past?’ and of what they can ‘do’ to ‘know’ it, is worth expanding on in here. He writes:

If then the historian has no direct or empirical knowledge of his facts, and no transmitted or testimonial knowledge of them, what kind of knowledge has he: in other words, what must the historian do in order that he may know them?

Coming out of this philosophical conversation, Collingwood offers his ‘answer’ to this problem of accessing the past as being to conceptualise the historian’s labour as a form of re-enactment, writing: ‘My historical review of the idea of history has resulted in the emergence of an answer to this question: namely, that the historian must re-enact the past in his own mind.’ While Collingwood frames this as an intellectual process, it is interesting to note that his approach was developed specifically through considering the question of how to historically engage with the medium of performance. As the historian William H. Dray notes, Collingwood reported:

[...] that the idea first came to him while asking himself how one understands the present performance of a piece of music composed at some earlier time [...] This, he says, requires that the auditor to reconstruct it mentally, or, at least, follow a present performance of it actively, in that sense performing it again in imagination.

Further coming out of these discussions is Collingwood’s considerations regarding the status of the present encounter, or experience with and of the evidence, to the historical knowledge or history to be written itself. Elaborating on this process, he reflects:

---

When a man thinks historically, he has before him certain documents or relics from the past. His business is to discover what the past was which has left these relics behind it. For example, the relics are certain written words; and in that case he has to discover what the person who wrote those words meant by them. This means discovering the thought [...] which he expressed by them. To discover what this thought was, the historian must think it again for himself.²²⁹

Here, Collingwood shows that in his view the historian experiences the evidence, not the past. This excerpt has been particularly important for me in my own considerations of not only how to ‘discover’ the thoughts of Soane and his office, but how to ‘discover’ the practical processes involved in the preparation and delivery of the lectures.

Another key methodological context for developing this performative practice of architectural history is the rich work done by a broad range of feminist architectural theorists and historians. Such work often self-reflects on historiographical processes of interpreting different kinds of evidence, deconstructing and re-constructing the archive and architectural canon, as well as engaging with, citing and using other historians’ existing work already written on similar historical subject matter. This work also often creatively experiments with the performative qualities of writing, of images, and of using both mediums together to read and tell dimensions of architecture’s past which may not be fully accommodated through a more traditional, distanced and objective writing approach. Beatriz Colomina’s call, for example, in Privacy and Publicity (1996) to actively work with and interpret across the ‘gaps’ of the archive, which she writes are always ‘fractured and partial’, initially influenced the development of my own attitudes to the ‘archive’, both as a physical repository and broader idea.²³⁰ While Colomina makes these comments in relation to both the excess and the lack of evidential material which make up the respective ‘archives’ of Le Corbusier and Adolf Loos (‘archival excess’ and lack as, I would read, two types of ‘gaps’), I have explored the notion of reading the ‘gaps’ in a different way. I have often tried to explicitly foreground the relative limits – and inevitable

‘gaps’ – of and between the evidence which I draw upon, from more than one institutional archive, while making different kinds of readings of Soane’s R.I. lectures. Colomina’s work also helps to describe what could be understood as a rather large ‘gap’ at the heart of this project, in the form of the historical architecture or meanings that were proposed in performance between Soane’s words and drawings.

The writing of Jennifer Bloomer has also been important to my conceptualisation of the reading, writing and imaging of architectural history as a performative practice. In her essay, ‘In the Museyroom’ (1988) for example, I read Bloomer to perform Colomina’s ‘gaps’ through performative citation of fragments of the existing written and competing histories of the Soane Museum. Likewise, in other essays such as her highly suggestive 1992 ‘D’or’, Bloomer continues to draw attention to the citation of previous historians’ words to show to the reader the gendered construction of specific architectural histories; here specifically, the terms of ‘ornament’ and ‘structure’. Reflecting on what her own writing does to the canonical subjects which she brings into performative contact on the page, for example historical discourses surrounding the architect Louis Sullivan, she writes: ‘To make a brocade onto the top of Sullivan’s woven thing, his text, is not to kill him, but is, rather, a connecting by writing on top of, into, beneath (like sewing) [...]’. Another element deserving mention comprises the manner in which Bloomer gives the argument which she is making further spatial and architectural form, by using metaphorical and literal references to the door throughout, to enter and leave different discussions. Together with her conscious use of the productive ‘slippage’ and ‘oscillation between [...] the allegorical mode between the visual and verbal’, Bloomer uses word play and image play to both show historical operations which are already ‘at work’, and allowing other, more hidden histories to surface.

233 See for example, Bloomer, ‘D’or’, 168.
234 Bloomer, ‘D’or’, 178.
235 See for example, Bloomer, ‘D’or’, 180.
In my supervisor Jane Rendell’s first book *In the Pursuit of Pleasure* (2002), based on her PhD conducted in the nineties, she explores the role of urban space in the production of gender within 1820s Regency London. This book is also relevant to my own study, both through its examination of a similar historical period and its operations as a performative practice of architectural history. In this work, Rendell investigates a historical form of gender performance through architecture, which she shows occurred through the ‘display’ of gendered relations and was itself enabled in specific ways through the design of particular urban and built spaces of early nineteenth-century London, such as the Italian Opera House. Whilst not referencing Butler, turning instead to the work of feminist thinkers such as Luce Irigaray and postmodern geographers such as Edward Soja, her exploration of the co-productions relations between gender and the built environment, and architecture’s active role in constructing gender identity during the past, can also be read to explore concepts of poststructuralist performativity. In exposing how architectural history has contributed to reproducing such gender norms and often presenting architecture to have played a neutral role in gender difference, Rendell’s historical enquiry operates as a form of deconstruction whilst at the same time demonstrates that the processes of architectural history and historiography are themselves performative.

Rendell’s study also paid attention to her own ‘practice’ as a historian in conducting and constructing such a history. This approach followed previous work where she argued for architectural history itself as a ‘gendered practice’. Setting this perspective out in the introductory paragraph to an essay in 1995, Rendell writes that she aimed to address:

[...] the implications of feminism for the practice of architectural history. In so doing, it questions the basic tenets of architectural history, and proposes a new gendered practice; firstly, by suggesting new objects of study – the actual material which historians choose to look at; and second, by rethinking, from a feminist perspective, the intellectual criteria by which historians interpret those objects of study. In short then, this paper is concerned with defining the methodological approaches of a new gendered practice – that of a feminist architectural history.


Rendell’s essay emphasises what happens to the practice, or doing, of
architectural history when specifically influenced by feminism, through
shifting both what of the past and how the past is studied, and exploring the
ways these aspects can critique established norms of the discipline. Framing
history as a form of ‘practice’ – which we should note in the mid-nineties was
not as common as it is now\textsuperscript{\ref{Rendell1998}} – was informed by Rendell’s background as an
architect and teaching studio in art schools, alongside carrying out her
historical research. Rendell is a strong advocate of practice-based or practice-
related research, which often uses more obviously ‘creative’ visual, material
and spatial methods for studying and representing its processes and
findings.\textsuperscript{\ref{Rendell2009}} However, what I find significant in the above words is not the
foregrounding of an explicitly practical approach to history, but an approach
to the decisions of what to ‘look at’, and the development of ‘intellectual
criteria’ to read these ‘objects of study’ as ‘practice’.

Rendell’s more recent architectural criticism, which works directly with her
encounter with the critical objects she investigates – ‘objects’ ranging from
artworks and theories to buildings and other built spaces, has also inspired
my own approach to thinking about history as a performative practice. In
particular, this criticism has influenced the ways I have foregrounded the
encounter of reading historical evidence in the archive, and of experimenting
with ways of writing this performance of reading the history. In Rendell’s
2009 book, Site-Writing, she both theorises and develops her own form of
creative and critical art and architectural criticism,\textsuperscript{\ref{Rendell2009}} foregrounding the
constructing capacities of writing to emphasize her own writing as a
performative, architectural act. Indeed, when Rendell describes the ways
‘writing constructs as well as reflects meaning’,\textsuperscript{\ref{Rendell2009}} she provides a useful
definition for the ways written words can be performative, which echoes
Austin, by highlighting their capacities to actually enable and create meaning,
in addition to providing a descriptive role.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{\ref{Rendell1998}} For considering history as a form of practice see, for example, Gabrielle M. Spiegel, ‘Introduction’, in
Gabrielle M. Spiegel (ed.), Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the
\item \textsuperscript{\ref{Rendell2009}} See, for example, Rendell’s survey of feminist practitioners in Jane Rendell, ‘A Way with Words:
Feminists Writing Architectural Design Research’, in Murray Fraser (ed.), Design Research in
Architecture: An Overview (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).
\item \textsuperscript{\ref{Rendell2009}} Jane Rendell, Site-Writing.
\item \textsuperscript{\ref{Rendell2009}} Jane Rendell, ‘Critical Spatial Practices’, 36.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Drawing from a critical framework which combines intersecting discussions in feminist, art and performance studies, Rendell explores notions of an inherent and ‘necessary’ liveness and performativity at stake in the act of criticism. Citing writers such as Amelia Jones and Gavin Butt, Rendell articulates the process of written interpretation and the activity of critical engagement both as a ‘performance of the object’ under enquiry, and itself a ‘performative act’ which the critic enacts. An important issue to highlight here is the emphasis which Rendell places on what decides and defines this performance of the object under investigation, during the process of enacting the critic’s work. This time, drawing from psychoanalysis and feminist critique, Rendell foregrounds the concept of ‘situatedness’, as that which encapsulates the relative positions of writer and reader, subjectivity, autobiography, personal experience and investment, as well as the political and power relations at stake, and which are always entered into, during a critic’s engagement with any ‘object’ of enquiry. Architectural theorist Hélène Frichot, in collaboration with colleagues at Stockholm’s KTH architecture school, as part of their ‘Fictocriticism’ project, helpfully articulates the importance asserted by Butt of the performativity involved in acts of writing such a criticism. They write:

Butt suggests that the critical location is always embroiled in the midst of a situation. From the vantage of a newly located critical point of view, Butt proposes to rediscover criticism and its agency ‘within the very mode of critical address.’ By dismissing the fantasy of objectivity, new expressions of critical response that are more performatively, that employ fiction and autobiography, that multiply voices and points of view, and that ‘deviate from established modes of critical behaviour’ can be fostered.

Indeed, playing out over the course of Site-Writing, Rendell uses the spatial qualities of writing her own shifting positionality (as critic, writer, architect, feminist), during this process of reading art works and their contexts, where:


'the spatial qualities of writing become as important in conveying meaning as the content of the criticism'.244 This performative practice of criticism, which Rendell calls ‘site-writing’, develops through a discussion regarding the possibility of actually ‘writing the sites of art’ and ‘writing architecture’, in distinction to writing about them.245 She writes: ‘[r]ather than write about the work, I am interested in how the critic constructs his or her writing in relation to and in dialogue with the work.246

Architect and theorists Katja Grillner has also worked experimentally with spatialised and performative modes of writing architectural history and criticism, specifically landscape. In her early work Ramble, Linger, and Gaze: Dialogues from the Landscape Garden (2000), Grillner uses a form of dialogue staged between historical figures and herself, in order to enact a history of the eighteenth-century picturesque garden.247 This ‘theatrical’ form of writing – in the sense that the written dialogue is like the script of a play – I would argue, actively plays with the artifice and constructed associations and similarities between the written texts of the theatre and of history. At the same time, the spatial structure of Griller’s thesis mirrors and performs scenographic aspects of Grillner’s historical ‘object’ of enquiry itself; that of the picturesque garden. Although she did not in 2000 explicitly define this historical work as a form of performance or as performative, in a later journal paper, Grillner further develops and reflects on this project ‘in terms of its performance as a piece of critical writing’.248 She writes:

The continuous link between the dialogue and the garden produced a narrative movement around its central questions. From different angles the same question reappears [...] When these characters meet at Hagley these notions are shown at work, not drawn out of their context to be objectively examined and discursively explained.249

244 Rendell, Site-Writing, 20.
245 Referring to authors such as David Carrier and Yve Lomax, Rendell reads this distinction through corresponding debates taking place in the 2000s in relation to the practice of ‘art writing’, whereby writing is understood not only as a supplementary medium which makes accounts of, and comments on art, but that can also function as an artistic practice, and form of art-making in its own right. For earlier version of this discussion, see: Jane Rendell, ‘Architecture-writing’, The Journal of Architecture, Vol. 10, No. 3 (2005), 255-264.
247 Grillner, Ramble, Linger, and Gaze.
248 Grillner, ‘Writing and Landscape’, 239.
The reader’s experience of the dialogue reflects the scene-like qualities of encountering this specific type of landscape, that is, through a series of moving, encircling views. This form of critical writing draws from the spatial form of the historical landscape that it writes about. It also shows, with indeed all this word’s embodied associations of unveiling, gesturing or demonstrating, that ‘[f]rom different angles the same question reappears’. In so doing, we could interpret that Grillner makes a virtue of the fact that the past is continually being remade through the historian’s changing position and framing in the present.

In a more recent essay from 2012, entitled ‘A Performative Mode of Writing Place: Out and about the Rosenlund Park, Stockholm 2008-2010’, Grillner punctuates her writing with different autobiographical accounts of visiting a single public park in central Stockholm, at three distinct moments: 2005, 1975 and 2008-2009. While Grillner does not declare this piece as a form of historical enquiry, she does consider the ways autobiographical writing can retrieve and represent an urban site through the writer’s own encounters with it at different times in the past. In so doing, Grillner’s writing has relevance for the practice of architectural history and, in terms of my own work, for thinking through the complex temporality I have encountered involved in reading the past through encountering and reconstructing the same evidence repeatedly over time. Setting out to explore ‘a performative mode of writing which engages in and activates specific spaces […] through different forms of self-reflexive engagement’, Grillner proposes explicitly that this writing mode itself offers ‘important keys to understanding and knowing a particular place.’

Like Rendell, Grillner is interested in experimenting with strategies of writing that foreground her own subjectivity and interaction with a site, partially as a means to critique more dominant modes of criticism which she describes often strive towards the opposite aim. She writes, “This knowledge is often left aside in critical or historical accounts, where much effort goes into providing a distanced, and as far as possible neutral and factual

---

251 Grillner, ‘A Performative Mode of Writing Place’, 133.
252 Grillner, ‘A Performative Mode of Writing Place’, 133.
representation. So Grillner locates the performative properties of her writing in her acts of self-reflexivity and, in so doing, states this mode can operate as a ‘critical tool’ that more appropriately and actively engages with ‘spatial and artefactual realities in their immediate relation to use and experience’. In these performative acts, where Grillner considers her own subjectivity and its constitutive role in interpreting Rosenlund Park over time, Grillner shows how this site can be accessed in new ways. In a particularly spatialized description of the conundrums involved in reckoning with, and trying to understand a specific research object, Grillner reflects:

 [...] as soon one stops to focus in, or climbs up to get an overview, one has stepped out of practice and use.

In this description of the encounter between a researcher and the thing being-researched, which is articulated not in intellectual terms but as physical and embodied, Grillner performs the challenges experienced by the writer, as they try to better understand and experience what they are investigating. Grillner describes the inadequate impression and representation one gets both from pausing for too long up-close or, equally, from attempting to analyse something from further away or from above. This image bears some resemblances with the spatial operations at the heart of my own study concerning the different and repeated ‘in’ and ‘out’ actions of respectively close- and contextually reading the evidence of Soane’s R.I. lectures. It highlights the question of what happens when engaging with the specificities versus generalities of an object or site, and in the differing critical activities which are involved in closely inspecting the detail, as opposed to summarising, situating and surveying it from a distance.

Grillner’s description of this critical conundrum is the very challenge she then sets about to explore in her essay, which in turn encourages the reader themselves to think about the possibility of an alternative writing mode which could more actively engage with the way one encounters an object of study over time. A writing mode that could, for example, better accommodate a space, site or object’s ‘practice and use’ by acknowledging movement or the changing involvement of the writer with that space, site or object. In a

---

253 Grillner, ‘A Performative Mode of Writing Place’, 133.
254 Grillner, ‘A Performative Mode of Writing Place’, 133.
255 Grillner, ‘A Performative Mode of Writing Place’, 133.
manner which is like her written performance of the landscape garden, she makes the sentence and structure of the essay as a whole do the work of saying through the spatial image it creates. As she reflects:

This specific site, Rosenlund Park, influences the structure of this texts, its narrative and its lines of argument. Interwoven with that structure runs an associative line of critical discussion creating a rhythm of showing and telling. That is, this text does something, it performs, and for the reader this shows directly what is at stake.\footnote{Grillner, ‘A Performative Mode of Writing Place’, 135.}

I have already outlined in previous sections the ways in which the artist and architect Katarina Bonnevier, who was taught by Katja Grillner, has used the lecture as a performative device to structure Behind Straight Curtains: Towards a Queer Feminist Theory of Architecture, in which she analyses Eileen Gray’s building E. 1027, the literary Salon of author Natalie Barney at 20 rue Jacob, and author Selma Lagerlöf’s home Mårbacka.\footnote{Bonnevier, Behind Straight Curtains.} But this practitioner also uses the lecture as a means to perform one of the central arguments in this work, concerning the ways architectural space intervenes in and effects the performance or social events which occur within it, as much as such events also produce that architecture. As Bonnevier writes: ‘The architecture appears in the event, or the act. It shows that architecture plays a part in performativity. The architecture of the literary salon is in the move; in the actions of the social scene.’\footnote{Bonnevier, Behind Straight Curtains, 122.}

Not only experimenting with a performative mode of writing the history, Bonnevier also draws heavily from Butler’s theories of performativity, to explore this active role of the built environment specifically in the construction of gender, and vice versa.\footnote{For Bonnevier’s earlier and more recent investigations of this subject, see: Katarina Bonnevier, ‘A Queer Analysis of Eileen Gray’s E.1027’, in Hilde Heynen and Gülşüm Baydar (eds), Negotiating Domesticity: Spatial Productions of Gender in Modern Architecture (London: Routledge, 2005), 162–180; Katarina Bonnevier, ‘Dress-Code: Gender Performance and Misbehavior in the Manor’, Gender, Place & Culture, Vol. 19, No. 6 (2012), 707-29.} Positioning Butler’s concepts as lenses or tools through which to consider the active role of buildings and building process to construct gender, she states that:
In any building activity, ideologies and norms are reiterated, but what I simultaneously want to bring into play is that this also works the other way around – subject positions are partly constructed through building activities. Feminist and queer perspectives, especially the theories of performativity and heteronormativity, are critical starting points to investigate how these constructions.\(^{260}\)

As Bonnevier’s work shows, particularly through her use of often theatrical performance with a live audience,\(^{261}\) an architectural history can of course be performative in ways other than its written form and content. In an article entitled, ‘Pink and White Descriptions: Ekphrasis and the Eighth Wonder of the World’ for example, another architectural researcher, Sarah Treadwell, uses a combination of written text and visual image to perform a history of a series of natural terraces, once located on the North island of New Zealand.\(^{262}\) The images which Treadwell shows, comprise beautiful black and white photographs, and also oil and watercolour paintings of these terraces, produced in the late nineteenth-century. In the written part of this account, Treadwell weaves her own close descriptions of these images of the terraces – a landscape which is ‘now buried beneath volcanic ash and displaced earth’ – alongside a more theoretical discussion of the literary genre or technique of ‘ekphrasis’, defined as the simultaneous ‘written description of a graphic representation, [and] verbal narrative released by an image’.\(^{263}\) Describing this work, Treadwell reflects how:

Descriptions from the nineteenth century are here collaged with twenty-first century architectural readings and ekphrasis is practised as a sort of stuttering, a repetitive accumulation of imaginings, “tinted” echoes across time. Language is deployed to activate the visual representations even as the visual images pattern the nature of the writing.\(^{264}\)


\(^{261}\) See photographic documentation of the salons Bonnevier staged as a research method in *Behind Straight Curtains*, but also as a member of the design/artist collective ‘Mycet’, with fellow practitioners Mariana Alves Silva and Thérèse Kristiansson: http://mycket.org/MYCKET, accessed 7 June 2017.

\(^{262}\) Treadwell, ‘Pink and White Descriptions’, 266-280. Note that the historians already mentioned, for example Jane Rendell or Jennifer Bloomer, also often use performative strategies of text and image. See for example, Rendell’s conscious use of the orientation of the page as a performative device in: Jane Rendell, *The Architecture of Psychoanalysis: Spaces of Transition* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2017).

\(^{263}\) Treadwell, ‘Pink and White Descriptions’, 271.

\(^{264}\) Treadwell, ‘Pink and White Descriptions’, 268-9.
Indeed, Treadwell both academically but also performatively, through her own ‘practice’ of ekphrasis somewhere located between image and text, makes the case that ‘ekphrastic writing might be seen as an interruption, or alteration, of the conventional flows of architectural history.’ Rather than using images which play a secondary role to the written argument, Treadwell shows, in a similar way to Bloomer, how the power of language and image to act upon one another, and to be used together as a practice of architectural history in its own right, critically participates both in the reading but also the telling of the past.

As well as drawing strong influence from researchers who position text and image as a performative practice of history, I have also been inspired by others who have found their way into architectural history following a training in fine art, and who reflect on the influence of this route both on their history practice, and the status of the architectural historical knowledge which they produce. As artist and architectural historian Cynthia Hammond writes in her study of the role of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women in shaping the built environment of Bath, she embarked on her research: ‘with the best way I had of “knowing” – making art – as my approach’. While I do not frame my own enquiry as art, I do understand it as an extension of my fine art training and as being conducted through the eyes of the practitioner. I draw influence from Hammond’s work which she frames as a ‘performative literature’. Reflecting on the act of writing as a means to play with the history and evidence, Hammond summarises her approach:

> I came […] to see my writing about the city as a platform upon which I could draw attention to the need for more inclusive public memory, as well as a rhetorical space in which I could rehearse my archival findings.

In his book *What is Architectural History?*, architectural historian Andrew Leach explores the way that, depending on the architectural historical questions and problems which are at stake within a particular project, different kinds of ‘evidence’ become activated and are required to be drawn

---

265 Treadwell, ‘Pink and White Descriptions’, 268.
266 Hammond, *Architects, Angels, Activists*.
267 Hammond, *Architects, Angels, Activists*, 7. Please note the above discussion is by no means exhaustive of historians and architectural historians whose practices can be described as performative, and rather provides some key examples of the wider field of architectural history and historiography within which the thesis is situated.
on, whilst different kinds of ‘tools’ become relevant in order to analyse and process this evidentiary material. It is helpful to quote Leach at length regarding this point:

A history concerning the recovery of a design decision does not necessarily need to have recourse to the same kind of evidence as a history concerning the social significance of a particular public or semi-public site. These are different kinds of questions, and their ‘answers’ rely upon different kinds of material - and by extension upon different analytical tools. The form and content of architectural history, its method and evidence thus assume a dialectical relationship. One tests the other and vice versa. The extent to which a document is useful depends on the questions being asked of it.268

As Leach describes here, a dynamic interaction takes place to some extent during every process of architectural historical enquiry. On one level, there is the issue of the specificity of the architectural historical question that is being asked – which itself also takes into account, as Leach notes, the fact that the definition of what constitutes ‘architecture’ is historically situated and has itself changed over time.269 On another level, there is the matter of the corresponding ‘evidence’, ‘method’ and ‘analytical tools’ which in turn become appropriate or in fact necessary to use in order to investigate the specific historical question regarding architecture identified by the historian. Whilst Leach – unlike many of the feminist architectural historians mentioned above – does not name historical process or the architectural historian’s practice explicitly as ‘performative’, I suggest that he describes it in terms that resemble Austin’s and Butler’s theories of performativity. Here I mean to draw attention to Leach’s emphasis on the reliance of the way the history is constructed by the historian (its ‘form’) on the objects and themes it examines (its ‘content’) – and the particularity of this process as actually arising from or as being proposed by the aforementioned, reciprocal processes taking place in the enquiry between specific questions, evidence, method and analytical tools.


269 Leach highlights that the definition of what constituted ‘architecture’ has itself changed over time: Leach, *What is Architectural History?*
My own conscious reflection on and writing about the ways in which, as Leach describes above, the ‘form and content of architectural history, its method and evidence’ performatively played out and actually tested one another during the process of studying Soane’s lecturing practice, provides another definition of the way I understand my own practice of architectural history to be performative.

Following on from Leech’s observations about developing suitable methods in response to historical questions and evidence, as I began to examine the R.I. lecture manuscripts and drawings, it seemed to me that architectural history did not have existing methods which could address all the questions I had of Soane’s lectures. Although it has a strong tradition of carrying out archival work, literature review, textual criticism, visual analysis of architectural drawings and, of course, means for researching and analysing buildings, it does not offer ways for considering evidence in the lecture manuscripts, lecture drawings and R.I. building for Soane’s lectures considered as forms of practice, performance and performance practice.

But rather than viewing this as a barrier to investigating the lectures, I have approached the questions of how to accommodate the practised, performed and performative status of Soane’s lectures, and how to read the R.I. manuscripts and drawings as a form of performance documentation or as having actually participated in a historical performance practice, specifically as creative problems. In so doing, there has been a need to develop new methods that can address and respond to observations and encounters with the evidence. In addition to locating the originality of this doctoral research in identifying new research objects (Soane’s R.I. lectures) and studying archival evidence which has not been studied before (R.I. lecture manuscripts and drawings), this project also locates the development of bespoke methods as key to its originality and contribution to knowledge. Whilst this approach of formulating methods in response to the process of practice is common in practice-led research within design and art, it is less common within history or, as in my case, architectural history.

270 Dana Arnold, Reading Architectural History (London: Routledge, 2002).
Three methods which I have devised through a combination of reading the evidence and engaging with performance history, theory and practice are particularly important to discuss here. I consider these methods in differing ways as methods of my practice, performance practice and performative practice of architectural history. The first consists of my transcription of the R.I. manuscript (which I discuss in depth within Part I: ‘Reading Again’). The second method is the use of printed, life-size facsimiles of some of the lecture drawings, which I re-enacted with the help of others in the space of the current R.I. lecture theatre (discussed within Part II: ‘Drawing Again’). The third method, explored throughout Part I and Part II, consists of adopting a ‘live’ approach to reading and writing about primary archival material.

Following on from the previous section, which paid special attention to the performance theories of Rebecca Schneider, such methods of my practice have been developed as specific means to re-enact particular kinds of evidence contained in and suggested by the lecture manuscripts and drawings. These include, for example, the material layout of the manuscript pages, or, the actions of showing the lecture drawings whilst words were spoken during specific lecture events. Indeed, whilst each method draws from existing forms of transcription and re-enactment used within history, performance and writing practice, it is of equal importance to understand that they were also developed in iterative response both to the archival material itself (i.e. the issues observed to be at stake in the evidence) and my encounters with the evidence (i.e. through the practice of architectural history; its process and/or doing).

As I allude to in the final paragraph of the previous section, I develop each of these three methods, which draw from the theory and practice of re-enactment (and Schneider’s assertions about the associated ‘cross-temporal’ liveness of all performance and re-enactment), as a means to address the complex, complicated temporality involved in doing historical work and engaging with and reading evidence. These issues are indeed further accentuated and exacerbated through approaching Soane’s two-hundred-year-old performances and performance practice as the focus of my enquiry. As I further elaborate below, each method becomes a different way to

---

See final ‘Drawing again’ section of Part II.
re-enact the evidence and my readings of it both for myself away from the archive, and for my future reader.

The first of these methods – that of transcribing and producing a transcription of the R.I. manuscripts – enabled me to read and engage with, analyse and record questions regarding a range of dynamic features of the lecture manuscript that seemed to play a role in Soane’s performance practice of lecturing. In particular, my transcription policy sought to transcribe two elements not common in conventional transcription approaches of historical documents: firstly, the manuscript’s changes in handwriting (which enabled me to reveal how the manuscripts were written and constructed via several hands), and secondly, its layout (which appeared to consciously script an interplay between written text and instructions for drawings). In facilitating the manuscripts to be ‘read again’, often in ways which were not engaged with or apparent when I first read the manuscripts silently, I argue that the ‘practice’ (the doing and process) of transcription plays an active role in the reading of the evidence it transcribes.

The written transcription artefacts on the other hand, produced through this practice of transcribing (presented as a separate Appendix 1 to this thesis), have become an invaluable practical tool, continuously used throughout the project for reading the form and content of the R.I. manuscripts – both away from Soane Museum, and whilst in the archive at the same time as examining the original documents. These transcription artefacts, however, also posed problems in terms of the question of their status – as historical evidence in their own right, or, as evidence of my practice of the history. Should they be treated as (unedited) documents which could be used by other future researchers of Soane’s R.I. lectures? Or as performative artefacts which I created in response to the manuscripts and which foreground my subjective recording of their visual appearance, as well as my questions and observations?

The second of such methods – that of using life-sized printed facsimiles of the lecture drawings in a specially designed ‘practical history’ seminar held within the current R.I. lecture theatre – was devised in order to test out evidence relating to the original lecture drawings and their possible role in Soane’s broader performance practice of lecturing architecture. At the point at which I held this seminar towards the end of the project, I had already carried out many readings of the relationship between specific parts of Soane’s written
R.I. lecture texts and specific lecture drawings. Indeed, both in the Soane Museum archive looking at the original manuscripts and drawings, and whilst at home referring both to my own transcriptions of the manuscripts and reproductions of drawings, I had continually imagined what such words and drawings might have meant when they came together in specific dated lectures. Staging the facsimile drawings at the same time as getting participants to read the corresponding lecture texts which the R.I. manuscript records were spoken when such drawings were shown – and within the actual space in which Soane’s lectures were originally delivered in 1817 and 1820 – allowed me to explore in a more obviously embodied way what the meanings between the words and drawings could have been when they were performed together in the lecture events.273

The emphasis of the event was on discussion between participants, prompted by the staging of the lecture drawing facsimiles and based on textual evidence which I had engaged with previously in the archive. The seminar experimented with how physically working with the facsimile drawings in the space could perhaps aid understanding of what happened in the past, particularly how the drawings were physically demonstrated, at the same time as remaining sceptical of the abilities and capacities of this form of re-enactment to do so. In relation to this point, I was inspired by Schneider’s comments which problematise re-enactment:

> Appropriately, live experiential practice as a potential mode of critical historical thinking is volatile territory. The question needs to be continually rearticulated: how can the category of lived and live experience be *critical* – both as a mode of analysis and subject to analysis?274

I have since tried to critically evaluate my practical history seminar further in this way, both in terms of what its use as a ‘mode for analysis’ revealed about Soane’s performance practice, and also for how it required and should be ‘subject to analysis’. Perhaps the most productive aspect of this seminar, which borrowed from performance practice to do architectural history,

273 My reference to the ways the practical history seminar considered the meanings of the lectures ‘in a more obviously embodied way’ is made in light of previous comments in my ‘Conceptual Framing’ which, via reference to Schneider (and also my reading of McAuley), explores the more conventional work of the historian (for example, in the form of archival work) as also being a form of embodied performance.

concerned the way that competing interpretations could be collectively shaped and played out. This led to a number of persuasive suggestions, particularly regarding the proposal of a ‘third meaning’ or representation of architecture achieved during performance of Soane’s lectures – that is, the effect when spoken words came together with drawings in the lecture, which was different to the meanings either when the words were read on page or when they were read aloud on their own, and also different when the drawings were looked at either on their own or in conjunction with the written words on the page. Related to this, a further productive reading from the session concerned the ways that different sets of drawings combined with particular words or verbal accounts and seemed to adopt different and particular strategies of representation and methods of being shown that corresponded with specific kinds of architectural subject matter (for example the picturesque) they were trying to communicate. However, as with my practice of transcription, re-enacting the lecture drawings through the facsimiles, as much as providing potential ‘answers’ and aids to reading the evidence for the past, also prompted questions and challenges. As I explore in Part II, there was an ambiguity regarding my own position as organiser of the event and mediator and lead-demonstrator of the evidence (was I historian? artist? performer?).

The third of these methods – that of adopting a ‘live’ approach to reading and writing about primary archival material – experimented with demonstrating through written word and image the ‘present moment’ qualities of my own encounters of reading the lecture manuscripts, drawings and other pieces of evidence. Here I place importance on and enact for the reader the processes of historical thinking and questioning which are involved in reading and drawing conclusions about the past from specific material sources. Writing in this way served as a research method for considering and weighing up what the evidence appeared to be showing; it was often carried out in the library spaces of the Soane Museum at 14 Lincoln’s Inn Fields, but it was also performed afterwards either through memory or with photographs of sources which I had previously encountered in person. But it is not only a research method for gathering and processing information. Indeed, through harnessing and experimenting with live and demonstrative registers in written description, this approach to historical writing also serves to communicate the history in a particular way to the reader. It thereby foregrounds reflections about the process of reading evidence, evidencing this reading through words and also visually – and in so doing, making and
constructing a historical argument. Hence, I refer back to Roms’ reflections referred to within the opening words of this introduction regarding ‘evidence’ as simultaneously a ‘thing done and thing doing’, encompassing both ‘proof’ and the act of such a proof being shown, demonstrated or performed. Again, as I outline at the end of the previous section – and influenced by Schneider’s ideas of liveness as encompassing not only the present, but more than one time – in paying special attention both to writing these encounters and to actively exploring how images are used and how they interplay with words on the printed page, I not only engage with my own past live encounters with the evidence in the archive, but I also anticipate the future live encounter of the reader.

In developing this ‘cross-temporal’ ‘live’ practice of reading and writing architectural history whilst investigating Soane’s R.I. lectures, I was influenced by several specific different types and examples of writing. Two such types include, firstly, those written texts which have been produced before, and actually for the purpose of being spoken and read aloud; and secondly, those written texts which were produced after the subject matter written about has already been spoken about or read aloud, or that may have had a previous incarnation as a text for speaking. The former is often written in a way that directly addresses an audience and imagines the circumstances within which it will be heard in future and how it will sound when spoken. The latter, on the other hand, may borrow or retain aspects of its former ‘voice’ suitable for speaking, its structure or its ways of introducing and intonating the written with visual material, whilst at the same time deliberately adapting for an encounter of reading off the page and incorporating more information than would have been possible in spoken form, such as through references and footnotes. Indeed, the lectures and spoken presentations, which I have given throughout this research, I view as experiments in ways of ‘demonstrating’ archival material to an audience using words and images. Without aiming to produce a written thesis that is literally like a lecture transcript, I nevertheless consciously retain and have sought to further develop the ‘direct’ qualities of spoken address and spoken-to-imaged qualities of the writing.

Soane’s lecture manuscripts prepared for both the R.A. and R.I. form examples of the former type of written text. A published example of the latter type which has influenced me is the architectural historian John Summerson’s Classical Language of Architecture, originally written to be
spoken on the radio in 1963.²⁷⁵ This written text, which he describes in his preface as a set of ‘scripts’,²⁷⁶ is punctuated throughout most paragraphs with directions to the reader to look at specific images in the book. Significantly, and as his use of the term ‘scripts’ reinforces, these images were originally provided in an illustrated booklet to accompany the radio-listening experience. Summerson’s later book functions as a lecture-like narrative of these images, between and through which he demonstrates to the reader a process of reading and identifying classicism in specific buildings from antiquity to the present day. Language is used like ‘Here you see’, ‘And you see’ and ‘Now focus on’ in order to refer to and introduce images,²⁷⁷ which Summerson then asks the reader to inspect, notice and question in specific ways.

Summerson consciously ‘scripts’ the (future) reading experience between word and image with precision, placing importance on the reader’s encounter of looking and reflecting on what tropes of classicism the building depicted in the photograph is evidencing, and how it is doing so. Whilst reading Summerson’s book, I constantly considered the capacities of the buildings themselves (this question is directly examined by Summerson and illustrated through the images), but I also considered how Summerson shows and performs (through the interplay between word and image) the relative limits and capacities of written description and the photographic image, or a combination of the two, to evidence the points that he is making. Whilst Summerson would most likely not have described his book as ‘performative’, it is possible to read it in relation to the ways I have been considering the performative practice of architectural history. Summerson prompts the reader to self-reflexively think about the process of reading buildings and the actions of reading buildings through words and images, as well as to question the assumptions of architectural history and historiography which Summerson himself continually troubles. In ways that link with the art historian TJ Clark’s use of images in The Sight of Death,²⁷⁸ Summerson’s approach has particularly informed my own attempts to make the reader think about what is happening in the images, and how they are playing a role

in visually evidencing things that perhaps cannot be articulated, or certainly not in the same way, by the words.

Another key influence for this live mode of address are the questions which Roland Barthes foregrounds in his lecture series about ‘writing and the present’ in his notes for a lecture series at the College de France in 1978-80, which were published as The Preparation of the Novel. In this lecture course, he ‘simulate[s]’ the processes of constructing a novel:

Here we immediately encounter a problem that will orient this year’s course. Is it possible to make a Narrative (a Novel) out of the Present? How to reconcile – dialecticize – the distance implied by the enunciation of writing and the proximity, the transportation of the present experienced as it happens? (The present is what adheres, as if your eyes were glued to a mirror). Present: to have your eyes glued to the page; how to write at length, fluently (in a fluent, flowing, fluid manner) with one eye on the page and the other on ‘what’s happening to me’?279

These words make me think about my own live encounters with a document or drawing, and the attempts to write this reading of ‘what’s happening’ in the evidence and one’s understanding of it (for the past). In characterising an approach to historical writing as ‘live’, I mean to signal an attitude – following art and performance historians such as Schneider, Jones and Adrian Heathfield – of architectural history and the practice of architectural history, as not only concerning past, dead things, but as a practice equally concerned with matters of the present.280 The writing of this thesis is, in part, an attempt to write what Barthes describes as the ‘present experienced as it happens’, and then in due course to link back and forward to my own previous live encounters in the archive and the future live encounter of the reader.

281 Schneider, Performing Remains; Jones, ‘Performativity, Cultural-Politics, and the Embodiments of Knowledge’, 91-141; Jones and Heathfield (eds), Perform, Repeat, Record.
Summary of Parts and Sections

At the beginning of Part I and Part II I start by focusing in on a specific set of primary documents (that of the R.I. lecture manuscripts or lecture drawings), asking what can be accessed of Soane’s nineteenth-century lecturing practice by directly encountering and describing these (written or drawn) historical sources and types of evidence held within the John Soane Museum archive. I then expand out to address wider historical and theoretical contexts and secondary literature, which subsequently offer further ways of situating the evidence closely read from the primary documents in the previous (in) sections. Then, through my own performative methodologies of transcription (in Part I) and collaborative re-enacting of printed drawing facsimiles (in Part II), I replay aspects of the material lecture manuscripts and lecture drawings again. Specifically informed by recent performance history and theory concerning the practice of re-enactment as a form of ‘critical historical thinking’, I consider what could be discovered or what conditions could be created for newly reading Soane’s lecturing practice by repeating such evidence in these ways. Ultimately, I make a case for the significance of recognising such techniques as live practices of architectural history.

‘Reading In’ records work I mainly carried out at the beginning of this doctoral project and which focused on the question of what textual, visual and material information could be read for Soane’s lectures from the R.I. manuscripts. This activity of ‘reading into’ the manuscripts shows how Soane paid extensive attention to scripting and reflecting on the visual and verbal meanings and coordination of his lectures and their reception before and after his lecture events; it shows how he reflected directly on the matter of his delivery of the lectures (not only their discursive content). Through my close observations of the manuscripts, I ultimately make the case that Soane’s R.I. lectures can be interpreted as a form of nineteenth-century performance practice.

In ‘Reading Out’, I explore the broader oral and performance culture of the nineteenth century, attempting to situate Soane in relation to practices of ‘reading out loud’ that were circulating during the period. I start by reading the public speaking manuals written by members of the ‘elocutionary movement’, manuals which Soane himself owned. The elocutionary movement, which was in full swing throughout the eighteenth and early
nineteenth centuries, sought to assert speech’s power over writing and to theorise oral delivery. I then explore a central member of the movement, John Thelwall, who was a lecturer and writer on elocution and at whose Oratorical Institution in Bedford Place Soane attended a lecture in 1810. In this section I refer to a range of historical work carried out by other early nineteenth-century London lecturers, including Soane’s professorial colleagues at the R.A. in painting, sculpture and perspective, and other lecturers at the R.I. in subjects such as literature, chemistry and music. I draw on the work of historian Patricia Howell Michaelson, and Romantic literature scholars Angela Esterhammer, Sarah Zimmerman and Judith Thompson, and I ask what the implications could be of understanding this context of nineteenth-century performance practice on different subjects for considering the architectural lectures of Soane.

In ‘Reading Again’, I begin by reading Soane’s R.A. lectures again through the various written transmissions of the lectures texts produced by Watkin in 1996 and 2000, Bolton in 1929, and Soane (mainly) in the 1830s. I then proceed to situate the historical and disciplinary specificity of these past approaches to editing and notation, deliberating on the different priorities and questions directed at the same lectures, and asking how this has been reflected in corresponding editorial inclusions and exclusions, and what the subsequent bearing this has had on how Soane’s lectures could be read. This analysis of previous treatments of Soane’s R.A. texts, which prioritises the reproduction of the textual content of words read in the lectures and marginalises and removes other forms of ephemeral evidence such as the layout, annotations and instructions for drawings, in turn forms the basis for developing my own bespoke approach to transcribing Soane’s R.I. lectures. This section then focuses on my development of an approach to transcribing these more ephemeral dimensions of the R.I. lectures, which I argue played an important role in the performance practice of the lectures. I focus here on how the practice of transcription, or acts of transcribing the R.I. manuscript, themselves play an active role in enabling evidence and conditions for reading evidence in the manuscript in new ways. In so doing, the practice of transcription comes to assume a self-reflexive and performative role in the project, helping me to engage further with the interplay between words and drawings and their scripted qualities on the page, and to reflect on the different handwritings which interact and can be identified within the document. Influenced specifically by recent performance history and theory regarding the practice of re-enactment as a (frequently contentious) form of
historical enquiry in its own right, I consider transcription not as a neutral method of reproducing a written document but specifically as a means to redo the original acts that went into writing the lecture manuscript. Here I explore the architectural historiographical value of foregrounding the affective qualities and the ‘question of the tension between creativity and authenticity’ which is encountered by the historian and others whilst replaying this nineteenth-century scene of constructing the lecture manuscript. This section also continues my interrogation of the different ‘actions’ of reading demonstrated throughout Part I, examining the ‘reading’ that happens through transcribing via the hand and eye, and the ways in which this differs from previous ‘readings’ which engaged with the manuscript through the eye only and without transcription.

As I have just described, Part I: Reading adopts a tripartite structure of A, B, and C (‘Reading In’, ‘Reading Out’, and ‘Reading Again’) to discuss Soane’s R.I. lecture manuscripts. In Part II: Drawing, I combine the words ‘in’, ‘out’, and ‘again’ with the term ‘drawing’ in a related but different formation to the way they are combined with the term ‘reading’ in Part I, and this reflects the related but different process of reading the lecture drawings carried out in the second part of the thesis. Here, rather than three sections, I repeat the actions of ‘Drawing In’ and ‘Drawing Out’ across four shorter sections to accommodate a more intense process of directly and contextually engaging with different kinds of evidence related to Soane’s lecture drawings. These four sections (‘Drawing In’, ‘Drawing Out’, ‘Drawing In’, ‘Drawing Out’) are concluded with a final section, ‘Drawing Again’, which mirrors the concluding section of Part I (‘Reading Again’) by considering performative evidence generated through re-enacting Soane’s lecture drawings with facsimiles in the current R.I. lecture theatre. Overall, Part II follows a D, E, D, E, and F structure.

In ‘Drawing In: to the Lecture Drawings and Their Storage, Cataloging and Viewing Spaces Over Time’, I begin by giving an account of the lecture drawings’ appearance and material qualities, and I outline their changing indexing and storage across three buildings of the John Soane Museum archive and its archiving processes over time. I then expand out to ‘Drawing

282 Iain McCalman and Paul A. Pickering, ‘Historical reenactment: from realism to the affective turn: an Agenda’, in Iain McCalman and Paul A. Pickering (eds), Historical Reenactment: From Realism to the Affective Turn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 11.
Out: to the Lecture Drawings’ Existing Historical Treatment’, which summarises the lecture drawings’ previous historical treatment and classification. Coming directly out of these first two sections, I show how there may be other ways of classifying the drawings, and I start to pose new questions developed directly in response to considering Soane’s lectures as a form of performance practice. In so doing, I destabilise a normative reading of Soane’s lecture drawings (and the lecturing practice evidenced by such drawings), shifting the focus from the question of identifying their content, to the simultaneous matters of reading their performance-related use and practical preparation over time, and the possible strategies of being drawn and executed specifically in order to perform in the lecture. In particular, here I consider the implications of combining theoretical and methodological approaches from architectural and performance history – considering the lecture drawings not only as a form of architectural drawing or representation, but also as a form of performance documentation.

In ‘Drawing In: to Reading the Lecture Drawings in the R.I. Lectures’, I draw into the question of how to read which drawings in the Soane Museum archive were shown in specific lectures at the R.I., a task which has not previously been carried out by historians. Foregrounding architectural history as a practice, and as a performative practice, I give an account of my process of reading this evidence and I emphasise the significance of foregrounding the questions and historical thinking which cropped up through and whilst doing so. This involves describing the process of identifying the drawings and reading a variety of spatially distributed written and drawn information in the archive as in itself an active, analytical activity of the historian (between: the front and back matter of the drawings; the written drawing catalogue and the written drawing titles; the digital and physical encounter with the drawings themselves). This also involves my performance, replayed in turn within the thesis in writing and image, of handling and turning over the drawings in an attempt to read them. Whilst I do not identify every specific drawing in the archive which was included in the list of titles of drawings shown at the R.I., I argue that, through the repeated act of handling them, a particular form of knowledge about how to read them and their previous handling emerges. Through a description of handling, turning over and moving the large lecture drawings within the spaces of the Soane Museum archive, and by positioning these acts in terms of being a performance and dance which requires and acquires skill (enacted in front of the archivist), I argue that particular aspects of the history of these drawings, their previous
handling and physical negotiation (and perhaps even critique of Soane and the Soane Museum archive) can be accessed and expressed in a manner that cannot be done in words.

In ‘Drawing Out: to Other Evidence for the Lecture Drawings’ Use’, I consider other mainly written forms of evidence for the drawings’ use. Here I particularly explore what other documents in the archive can tell us about the relationship between word and drawing during the lectures’ preparation, and about the status of the drawings in relation to words in the compositional process. In so doing, I argue that the drawings perhaps played a more active role than has previously been recognised. I consider the significance of reading different stages of the ‘practical preparation’ in relation to the drawings, as well exploring the ways in which word and drawing seem to have enabled one another during the compositional process or practising of the lectures.

In the final section of Part II, ‘Drawing Again: Re-enacting the Lecture Drawings’ Use in the R.I. Lecture Theatre’, I further develop the propositions of the previous sections and Part I, themselves developed through reading specific drawings with words of the R.I. lectures off the page, by considering the same drawings and words when physically shown and read aloud on the stage of the R.I. lecture theatre. Through the showing of printed facsimiles at the same time as getting participants to read aloud particular excerpts of words which Soane spoke whilst showing these drawings, I explore how replaying particular word and drawings within the R.I. lecture theatre space can play a role in ‘critical historical thinking’ in a manner that is different to when evidence is read and imagined in the archive. Whilst strongly influenced by recent performance theories of historical re-enactment, I called this event a ‘practical history seminar’ (rather than ‘lecture re-enactment’), with a focus on the collaborative, interactive nature of performing, shaping and reading evidence aided by the facsimiles of the lecture drawings that acted as props.

Overall the performative structure of combining ‘reading’ and ‘drawing’ with ‘in’, ‘out’, and ‘again’ becomes a way to practise, perform and play (following Schneider) with the history, to compare different actions of reading evidence (directly, contextually and repeatedly/performatively), and to facilitate and demonstrate further reflection on architectural historiographical processes.
Part I:
Reading In, Reading Out, Reading Again
Introduction: Reading

Part I develops over three sections – ‘Reading In’, ‘Reading Out’ and ‘Reading Again’ – in order to focus on writing the process of reading the R.I. lecture manuscripts in different ways over time (in, out and again; reading directly, contextually and repeatedly/performatively). Whilst this performative logic for the whole thesis initially came from this process of researching the manuscripts – rather than being applied onto it – the spatial motif of reading in, out and again has since become in turn a more formal approach and framework for reflecting on and experimenting with both reading evidence, and evidencing this process of reading.

In ‘Reading In’, I start by closely focusing on and directly observing these lecture manuscripts, engaging in a process of questioning, close reading and ‘reading into’ this primary evidence for Soane’s lectures as a performance and performance practice. This process creates more questions, particularly regarding the temporality of the documents as both performance scripts (which pointed forward) and documentation (which point back, as records of the performance event). ‘Reading Out’ then expands outwards to expose some of these observations and questions produced from working with the material to the particular historical context in which the manuscripts were produced. Here I consider mostly secondary literature which explores histories and theories of lecturing and reading aloud associated with and at work in relation to the early nineteenth-century public lecture. In ‘Reading Again’, which is the final section of Part I, I read the manuscripts again through the practice and process of transcribing them. This approach to transcription addresses questions and issues which arose in ‘Reading In’ and ‘Reading Out’ (of reading Soane’s lectures specifically as a nineteenth-century performance practice from a combination of the primary evidence in the manuscripts and secondary evidence for a broader lecturing culture of performance in other disciplines). At the same time, and as previously outlined at the end of my Introduction, my approach to transcription is equally informed by theories from performance regarding the proposed historiographical value of the practice of re-enacting the past live in the present. By remaking the manuscripts and engaging with the Soane office’s original process of writing them, I show how the practice of transcribing becomes a way to both re-encounter and reveal new evidence regarding the lectures.
Reading In

The observations which I make of the R.I. lecture manuscripts in ‘Reading In’ constitute one of the first pieces of work I carried out as part of my enquiry into Soane’s R.I. lectures. To some extent, therefore, the rest of the project and this thesis can be understood to have followed on and developed from these initial observations. For this reason, I have not modified this writing very much, choosing instead to retain the questioning, live, and sometimes speculative and experimental qualities of these encounters. Inspired by architectural and art historians such as Jane Rendell, Griselda Pollock, Mieke Bal, and T.J. Clark, who have all foregrounded the subjective encounter with an object, text or art work in their writing of history,1 ‘Reading In’ examines and closely focuses in on the R.I. lecture manuscript, testing the limits of what this archival material could tell us about Soane’s lectures as a performance and performance practice. This practice of ‘reading in’ and observing the manuscripts, and choosing to begin the enquiry in this way, is posed ultimately as a research method for generating and identifying theoretical questions and issues which are relevant to and seem to be at stake in the evidence itself.

‘Reading In’ comprises one subsection, entitled ‘Reading into the R.I. Lecture Manuscripts’, which reads into the different aspects of the visual, material, and textual form of the R.I manuscripts and the evidence they present for the lectures’ performances, and focuses particularly on the different kinds of information and types of text written within the manuscript. This work mostly considers inscriptions which were not read aloud but that nevertheless can be read to evidence Soane’s performance practice in specific ways. Whilst studying the architectural meaning of the content of the words of Soane’s lectures – as Watkin did of Soane’s R.A. lecture texts – is absolutely critical to our understanding of them, my exploration of the R.I. lecture manuscripts considers not only their written content but also pursues the question of what

such manuscripts can also tell us about the lectures’ form and Soane’s approach to his delivery of the content.

It seems important to acknowledge at this point that even my very first encounters with Soane’s R.I. lecture manuscripts were carried out through some lens of performance. That is to say, I came to the evidence with some preconceived interest in the possible significance of Soane’s architectural lectures as performances, as well as with questions about what the difference reading such lectures through performance history, theory and practice might make to an understanding of the architectural historical knowledge at stake in them. Whilst this existing preoccupation with performance led me to some degree to look for specific things in the evidence, I nevertheless began with open questions to which I did not know the answers: was Soane aware of the spoken or delivered nature of his lectures as a communicative medium, and did he pay attention to this performed status and format when he wrote and prepared them? Considering that in previous scholarship Soane’s lectures have been explored mainly as written productions and in relation to the content of their written arguments and theories about architecture, it had seemed very likely to me – before I examined these manuscripts – that they would contain no such obvious performance-related evidence.

Before continuing, it is helpful to outline the terminology which I use to describe different aspects of Soane’s R.I. lecture manuscripts. By ‘lecture manuscript’ I mean the handwritten objects which Soane had in front of him when he delivered his lectures at the R.I. By ‘lecture text’, I specifically refer to the words of the manuscript which were read aloud in the lecture, in distinction from the words of additional text, including annotations and instructions, written alongside the lecture text. The term ‘manuscript volume’ is used to describe each of the two leather-bound volumes which contain the individual R.I. lecture manuscripts (and which were bound together later).

**Reading into the R.I. Lecture Manuscripts**

The two bound volumes containing Soane’s R.I. lecture manuscripts are named in the John Soane Museum archive as ‘Soane Case 157’ and ‘Soane
Case 158. In the volume Soane Case 157, the two lecture manuscripts of 1817 are bound together, titled and dated as follows: ‘Lecture the First/ Read June 7th. 1817’ and ‘Lecture the 2nd./ Read on Saturday the/ 14th of June 1817’. This volume also contains a draft for the first lecture of 1817, as well as loose items related to the four later 1820 lectures, including an index and drawing lists for each.

The bound volume Soane Case 158 on the other hand contains the lecture manuscripts of the 1820 lectures. They are titled and dated as follows: ‘Lecture the First/ [...] Read 27 May 1820’, ‘Lecture 2/ [...] 1820/ Read Saturday 3 June’, ‘Lecture 3d/ Read, Saturday the 10th/ of June 1820’, and ‘Lecture the 4th/ 17 June 1820’. Some other loose material relating to both the R.I. and R.A. lectures are also held within the back of Soane Case 158. The archival reference of ‘Soane Case’ was not assigned by Soane, but rather by the seventh Curator of the museum Arthur Bolton, who reorganised parts of the Soane Museum archive between 1917 and 1945. The word ‘case’ refers to the bookcase which Bolton instated and in which the two manuscript volumes are stored within the archive. This is now located in the Adam Study Centre situated on the second floor at the front of number 14 Lincoln’s Inn Fields. Numbers ‘157’ and ‘158’ refer to the positions of these items within this bookcase.

Each individual lecture manuscript bound within the larger volumes contains about 50-60 pages. The front pages of each manuscript announce that lecture’s number and year; a small number of blank pages then follow. Each lecture manuscript follows the same page layout, with the lecture text that was read aloud by Soane in the lecture located on the right-hand side of the page. Images 6 and 7 overleaf, which show pages 32 and 33 that come halfway through the first R.I. lecture of 1817, show this lecture text running down the right-hand side of each of the two opposite pages.

---


3 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 1-2, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817). Note these are the quoted titles as written on the unnumbered front pages of the two R.I. lectures of 1817. I use the symbol ‘/’ here to signify a line break in the manuscript. Note that as the titles for the R.I. lectures are inconsistent, I apply the uniform ‘Lecture 1, 2, 3’ etc. hereafter in the archival references given in footnotes to refer to each individual lecture manuscript.

4 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 1 (draft), *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817).


part i

136
The elegant and noble Corinthian order

In these examples we are forcibly impressed with the great difference in the proportions and character of the entablatures in each order.

The order of the Doric columns, which may be thus accounted for, is from the text of Vitruvius, who tells us, that "The Corinthian columns are of the same proportion as the Ionic, and that the entablature is taken either from the Doric or from the Doric order, and that of the Doric order, when joined with a different capital, a third order is produced."

The Triumphal Arch at Athens, the Bank of France at Paris, and the Bank of Spain at Saragossa are conformable to this doctrine of Vitruvius. Malkovich also calls the order used in the Temple...
On each page, opposite the lecture text, the left-hand column contains other written notations and amendments. These include, for example, titles of drawings, a quotation or a comment about the drawing title or words it sits next to, or alternative words to replace whole sections that have been scored out in the adjacent right column containing the lecture text (see Image 8 opposite). We can guess this additional text was written at a different, later time owing to the fact that it often appears in a different handwriting, and/or seems to add words which respond to, correct and extend the lecture text written opposite and presumably on a previous occasion. The order in which the different words in the manuscript were written, or indeed the precise moment at which specific sections were scored out, is further complicated by examples of notes that curiously seem to have been added to the manuscript the day after a particular lecture was read. For example, looking at the detail from Soane’s first ever lecture at the R.I. on 7 June 1817 (Image 9, which is also located opposite), we can see a quotation on page 17 in Soane’s hand which cites an excerpt from Shakespeare’s *History of Troilus and Cressida* and is dated the next day of ‘8 June 1817’.7

---

7 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 1, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817), 17.
Sometimes the lecture text is scored out line by line, whilst in other cases a vertical line – sometimes in pen, sometimes in pencil – runs down the left of this main text, having the effect of highlighting that paragraph(s). Whether such words were highlighted to indicate that they should or should not be read often remains ambiguous. Extra words and punctuation are frequently added above and between words, again showing where the text was edited later and often in a different handwriting. On the odd occasion, a pencil or pen sketch is also added to the left-hand margin.
In the great work of Nature, Michael Angelo Pomponio (1513–1584) expressed the essential harmony of the universe. His art was influenced by the classical ideals of antiquity, and he was the greatest figure in the history of architecture, sculpture, and painting. His works have become a symbol of the Renaissance, and his influence is evident in many of the greatest works of art produced during his lifetime. His most famous works include the Sistine Chapel ceiling, the Tomb of Julius II at St. Peter's Basilica, and the Medici Chapel in Florence.

The Sistine Chapel ceiling is considered one of the greatest achievements of Renaissance art. The ceiling is decorated with panels of frescoes, and Pomponio's work is renowned for its technical skill and mastery of form. The ceiling is divided into three sections: the central area, the outer ring, and the lower frieze. The central area is the most complex, and it features four large Scenes of the Creation of Man, with Adam and Eve being created from the dust of the earth.

The Tomb of Julius II is another masterpiece of Pomponio's. It is a freestanding monument, and it is decorated with reliefs and statues. The Tomb is considered a representation of the power and wealth of the Medici family, and it is a key example of the use of art to celebrate the ruling class.

Pomponio's work is also notable for its influence on later artists. His use of perspective and the emphasis on the human body as a symbol of divine grace has had a lasting impact on art throughout the centuries. His works continue to inspire artists and art lovers around the world, and they remain a testament to the power of art to express the human experience.
As Image 13 opposite shows, on the front page of the first R.I. lecture of 1817, Soane wrote:

Lecture the First  
Read June 7th 1817  
about 55 Minutes  
read too quickly  
by at least 20 minutes  
at least 600 persons

Similarly, as Image 14 shows, on the first page of the first lecture of the later 1820 lectures, Soane recorded:

50 minutes (too fast)

By reading these different kinds of notes added by Soane, it is possible to say that the manuscripts which contain the texts that Soane read at the R.I. were produced completely neither before nor after they were performed in lecture form. Indeed, the fact that such notes, which were never intended to be read aloud, were added to the front page of the manuscripts after Soane delivered them (or, in the case of the marginal quote, added the day after the text was read), further underlines the complicated temporal status of the manuscripts in relation to the actual performed events. Soane in fact wrote annotations on the front pages of all six R.I. lectures and most of the R.A. lectures across twenty-five years. By indicating the duration of the lectures and sometimes the number of people they were delivered to, these usefully operate as a document which gives us details and impressions of specific dated R.I. events and audiences. Additionally, however, they also suggest that Soane engaged in a process of reflecting after each event on the pacing of his spoken delivery in conjunction with an awareness of the fact that such a delivery had also been received. This repeated process of thinking and recording after individual lectures could be understood as a retrospective assessment by

---

8 SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 1, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817), unnumbered front page. Note that in all indented quotations, the number of words on each line replicates that on the original manuscript.  
9 SM Archives, Soane Case 158, Lecture 1, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1820), unnumbered front page.  
10 See for example SM Archives, Soane Case 152-56, *Royal Academy Lectures* (1809-1819). Note that on the front of the R.A. manuscripts Soane often recorded the names of audience members in attendance.
Lecture to the First
Royal Institution
May 1820
Read 27 May 1820
Saturday
50 Pm. (c. 5.30pm)

Royal Institution.
Lecture to the First
Red.
1st May 1824
About 50 or 60 Places
by a few more Persons
of the lower Classes.

2.
Soane of his performance, and also as a form of preparation for the delivery of the next lecture to a future audience and a commitment to improving his delivery over time.

It is possible to identify evidence for Soane’s awareness of delivering the lecture texts and his conscious use of the written manuscript as an aid to his future delivery through significant annotations, which include pencil notes written throughout a single lecture text that act as signposts to monitor pacing. For example, on page 18 of the second (49-page) lecture of 1817, which is shown in Image 15 below, Soane added to the left-hand column the words:

One Third

Image 15

---

Correspondingly, and indicating the score-like function of the transcripts to aid in the delivery of the lecture, on page 30 (Image 16) he wrote:

Two Thirds\textsuperscript{12}

In a similar way, and as shown in Image 17 overleaf, there is a scrawled note sitting in loose papers at the end of the bound manuscript volume containing the 1820 lecture texts, again in Soane’s hand, which states:

As there will be upwards of a hundred drawings in elucidation of this lecture I am fearful I must trespass beyond the usual time to give a better opportunity of shewing the drawings\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 2, \textit{Royal Institution Lectures} (1817), 30. 
\textsuperscript{13} SM Archives, Soane Case 158, \textit{Royal Institution Lectures} (1820). Loose note at back of bound manuscript volume.
As more will be unvay
of a landed drawing or
elciation of this letter
I am feare I must to speke
beyond the usual time & gow
a better opportunity of
shering the dessign.
What is the status of this note? We do not know which lecture it refers to or the circumstances in which it was written. Who it was written for also remains unclear. Does it matter? Maybe it was never read aloud (or announced?) by Soane; equally, perhaps it was never read silently by anyone else but Soane. Or perhaps, through marking the time between writing the lectures and delivering or performing them, this note could be interpreted to reveal Soane’s anticipation of the audience’s experience and reception, and again some indication of the perceived success of the lecture as shaped by its delivery. ‘Delivery’ in this context could be extended beyond acts of speaking the written lecture text to include, as this note suggests, the simultaneous, coordinated and timed act of showing drawings to the audience and the issue of the manner in which, or how well, this could be done.

Whilst *Part I* does not directly analyse the lecture drawings which the Soane office produced for Soane’s lectures, it is worth considering how their role in Soane’s lecture events and his associated lecturing practice are suggested and evidenced by the manuscripts. It might be possible, for example, to say that the above written note records the emphasis Soane placed on ‘the act’ of showing drawings in his lectures, and that it gives preliminary clues regarding his attitudes about the drawings’ role in actually determining and structuring the event, both visually and temporally. Significantly, in a lecture spanning 55 minutes in which, as the note indicates, 100 drawings were shown, this would have meant a rate of more than one, often very large, drawing per minute! We know the number of drawings shown in each R.I. lecture from two further sources: from the drawing titles which are noted throughout the two R.I. manuscript volumes in the left-hand page column opposite the lecture text; and from the separate drawing lists correlating with individual Lectures 1-2 of 1817 (contained in preparatory papers also held within the Soane Museum archive)¹⁴ and Lecture 1-4 1820 (which, as previously mentioned, are held loosely at the back of Soane Case 157).¹⁵ From this apparently high rate of drawings shown, and some basic knowledge of the largeness, thickness and heaviness of such objects (a point I explore in more depth in *Part II*), perhaps we can start to further imagine the impact of the drawings on the lecture. Not only can we estimate an average length of

---

¹⁴ For separate lists of drawings for Lecture 1 and 2 at the R.I. in 1817, see SM Archives, MBi 1/23; SM Archives, MBii 1/38.
¹⁵ For drawing lists for Lectures 1-4 at the R.I. in 1820, see loose sheets held at back of manuscript volume: SM Archives, Soane Case 157, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817).
time spent on each drawing, but we are also prompted to imagine the high level of movement by a person or people involved in coordinating, unveiling and – as Soane’s previous note expressed – ‘shewing’ successive drawings.

It is also possible from reading these manuscripts to notice the consideration of the drawings in the process of writing the lecture text. In Image 18 opposite, which presents a draft of the first 1817 R.I. lecture, instructions for showing visual drawing material (in the form of titles running down the left-hand columns) are revealed as serving a role during the formulation phase of this lecture whose text, it should be noted, is still being edited. Throughout this R.I. draft, the argument to be presented through the medium of lecture drawings and the written arguments to be read aloud are laid out next to one another on the page in this way, potentially suggesting a practice and form of thinking during the preparation for the lectures, whereby a dialogue somewhere between both modes was carried out. In the later manuscript of the same first lecture, this page layout of the visual playing out in parallel to the verbal is written more neatly into clearly defined and legible columns. In a sense, the draft can be understood to be like a working document which captures a process of mapping the lecture text in relation to the drawings to be delivered in the lecture. The later, neater copy of Lecture 1 (1817), on the other hand, similarly evidences an active site where the written and drawn argument about architecture seems to be still in the process of construction and editing in advance of the lecture. However, by making clearer distinctions between these information types on the page (material to be shown in relation to words to be spoken), an additional purpose is also highlighted of the later more legible manuscript that it needs also to operate as effective written and visual instructions – or a script – for showing drawings in relation to reading aloud within the lecture itself. Throughout the manuscript, evidence of the Soane office using the manuscript as a place to weigh up and coordinate in relation to the words with which drawings would be shown in the final lecture are suggested, for example through the pencil tick mark added to the page against a drawing title for a view of Somerset House, as shown in Image 19.
Occasionally, further notes concerning the drawings are added later in Soane’s hand to the left column, as is shown, for example, in Image 20:

Front of Somerset House next to the Strand, leave this + take away the others\textsuperscript{16}

Here, rather than indicating an amendment concerning the drawings which has a discursive bearing on the lecture text and its architectural content, this comment suggests that the preparation and construction of the lecture was also considered in terms of physical acts of showing visual material. In so doing, both the organisation and inclusion of such information again suggests that the manuscripts, in addition to scripting the words to be spoken, served another performance-related role: that of scripting the coordination of spoken words in relation to the physical display of drawings.

\textsuperscript{16} SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 2, \textit{Royal Institution Lectures} (1817), 37.
Vienna, on the 22nd of September.

Mrs. de Rossi. No, she is not Mrs. de Rossi. Miss de Rossi.

The Bath House.

Wimbledon. Mr. and Mrs. Heathcote, and Mr. Heathcote, are absent.

Mr. Heathcote is not a very good judge of art, and does not take much interest in it. He claims to approbation, and has not escaped the anonymous criticism of such publications as the "Pamphlet" of such observations. He is a little too officious, I think.

No. 6. Pott's Palace.

PART I

Reading Out

From my observations in the previous section of Soane’s R.I. manuscripts, it is possible to interpret Soane’s architectural lectures in a new way. They can be read not only as an intellectual journey of researching and writing a lecture text about architecture (as they have been approached previously), but also as a nineteenth-century performance practice which paid attention to and exhibited different methods and attitudes regarding the pacing, coordination and delivery of visual/verbal elements, as well as consideration of their impact on a future audience. But what other evidence is there – beyond the manuscripts, and as a means to develop my observations from them – which could further situate Soane’s participation within the lecturing and performance culture of the period?

In the next section of ‘Reading Out’, I expand the discussion to address this wider context of the oral and performance culture in which Soane’s lectures were delivered and received. In moving from reading primary evidence in the previous section to reading mostly secondary evidence in this section, I mean to signal a spatial shift in the reader’s engagement from in to out. In addition to this, the term ‘reading out’ simultaneously refers to a focus on a specific type of reading practice of the early nineteenth century – that of ‘reading out loud’. Choosing to focus on this particular dimension of the oral and performance culture of the time itself follows on from observations made in ‘Reading In’ regarding the status of the R.I. manuscripts as material scripts written for reading aloud. Whilst I explored in my Introduction the particularities of the interlinked institutional, lecturing and performance cultures of the R.I., the following section expands out further to consider London lecturing cultures more broadly and other secondary histories of different kinds of public lecture during the period.

‘Reading Out’ is split into three subsections. The first, Reading Out Loud: Early Nineteenth-Century London Lecturers in the Arts, Literature and Science, discusses existing art historical, literary and science histories of the British Romantic period which explore London’s nineteenth-century performance and lecturing culture of which Soane’s lectures were a part. The second, Reading Out Loud: Soane’s Public Speaking Manuals and the ‘Elocutionary Movement’ shifts to exploring the public speaking manuals
which Soane himself owned and which together demonstrate Britain’s strong discourse of rhetoric and public speaking, active during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, known as the ‘elocutionary movement’.
Reading Out Loud: Early Nineteenth-Century London Lectures in the Arts, Literature and Science

The history of both London’s early nineteenth-century lecture-going cultures and lectures as a form of performance has been documented and studied within art, literary, and science history. This section operates as a literature review of this historical work whilst also considering the questions that aspects of the art, literature and science lecture and their secondary interpretations offer for considering Soane’s architectural lecturing practice during the same period.

In literary historian Gillian Russell’s study of the lecture’s role in London social networks within the Romantic period, she explores ‘the significance of the lecture as a social event’, situating it in the context of, and in response to, ‘other forms of sociable behaviour in the early nineteenth century’, such as theatres, which were thought to be more morally-debased spaces, particularly for women. Russell also positions lecture-going as an alternative to the then often negatively perceived activity of solitary reading. Quoting Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s 1818 lecturing ‘Prospectus’, Russell explains that within this context lecturing was conceived as offering ‘a kind of curriculum of useful literature that would counteract the ‘mischief of unconnected and promiscuous reading’.

Focusing on writers and poets including Coleridge, John Thelwall and William Hazlett, who were lecturing in London at the same time as Soane, Russell shows how various different forms of sociability were constructed at different venues of the Royal, Surrey and Russell Institutions, as well as at other venues such as the London Philosophical Society and the Crown and Anchor tavern. Foregrounding the conscious awareness of the lecture as a performance both by the lecturers themselves and by the audience in the reception of such lectures, she writes that through the:

---

17 Russell, ‘Spouters or Washerwomen?’, 123.
18 Russell, ‘Spouters or Washerwomen?’, 132-3.
19 Russell, ‘Spouters or Washerwomen?’, 137.
[...] use of the arts of performance, the capacity to attract an audience through manipulation of speech and gesture, the lecturer could harness the power of the actor while importantly remaining in his own character, not subjecting himself or his audience to the uncertainties of impersonation.20

Further locating the space and pastime of attending lectures in relation to other cultural activities of the time, Russell reflects on ‘the lecture-room’s uncertain position in late Georgian culture, somewhere between the church and the theatre.’21 Furthering the ideas of the conscious ‘use’ and ‘manipulation’ of the authority of the speaker by the speakers themselves within the context of the lecture situation to deliver knowledge, she elaborates that in the period:

[1]ecturing can be regarded as a form of secular sermonizing which exploited the idea of enunciation as expressive of direct access to the divine at the same time as channelling such enthusiasm towards the ideals of Enlightenment science.22

Other historians such as Peter Manning have also written about the public literary lectures of Coleridge and Hazlett during the early nineteenth century, likewise exploring such lectures’ significance as a social experience in the ‘urban scene’ of the Romantic city, and as a consciously produced and received performance. He writes:

For the speaker, lectures offered an immediacy not offered by print: an exchange with an audience, both spontaneous and designed, a dramatic situation, that could be exploited to make the lecturer, focus of all eyes and ears, into a star. It was the contemporary form of an oral culture, an oral culture under market conditions.23

20 Russell, ‘Spouters or Washerwomen?’, 124.
21 Russell, ‘Spouters or Washerwomen?’, 124.
In so doing, Manning focuses on the ‘manufacture of the romantic image’ through the way that lecturers constructed their on-stage personas in front of audiences, and in turn traces how these identities were promoted and reproduced through print.24 Linking with Russell’s views regarding the shift to a more ‘social experience of reading’ afforded through the spatial setting of the new institutions’ lecture halls and theatres of the period, Manning states that ‘solitary reading [became] unamenable to the status display of lecture-going’.25 Here, drawing from well-known fictionalised accounts such as Pierce Egan’s 1820-21 Life in London, which chronicles the urban rambles of ‘Tom, epitome of the man about town, and his Oxford companion, Bob Logic, [and] their country acquaintance Jerry Hawthorn’,26 Manning shows how lecture-going at the time was depicted alongside exhibitions, museums and the opera as places in which the characters could ‘be seen as well as see’.27

Much of the history foregrounding the importance of the public lecture in the early nineteenth century has been written from the perspective of Romantic and literary studies, with the associated claim made by historians such as Judith Thompson that Romanticism is a movement which should be considered as occurring and being received as much on the stage as on the page.28 Indeed, according to Thompson, in much Romantic scholarship:

[...] reading [was] assumed to be a solitary, silent process rather than a public, spoken performance; and the public sphere taken to be synonymous with print culture, with little attention to its significant oral dimensions.29

26 See Pierce Egan, Life in London: or, the Day and Night Scenes of Jerry Hawthorn and his Elegant Friend Corinthian Tom (London: John Camden Hotten, 1869), 57 (Egan’s work was printed in monthly parts from 1820, and first published in book form in 1821; the 1869 edition is a reproduction). Also see Manning, ‘Manufacturing the Romantic Image’, 227.
27 Manning, ‘Manufacturing the Romantic Image’, 229-230. For reference to Egan’s account of London during the period, also see Rendell, The Pursuit of Pleasure, 30-62.
Whilst the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are associated with an increase in the practice and activity of ‘silent’ reading which accompanied the invention of the novel, Thompson advocates an increased attention to studying the significance of ‘reading’ within the early nineteenth century as an oral and performed act, focusing not only on the social implications of such communal events but also on the difference that the act of voicing and publicly uttering words has on the meaning of words that are spoken.

Thompson’s assertions overlap with a large number of other histories of the practice of reading aloud within the early nineteenth century. Literary historian Patricia Howell Michaelson’s work, for example, focuses on the gendering of the ‘social practice of reading’ and its connections with speech in early nineteenth-century contexts outside the remit of the public lecture – for example, reading aloud within a domestic and family setting, reading aloud as an educational exercise, and reading aloud as instructed and evidenced through written elocution manuals and printed literature of the period. Such work, by examining written evidence for ‘issues of oral performance’ specific to the period, has been very influential on literary histories of the public lecture. Michaelson reflects on:

[... ] how texts were actualised as speech – that is, how they were performed – and how contemporaries saw reading [aloud] as a way of practicing authoritative speech.

As summarised towards the beginning of my introduction, the cultural historian Jon Klancher has also traced this lecturing culture, focusing on differentiating between the different types of organisations in London where these lectures were held – that is, between the older ‘academies’ and ‘societies’, and the new ‘institutions’, of which the R.I. was the first in 1799. In fact, Klancher develops his characterisation and definition of the differences between these types of venues/organisations, and comments that ‘how they mediated their knowledge production (whether as “natural philosophy” or as

---

31 I came across Michaelson’s work via the literature review Thompson provides of issues regarding oral performance during the early nineteenth century: see Thompson, ‘John Thelwall and the Science and Practice of Elocution’, 23.
“aesthetics”) to wider publics – as periodicals, books, lectures, models, or in other media – was always critical to their modes of functioning. What becomes clear through these various histories is that different kinds of lecturing cultures were associated with these different London venues. On a single street such as The Strand, for example, within the confines of Somerset House there were what Klancher calls the formal ‘by “invitation only”’ lectures of the ‘exclusivist and dictatorial’ Royal Academy of Arts, and the ‘reading of papers’ at the scientific Royal Society, whilst only a few more minutes west at the ‘Beaufort Buildings’ there were lectures of a completely different type, given by overtly political and radical speakers and commentators who addressed different kinds of audiences. Further differences – often reflected in the design and material configuration of the spaces within which these lectures took place – can be observed between these contexts and those studied by Russell at the Surrey, British and Russell Institutions, which are credited as following the example of the R.I. Indeed, following Russell, Thompson asserts that: ‘we must move away from a narrow text-based concept of the public sphere by focussing on the actual public sites and material contexts within which culture was circulated, produced and performed.

Of particular relevance to my study here is Sarah Zimmerman’s work, referenced in my Introduction, which tries to read the material R.I. lecture theatre space from the (reconstructed 1928) physical room which exists at the R.I. today, and which briefly considers the significance of this spatial environment on the experience of R.I. lectures in the early nineteenth century. Zimmerman’s work is also relevant to my study through its attempts to engage with theatre and performance history and theory’s discourse, mainly via Phelan (who is discussed in more detail in my Introduction) on the vanishing and disappearing nature of performance to read evidence for the early nineteenth-century literary lecture. Zimmerman

---

33 Klancher, ‘From the Age of Projects to the Age of Institutions’, 45-46.
34 Klancher, ‘From the Age of Projects to the Age of Institutions’, 45.
35 For exploration of the radical lectures held at the Beaufort Buildings located at what is now 108-109 The Strand, see Thompson, ‘From Forum to Repository’, 177-191. For the different kinds of spatial formats of these London lecturing venues, see Russell, ‘Spouters or Washermen?’. For a study of London’s radical lecture spaces such as the tavern, see Parolin, ‘Radicalism and Reform at the ‘Gate of Pandemonium”, 113.
36 Russell, ‘Spouters or Washermen?...’.
37 Thompson, ‘From Forum to Repository’, 178.
38 Zimmerman, ‘Coleridge the Lecturer’, 46.
compares how literary and performance historians have engaged in related ways to questions regarding the ephemerality of performance and the access granted to a past performance or event through a written document in the present.

Whilst Zimmerman’s point seems to be that theatre historians have a more established tradition of considering such issues, she is also saying that there has been comparable thinking in literary history, and, through drawing on theatre history, she seems to suggest that literary history can also benefit from some of the philosophical and theoretical perspectives offered in response to these questions from theatre and performance history. Focusing on the historiographical transmission of the poet Coleridge’s lectures, Zimmerman notes that ‘literary historians have been preoccupied with the grave uncertainty surrounding the texts of Coleridge’s lectures’, owing to the fact that no published lecture text or ‘script’ prepared for their delivery ever existed or survives. Instead, there are only ‘skeleton’ lecture notes (which are the texts that have since been published), which, as editor R.A. Foakes reflects, are likely to ‘have seemed very different when fleshed out to an audience’. We can extrapolate that the ‘grave uncertainty’ which Zimmerman refers to concerns the debate between historians on the limited evidence for understanding what the lectures actually meant when their texts were performed or ‘fleshed out’ when embodied on stage. Zimmerman shows not only that do we not know which words were actually spoken, or how they were spoken, or the way their performance and delivery was approached (aspects of which could be partially evidenced through a published text or a script), but that we also have limited access to the meaning of this content and its form within the context of the broader event. In relation to this point, Zimmerman takes on Phelan’s position of performance as disappearing and vanishing, and she reflects on ‘the double nature of the lectures’ loss: we possess neither adequate texts nor the events themselves as historical performances.

39 Zimmerman, ‘Coleridge the Lecturer’, 46–47.
41 Zimmerman, ‘Coleridge the Lecturer’, 47.
In addition to the literary lecture, the significance of the science lecture as a communicative and educational medium at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has also been studied in detail. This body of work often focuses on the lecture’s role in enabling the shift of science from a private to a public pursuit.\(^4\) It also considers the issue of the significance of the lecture’s performance and spectacle\(^4\) and foregrounds the importance of live demonstration in evidencing to the audience the facts of the science. In an essay on the natural philosophy lecture and experimental demonstration practices largely towards the end of the eighteenth century, Simon Schaffer argues for the ‘notion of scientific production as performance’, proposing in turn:

under the heading of *audience* that experimental natural philosophy can be analysed in terms of a practice of public display, and its rhetoric interpreted in terms of a set of claims about the putative effect on an audience of the experience of the production of active powers from matter.\(^4\)

Jan Golinski’s work on the lecturing practice of scientist Humphrey Davy in particular relates to the description by literary historians of lectures in terms of a nineteenth-century performance practice.\(^4\) As I discussed in my *Introduction*, Davy acquired ‘celebrity’ status as Professor of Chemistry through his lectures, and his strategic and conscious use of performance to both communicate science and also to construct a particular persona on stage at the Royal Institution by ‘exploit[ing] the relationship with audience to consolidate and extend his scientific achievements’. Golinski writes that Davy:

[...] created a situation in the lecture theatre in which his audience assumed a passive, acquiescent role in the face of his forceful

---


\(^{4}\) See, for example, Schaffer, ‘Natural Philosophy and Public Spectacle in the Eighteenth Century’.


presentation; and he used this effectively to induce other specialists to adduce his claims.46

Just as Coleridge’s lectures were not only approached as a performance practice but were also received by audiences as performances, so too Davy’s lectures, as Golinski writes:

[...] male and female auditors alike found themselves seduced by his mode of delivery, and captivated by forceful presentation of his own personality and of the powers of nature under his control. He carefully cultivated oratorical talents and his attractive personal appearance were mobilized to produce this effect, as was his choice of convenient and spectacular experimental demonstrations [...]. The effect of these spectacular demonstrations was both to show the efficacy of natural forces such as galvanism, and simultaneously to demonstrate Davy’s power to command them through the instruments at his disposal. In other words, his possession of instruments such as the voltaic pile, by which natural forces could reliably be controlled, was projected as an integral part of his presentation of himself as an experimental philosopher. In the rhetoric of Davy’s lectures, the power of the instruments and that of the experimenter buttressed one another.47

Characterising the ‘competitive’ nature of the London lecturing scene at this time, where audience members might have to choose between well-known speakers on a variety of subjects and at different venues on the same night,48 Manning quotes Pierce Egan’s *Life in London*:

Paying a visit to the *Fives Court* to view the NONPAREIL and Turner exhibit, or in taking a turn in the evening, to listen to Coleridge, Fuseli, Flaxman, and Soane, if the MIND makes a hit, and some striking impressions are implanted upon the memory, then the advantages resulting from the varieties of “LIFE” must here again be acknowledged.49

48 For the competitive nature of lecturing in the period, see, for example, Hadley, ‘Public Lectures and Private Societies’, 52.
Here Egan refers to Coleridge’s lectures, which could have been at any number of the institutions cited above where he lectured during the previous twelve years, whilst his reference to ‘Fuseli, Flaxman, and Soane’ together here presumably refer to professorial lectures given at the R.A. As part of his study of Soane’s R.A. lectures, Watkin addressed how Soane attended the lectures of his fellow R.A. Professors J. M. W. Turner (perspective), John Flaxman (sculpture) and Henry Fuseli (painting), reading overlaps between the ideas and content of Soane’s and these other men’s lecture texts. Darley also situates Soane’s lectures in relation to the other R.A. professors, this time focusing on the reported shortfalls of Turner, Flaxman and Fuseli as speakers, whose ‘Presentation (as much as content) needed improvement.’

In an article entitled ‘Visual Facts and the Nineteenth-Century Art Lecture’, the art historian Trevor Fawcett offers the fullest account of the approaches to speaking – and also to showing visual materials – which were adopted by the R.A. Professors in their lectures, exploring not only those just cited who were professors at the same time as Soane, but also previous professors such as Sandby and Joshua Reynolds whose lectures Soane had attended as a R.A. student. Indeed, Fawcett’s paper explores the R.A. lecturers from the beginning of the academy in 1768, including Soane, and he traces their techniques of communication. As mentioned in my introduction, Fawcett locates a precedent to Soane’s use of drawings in his lecture, as Watkin does, in the lecture drawing practice of Sandby – but he also discusses other precedents such as the showing of plans, drawings and visual material at meetings of the Society of Antiquaries and in the lectures of Robert Morris (whose lecture texts Watkin also shows Soane to have read).

Fawcett attempts to read the art lecture against a backdrop of other spectacular lectures taking place in other subjects in London at that time. He explains that the art lecture drew from the ‘medical and scientific demonstration lecture’, which ‘offered a pedagogic model quite different from the older literary (ultimately rhetorical) precedents followed by Reynolds’.

---

Here Fawcett makes the point that although the spoken rhetoric of Reynolds’ lectures ‘appeal[ed] ... to the evidence of the eye’, Reynolds did not make use of visual aids in order to communicate, choosing rather to address the ‘mental eye’ of his audiences. Likewise, Fawcett explores how ‘the early Professors of Painting (Penny, Barry, Fuseli and Opie) all inclined to a theoretical or historical treatment of their subject ... appear to have been satisfied with a merely verbal presentation.’ Further reflecting on the influence of the science lecture on the art lecture as an act of demonstrating and evidencing the facts of science before the presence of a live audience (as is well illustrated in Golinski’s words above) – an argument which also closely relates to Sybille Peters’ reading of the origins of the academic lecture during the same period as a performance and performative act – Fawcett reflects:

What is especially to the point here though is the now decidedly empirical or evidential nature of lecturing. The science lecture with its experiments, demonstrations, and displays of natural specimens and mechanical artefacts, had become the paradigm. Almost whatever the subject of the lecture it was now necessary to adduce evidence, quote instances, provide sources, show examples.

Indeed, following on from Fawcett’s observations of the lecture on art and art history, as well as the reflections of the literary and science historians considered above, it might be asked: what could be the implications of engaging with this performance culture for situating Soane’s practice of lecturing architecture? It is important to acknowledge that in the early nineteenth century the arts and sciences were not considered to be distinct disciplines. Indeed, as Klandcher and architectural historian Jonathan Hill have observed, these various areas of knowledge and their respective practitioners actively influenced and interacted with one another at the R.I. during this historical moment. How might these contemporary approaches to lecturing art, literature and science at the R.I. help activate the ways Soane used the medium of the lecture to actually show architectural ideas to his audiences?

---

Indeed, from the discussion above, we can note how lectures on literature evidenced the effects of a particular writer’s work to an audience, by ‘quot[ing]’ or reading passages out loud. This could lead, in Michaelson’s words cited above, to consideration of the significance of ‘how texts were actualised in speech’; often as a means for ‘practicing authoritative speech’. Lectures on science, on the other hand, conducted live experiments in front of audiences, empirically evidencing the facts of natural laws, whilst also staging the scientist’s expertise and identity through the negotiation of scientific apparatus. We could say on one level that the primary evidence I have read from Soane’s R.I. manuscripts in ‘Reading In’ – which showed that Soane actively considered and reflected on the matter of his delivery, as well as scripted his lectures on architecture between words and drawings – can be observed to correlate with a broader consensus among other historians about the awareness and cultivation of performance techniques by other practitioners of the period. But what and how could buildings or architectural facts or Soane’s own authority as an architect have been ‘actualised in speech’, or ‘actualised’ in or through drawings, or demonstrated through a combination of the two?

Reading Out Loud: Soane’s Public Speaking Manuals and the ‘Elocutionary Movement’

On 24 November 1808, Soane bought from the bookseller Thomas Boone *British Education: or, the source of the disorders of Great Britain,* a popular text on ‘the art of speaking’ written by Thomas Sheridan. The full title of the publication, which also functioned as a synopsis and advert for its contents, is worth quoting in full:

> British education: or, the source of the disorders of Great Britain. Being an essay towards proving, that the immorality, ignorance, and false taste, which so generally prevail, are the natural and necessary consequences of the present defective system of education. With an attempt to shew, that a revival of the art of speaking, and the study of our own language, might contribute, in

---

a great measure, to the cure of those evils. In three parts. I. Of the
use of these studies to religion, and morality; as also, to the support
of the British constitution. II. Their absolute necessity in order to
refine, ascertain, and fix the English language. III. Their use in the
cultivation of the imitative arts: shewing, that were the study of
oratory made a necessary branch of the education of youth; poetry,
musick, painting, and sculpture, might arrive at as high a pitch of
perfection in England, as ever they did in Athens or Rome.61

As November 1808 was approximately two months before Soane began
lecturing at the R.A., it might be reasonable to guess that the purchase of
such a book on the subject of vocal performance and public-speaking practice
may have reflected Soane’s own anticipation of reading out loud for the first
time in public.62 Sheridan is widely recognised by historians to be the most
well-known proponent of what is often termed the ‘elocutionary movement’
within the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Britain. This
movement consisted of the increased attention paid by a large number of
male writers (who often doubled as lecturers) in developing and
disseminating a broad range of ideas and systems on the subject of public
speaking and oratorical practice.63 Largely ‘resist[ing] the growth of print
culture’, as the title above indicates, Sheridan (together with other members
of the ‘elocutionary movement’) ‘emphasis[ed] the value of the spoken word
along the lines of classical tradition’64 and largely focused on drawing
‘attention to the relation between speaking and writing’.65 As Nicholas
Hudson writes, Sheridan and many other elocutionary lecturers wished to ‘re-
establish the primacy of the living voice’ and assert writing as a subsidiary of

61 Sheridan, British Education.
62 As Soane Museum archivist Sue Palmer writes, ‘Sometimes one can detect patterns in [Soane’s]
buying, for instance there is a high level of book purchasing around the time of his election as Professor
of Architecture in 1806, when he was starting work on the preparation of his professorial lectures’: Sue
Palmer, ‘Building a Library: Evidence from John Soane’s Library,’ in Robin Myers, Michael Harris and
Giles Mandelbrote (eds), Publishing the Fine and Applied Arts 1500–2000 (London: Oak Knoll Press
63 For historiography of elocutionary theory of the Romantic period, see Thompson, ‘Re-sounding
Romanticism: John Thelwall and the Science and Practice of Elocution’, 22–23. Also see Frederick
University, 1947); Paul Goring, The Elocutionary Movement in Britain’, in Michael J. MacDonald
(ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies (Oxford Handbooks Online, March 2014), accessed
9780199731596-e-043
64 Michaelson, ‘Theorizing Speech in the Public Sphere’, Speaking Volumes, 44–63, 44.
speech, a view that formed part of an active debate within the period, with other grammarians of the day, such as Samuel Johnson who Soane admired and often quoted in lectures, believing and advocating for almost the very opposite: ‘that the most “elegant” speech was that which most resembled written language.’\(^{66}\) Whilst Hudson writes, that ‘Sheridan and Johnson came to embody extremes of opinion about written language’ during the period,\(^{68}\) Michaelson points out that what these men and other proponents of this interest in speech and writing of the period nevertheless ‘shared [was] an impulse to standardise English.’\(^{69}\)

In *British Education*, Sheridan makes the case for a better education system in the art of speaking through an extensive account of the value attributed to oratorical practices by the Greeks and Romans. Through extensive reference to and direct quotation from the oratorical treatises of Cicero and Quintilian – writers whom Soane also owned and made notes on in 1805-1806 and 1816\(^{70}\) – Sheridan highlights the role of speaking both in the conceptualisation and transmission of ideas.\(^{71}\) In an account about ancient Greece, he states:

...the wisest councillor in such a state, without a power and facility of delivering his sentiments, could be of little use to the publick. Such communication could be made no other way but by language; a complete knowledge of that was therefore absolutely necessary. But as mere communication alone might not always produce the effect of bringing others into the same way of thinking, it was necessary that this communication should be made in a clear and forcible manner, so as to enlighten the understanding, and to make strong impressions on the hearts of the hearers.\(^{72}\)

Here Sheridan distinguishes between the content and delivery of the spoken word: between ‘mere communication’ or the literal use of the meanings of

\(^{66}\) SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 2, *Royal Institution Lectures* (1817), 40.
\(^{68}\) Hudson, *Writing and European Thought*, 104.
\(^{70}\) Soane owned eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editions of both of these classical authors. See, for example, Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Cicero’s select orations, translated into English* (London: G. Keith, 1756); SM Architectural Library, 872; For Soane’s own notes on this text made 27-30 June 1816, see SM Archives, Soane case 172, 354-356. Also see Watkin, *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought*, 24-25. For notes on Quintilian in 1805-1806, see SM Archives, Soane Case 161/3.
\(^{71}\) See, for example, Sheridan, *British Education*, 46-51.
\(^{72}\) Sheridan, *British Education*, 46-47.
words and language, and the additional ‘power and facility of delivering... sentiments’. Specifically, he is concerned with the use of the way or ‘manner’ in which words are communicated through speech to persuade a listener. As literary scholar Paul Goring notes, the primacy of the matter of ‘delivery’ – ‘mediated through classical works on rhetoric’ – became a key tenet of the elocutionary movement, with other writers, such as Hugh Blair, whose *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* Soane also owned, making reference to the famous Athenian orator Demosthenes:

“When being asked, What was the first point in Oratory? he answered, Delivery; and being asked, What was the second? and afterwards, What was the third? He still answered, Delivery”\(^73\)

This appeal by the speaker to the passions of the audience which takes place through the way the ‘communication’ is ‘made’ or done is articulated by Sheridan as to specifically be ‘delivered with proper tones and gestures.’\(^74\)

In particular, Sheridan states the particular relevance of the case he is making for the art of speaking for the clergy and lawyers\(^72\) at the bar and pulpit, about whom he comments that ‘the welfare and safety of the state depend.’\(^75\) In parallel with this public value, Sheridan emphasises the connection between oration and the advancement of knowledge: ‘there is not the smallest branch of ours which can be well executed without skill in speaking, and the more important parts, calculated to answer the great ends, evidently require the whole oratorical powers.’\(^77\)

Throughout his account, Sheridan plays out the respective merits of speaking and writing, ultimately reinforcing and making the case for spoken language’s superiority as a result of its capacities to move and appeal to the passions. In a discussion specifically about the role of oratory as a skill to be acquired by

---


\(^73\) Sheridan, *British Education*, 47.

\(^74\) See for example, Sheridan, *British Education*, 136.

\(^75\) Sheridan, *British Education*, 172.

\(^77\) Sheridan, *British Education*, 56.
the clergy, he expresses how both mediums (spoken and written) play a role in communication, but ultimately he highlights speech’s active capacities to affectively persuade the hearer through ‘tones to charm the ear, and penetrate the heart [...] joined to it action, and looks, to move the inmost soul.’\(^7^9\) As Michaelson and other commentators have noted, the message of persuading affectively was a key principle of the ‘elocutionists’ in general. But here she writes, with reference to the work of the literary theorist Jay Fliegelman, that ‘the paradox of the elocutionists’ emphasis on affective persuasion is that it presents “natural” language theatrically. In order to persuade, the orator must appear sincere in his emotions.\(^7^9\)

For Sheridan, writing is demoted to being a fictitious and artificial construct – ‘the invention of man, a mere work of art... [which] therefore can contain no natural power.’ On the matter of writing, he reflects:

> Its use is to give stability to sound, and permanence to thought. To preserve words that otherwise might perish as they are spoke, and to arrest ideas that vanish as they rise the mind. To assist the memory in treasuring these up, and to convey knowledge at distance thro’ the eye, where it could find no entrance by the ear.\(^8^0\)

It is important to note that writing is conceived of here as a form of knowledge which is distant and mediated, whilst speech is expressed as comparatively immediate and direct. The choice of the word ‘entrance’ with respect to spoken knowledge transmission via the ear, in comparison with ‘distance thro’ the eye’, suggests a physical closeness whereby speech literally enters the body, perhaps even becoming part of the hearer. There is also something spatial in this characterisation of the written in relation to the spoken whereby the eye looks out to writing which exists at a distance, whilst the same words when spoken directly penetrate the body through the ear. Sheridan’s suggestions about the ephemerality of spoken in comparison with written language are also worth highlighting. Whilst that which is spoken is liable to ‘vanish’ and ‘perish’, writing is described as operating as a mnemonic

\(^7^9\) Sheridan, British Education, 85.


\(^8^0\) Sheridan, British Education, 85-86.
aid and as having permanent and stabilising qualities which ‘preserve words’, ‘sound’ and ‘thought’.

At the same time as purchasing Sheridan’s book, Soane also bought A Practical Grammar by John Milner, another well-known proponent of the elocutionary movement. Soane also owned Milner’s later publication Rhetoric; or the Principles of Oratory Delineated, which was bound together with another elocutionary publication, John Stirling’s A System of Rhetoric. Soane’s library holds further books written by other members of this movement, including A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary by John Walker, which was purchased on 23 June 1808, five months earlier than the Sheridan and Milner texts above (and seven months before Soane’s first R.A. lecture). Other historians have contrasted Walker’s approach with Sheridan’s in terms of the way the former demonstrates a prescriptive and almost ‘mechanical’ system of public speech. Whilst Sheridan’s writings can be said to largely consist of making a rhetorical case to its readers on particular subjects such as the higher status of speech over writing, or the social and moral importance of skilful public speaking (supported by a suitable provision of such education by the state) for the professions of law, the clergy and politics, Walker offers a more literal, practical system and manual which the student could follow in a bid to improve their own delivery.

There are a number of published texts within Soane’s library on the subject of vocal delivery which do not have an acquisition date. These include William Enfield’s The Speaker. Whilst this book was originally published in 1774,

---

81 See Copy Notes which state this book was bought from Thomas Boone on 24 November 1808, SM Archives, Spiers Box. For Soane’s copy, see John Milner, A Practical Grammar of the Latin Tongue, 2nd ed. (London: John Noon, 1742); SM Architectural Library, 899.
82 John Milner, Rhetoric; or the Principles of Oratory Delineated (London: printed by J. Gray, 1736); SM Architectural Library, 622.
83 John Stirling, A System of Rhetoric, in a Method Entirely New (London: printed for Thomas Astley, 1736); SM Architectural Library, 624. We do not know when Milner’s Rhetoric, which was bound with Stirling’s System, was acquired.
84 John Walker, A critical pronouncing dictionary, and expositor of the English language: in which, not only the meaning of every word is clearly explained, and the sound of every syllable distinctly shown, but where words are subject to different pronunciations, 3rd ed. (London: printed by Wilson and Co., 1802); SM Architectural Library, 1138.
86 William Enfield, The speaker: or, miscellaneous pieces, selected from the best English writers, and
Soane’s copy was printed in (and therefore purchased at some point after) 1800. Whilst the previous books summarised so far aimed to expound public speaking and promote particular systems of oral performance, Enfield’s *The Speaker* falls into the category of being a book of texts to be read out loud to improve elocution. As I point out in the previous section, Michaelson shows how the practising of reading out loud from such manuals in this manner was a common activity at this time.

Whilst it is reasonable to assume that most of the above books were purchased and owned by Soane himself, we know that one of the books in Soane’s library associated with the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century obsession with improving public speech did not belong to Soane. For example, written in ink on the first pastedown of Stephen Jones’s *Sheridan Improved*, a book specifically intended to advance upon Thomas Sheridan’s teachings, is written:

Chertsey  
Elizth: Soane  
July 18th: 1812

This book clearly belonged to Elizabeth, Soane’s wife, and was perhaps held, read or originally purchased at the couple’s Chertsey residence where, as Darley and Palmer note, she was staying during this period in 1812 whilst the Soane Museum was being rebuilt. However, as former Head of Collections and Library at the R.A. Nicholas Savage has noted, there are many difficulties and limitations to reading the inclusions and exclusions of books held within

---

*disposed under proper heads, with a view to facilitate the improvement of youth in reading and speaking. To which is prefixed an essay on elocution, and directions for reading* (Ludlow: H. Procter, 1800); SM Architectural Library, 214.

87 By the year 1800, Soane was 47 years old.


89 Special thanks to Dr Frances Sands, Soane Museum Curator of Drawings and Books for confirming this.

90 Stephen Jones, *Sheridan improved. A general pronouncing and explanatory dictionary of the English language, for the use of schools, foreigners learning English, &c. In which it has been attempted to improve on the plan of Mr. Sheridan; the discordancies of that celebrated orthoëpist being avoided, and his improprieties corrected* (London: printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, & Brown, 1812); SM Architectural Library, 1154.

the Soane Museum library as a historical document from which to draw conclusions about Soane. On this matter, Savage writes:

While it is a straightforward matter to collate information derived from booksellers’ bills, auction catalogues [...] or to record the presence of Soane’s marks of emphasis, comments and marginalia [...] it is much more difficult to determine what such evidence can tell us about the motives and choices that informed Soane’s activities as a book collector.92

While it seems unlikely that it is a coincidence that many of these books were bought in the years leading up to Soane’s R.A. lectures,93 Savage’s caution highlight that it is not possible to recover the reasons behind why, or the specific nature of or degree to which, they were read and engaged with. We also cannot assume their teachings mirrored Soane’s own beliefs regarding public speaking. But instead of writing an arbitrary contextual account of the elocutionary movement, I have used the books which Soane owned on this subject to decide the parameters of my discussion of this discourse. Importantly, rather than view these books as causal evidence for a particular individual’s method or opinions of vocal practice, they should instead be regarded as examples of commonly acquired and owned publications written on a prominent discourse during the period. The fact that Elizabeth owned a book which sought to update Sheridan’s earlier well-known philosophy, which the Soane household had purchased six years previously, suggests an active discourse at that time where different approaches are debated and amended. Similarly, also valuable to consider is that they may not have been remarkable purchases, and that they illustrate typical and widely disseminated and often opposing positions on vocal delivery. Not only do they indicate the range of typical debates concerning public speaking which Soane is very likely to have engaged with as part of being an educated man of the time, but they also help define debates which Soane’s audiences are likely to have engaged with and been receptive to whilst experiencing particular dimensions of his lectures.

93 Again, see Palmer, ‘Building a Library’, 81.
On 5 March 1810, Soane wrote in his ‘Note book’ that he:

[...] called at Mr Foxhall, at Mr Britton’s + with him to Thelwall’s lecture'.

As Sue Palmer writes, ‘Throughout most of his professional life, from 1781 to 1835, Soane kept a series of small pocket memoranda books, now known as the Soane Note books, in which he made daily entries of his activities, people he met and journeys he made.’ The ‘Mr Foxhall’ referred to in the entry above is likely to be Soane’s friend whom he originally met whilst a student at the R.A., while the ‘Mr Britton’ also mentioned was an antiquarian and friend who acted as an agent buying books for Soane in the later years of his life. The ‘Thelwall’, to whom this note also refers, was a British Romantic writer, poet and radical political figure, who had reinvented himself as a successful lecturer on elocution after being tried for treason in the 1790s. Interestingly, and also relevant to considering the circumstances of Soane’s note, is the fact that one of the most well-known accounts of this trial had in fact been written by Britton in his autobiography. Soane’s Note book entry corresponds with an advert published in the *Morning Chronicle* newspaper for a lecture held at ‘Thelwall’s Institution’:

Mon, Mar 5, 1810
Oratory and History.—Institution for Cure of Impediments, Instruction of Foreigners, and Completion of an accomplished Education, Bedford-place.— This Evening, at 8, Mr. Thelwall’s Third Lecture on the Spirit and Operation of the Norman Institutions. Admittance 5s. Subscription for eight Lectures, or six single Admission, 1l. 1s. Subscription to the Lectures and Discussions, five guineas...

Thelwall’s Institution for oratory and an early form of speech therapy was located at 40 Bedford Place, just off Russell Square (ten minutes’ walk from

98 John Britton, *The Autobiography of John Britton* (London: John Britton, 1850), 95, 181-184. Britton states that along with John Home Took, Thomas Hardy, William Godwin and Thomas ‘were unfairly stigmatized by the Attorney-General as the “acquitted felons”’.
99 *Morning Chronicle*, 5 March 1810. I am grateful to Sarah Zimmerman for alerting me to this newspaper advert and letting me see her transcription.
Lincoln’s Inn Fields) between 1806 and 1813. It was, therefore, about midway through this period that Soane attended the 1810 lecture there. Offering guidance on spoken delivery through a combination of weekly lectures and one-to-one sessions, Thelwall attracted a range of different kinds of people wanting to improve their elocution skills. As the advert above states, his clientele ranged from those with specific speech defects, to non-British speakers wanting to communicate more effectively in the English language, to a third group – into which we could perhaps include Soane – of anyone else seeking to achieve the ‘[c]ompletion of an accomplished Education’.

Thelwall’s Institution later moved to 75 Lincoln’s Inn Fields (1813-1820), a fact that we can assume Soane would have been aware of not only because he had attended a lecture at the Institution’s previous nearby location in 1810, but also because his own residence was in the same north-west corner of the square, in a building the Soane office had in fact carried out alteration work to in 1795 and 1809.100

It is reasonable to assume that when Soane attended the 1810 lecture he would have been very aware of the notoriety surrounding Thelwall, as well as the lecturer’s renown as a famously eloquent speaker. We know that Britton – Soane’s companion at this lecture – engaged with Thelwall and his career directly and from afar, writing later in his autobiography (published in 1850) about Thelwall’s trial in detail (which Britton had apparently attended), as well as remarking on Thelwall’s character and specifically his eloquent skills as an orator which he also identified as the reason for Thelwall being acquitted.101 Notably, Britton also provided in his autobiography an extended account of Thelwall’s Institution when situated in Bedford Place, at which he wrote he ‘was not only a frequent visitor and admiring listener, but often joined his private dinner and evening parties.’102

Other than the newspaper advert above, there is not a full report or transcript outlining the content of Thelwall’s 5 March 1810 lecture. It is, however, possible to guess the lecture’s contents by studying the detailed plans and

promotional material which Thelwall published about his oratorical institution within journals. Posters left over from other lectures that Thelwall delivered at other British venues that year also give useful clues regarding what Thelwall may have spoken about. From such sources it seems that this particular lecture constituted one of his ‘first Monday of every month’ lectures, which always dealt with the ‘Study and History of Oratory’. As it was Thelwall’s explicit intention to address the value of spoken delivery through discussions of the virtues and workings of previous oratorical practices throughout history, it would be reasonable to assume that Thelwall used the lecture on ‘the Spirit and Operation of the Norman Institutions’, as heard by Soane, to do something similar. Importantly, Thelwall states this as his explicit intention in his telling of accounts of other periods, such as British military history or the Greeks and Romans (‘Among the Grecian States, everything may be said to have been Eloctionary’).

It is interesting to think through what the different levels of significance could be regarding Soane’s attendance at this lecture at Thelwall’s Institution. A month earlier Soane had received negative criticism from a journalist writing in the Examiner for the delivery of his R.A. lectures: ‘The enlightened Professor will be heard with much more effect if he will be as attentive to the delivery as he is to the composition of the Lecture.’ Could this visit to Thelwall’s institution have been an attempt to improve his performance and lecturing style? Ascertaining the extent of the impact that attending one lecture might have on Soane, however, would be impossible to determine, since people can go to many lectures in their life, but might only remember,

104 Thelwall published two books during 1810 and 1809: John Thelwall, A letter to Henry Cline, Esq. on imperfect development of the faculties mental and moral as well as constitutional and organic and on the treatment of impediments of speech. (London: Richard Taylor & Co., 1810), 241; John Thelwall, The vestibule of eloquence ... Original articles, oratorical and poetical, intended as exercises in recitation, etc. (London: J. McCreery, 1810), 31-32.
105 For example, a notice for a lecture by Thelwall in Nottingham dated 21 August 1810 is included within A collection of addresses, handbills, posters, play-bills, squibs, &c., relating to elections, race-meetings, entertainments, &c., at Nottingham (Nottingham, 1797-1861), British Library General Reference Collection, 1888.c.18/1(104).
106 Thelwall, The Vestibule of Eloquence, 31-32.
107 Thelwall, The Vestibule of Eloquence, 41. For details of how Thelwall combined history and elocution-teachings in his lectures, see Thompson, John Thelwall and the Science and Practice of Eloction’.
agree with or take on board the details of few. It is reasonable to conclude that Soane was aware of ideas relating to oral delivery that were circulating in London at the time he was preparing for his own lectures. The fact that he went to see a famous orator, commentator, and promoter of elocution after/during the first year he delivered his first full series of R.A. lectures reinforces my previous suggestion that Soane was actively considering the impact of his spoken delivery on the words that he read out loud.
I begin ‘Reading Again’, which largely explores the process of the practice of transcribing the R.I. lecture manuscripts, by turning to the matter of the existing written transmissions of the R.A. lectures. This first section entitled, ‘Reading Soane’s R.A. Lectures Again Through Their Existing Written Transmissions’, examines Bolton’s and Watkin’s approaches to reproducing the R.A. lecture texts, and considers the role such editing has played in influencing an understanding of Soane’s lectures and lecturing practice in general over time. This section, which describes some of the material features of the various R.A. lecture manuscripts, also operates as a means for situating my previous observations of the R.I. lecture manuscripts within Soane’s broader practice and performance practice of lecturing architecture.

I then move on to discussing my own transcriptions of the R.I. lecture manuscripts, outlining my method and approach in the section ‘Reading Soane’s R.I. Lecture Manuscripts Again Through Transcribing Them’. The next two sections, ‘Transcribing the Handwriting: Reading the Hands Again’ and ‘Transcribing the Layout: Reading the Form and Content Again’, subsequently explore the way I have transcribed the handwriting and layout – and how through doing so I have been able to read and re-encounter evidence in the manuscripts to do with Soane’s lectures as a form of performance practice.
Reading Soane’s R.A. Lectures Again Through Their Existing Written Transmissions

As I have already established, whilst Soane’s R.I. lecture manuscripts and the texts they contain have never been copied or published, several different versions of Soane’s R.A. lecture texts have been reproduced at different times during and since Soane’s lifetime. These include fair copy manuscripts which the Soane office prepared between 1809 and 1841,\(^{109}\) followed by Arthur Bolton’s published edition in 1929 (which had been published previously in the *A.A. Journal* in 1927),\(^ {110}\) followed by architectural historian David Watkin’s two further published editions in 1996 and 2000.\(^ {111}\) The latter editions published by Bolton and Watkin were all copied from the same fair copy manuscripts created by the Soane office between 1809 and 1841.

As noted in my introduction, Soane revised and rewrote his R.A. lectures at various times, and a range of different manuscripts exist containing these different versions which were read aloud in particular dated lectures.\(^ {112}\) Separate to these manuscripts – which we could say, like the R.I. manuscripts which I observe in ‘Reading In’, were made for the purpose of reading aloud – nine additional bound, fair copy manuscripts of the R.A. lecture texts were also produced. Watkin notes these fair copies were originally intended to be given to the R.A. library, but were in the end retained at Lincoln’s Inn Fields.\(^ {113}\) For clarity, from this point onwards ‘R.A manuscripts to be read aloud’ refers to the manuscripts from which Soane actually read aloud in the dated lecture events, as shown in Image 21. The ‘R.A. fair copy manuscripts’ are the more legible and neater copies made of the earlier R.A. manuscripts, as shown in Image 22. Significantly, no comparable later fair copies of the R.I. manuscripts were ever produced by the Soane office.

---


Watkin describes these R.A. fair copy manuscripts as Soane’s ‘final manuscript record’ and ‘the definitive permanent record of his lectures in nine uniformly bound folio volumes’. He suggests that the first four fair copy lectures were prepared between 1809 and 1813, whilst the remaining eight were prepared much later, between 1833 and 41. Correspondingly, Watkin refers to the R.A. material which I describe as the ‘manuscripts to be read aloud’ as the ‘variants of all twelve lectures’. These differences in description of the same material highlight the foregrounding of different things in my own and Watkin’s research of Soane’s lectures. Whilst Watkin is interested in the earlier manuscripts as variants and versions of the same text, I am more concerned with their status as working documents in a performance practice.

In terms of their layout, the R.A. fair copies retain the page format of the earlier R.A. manuscripts to be read aloud, with written titles of drawings to be shown down the left, and lecture text on the right. These are also features which I observe of the R.I. manuscripts in the first section of Part I, ‘Reading In’. The other main feature of these R.A. fair copies is that they do not contain the annotations and amendments which are so apparent in the earlier R.A. manuscripts to be read aloud (and, again, the R.I. manuscripts) and which record moments in a process of ongoing, active editing prior to their delivery. The most obvious difference, however, between the R.A. manuscripts to be read aloud and the later R.A. fair copies, is that whereas the manuscripts to be read aloud contain written titles for the drawings shown, the fair copies contain written titles in addition to also including reduced copies of most of the lecture drawings, as can be seen in Images 22 and 23-26. This alters the reading experience and type of access that is granted to the reader of the lectures. Whilst in the R.A. manuscripts to be read aloud the reader encounters the lecture drawings through both their written description in the titles on the left-hand side of page and the varying textual reference to them

---

114 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 290.
115 SM Archives, Soane Case 35-43. Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 290-291. Whilst Watkin calls them the ‘final manuscript copy’, he also notes that Lectures 1-4 were revised in 1817 and 1819 and that, therefore, the fair copy produced in 1809-1813 omitted sections which were delivered to an audience at a later date.
116 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 290. Watkin states these were drawn mainly by C.J. Richardson.
within the lecture texts themselves on the right, in the R.A. fair copies the reader can additionally also refer to scaled down visual representations of the actual lecture drawings. Whilst in the R.A. fair copy of Lecture 1 the images of the lecture drawing are located immediately opposite the page where the written text refers to the drawing (see Images 23 and 24), in the later R.A. fair copies the reduced copies of lecture drawings are located all together at the end of the lecture text (see Images 25 and 26 for Lecture 11).

At the beginning of his 1996 reproduction of Soane’s R.A. lecture texts, Watkin describes the differences between Bolton’s and his own approach to editing the text contained in the Soane office’s R.A. fair copy manuscripts of 1809-1841. It is helpful to cite this passage at length, both for clarifying Watkin’s rationale, and as a basis from which to subsequently discuss my own approach in the next section to reproducing the R.I. lecture manuscripts:

The following text of the lectures, unlike Bolton’s transcript published in 1929, reproduces exactly that in the original manuscript volumes, written for Soane by his pupils. Bolton omitted certain extended passages [...] and made constant changes to word order as part of an attempt to ‘improve’ Soane’s grammar and language; in this process he also introduced, changed or eliminated numerous propositions. I have returned to the original text in all cases [...] Soane’s scribes divided the text into paragraphs [...] which were divided, not into sentences, but into long phrases separated only by semi-colons and dashes. Like Bolton, I have turned these phrases into sentences, for the sake of clarity, but, unlike Bolton, I have not introduced any linking words of my own. It is thus possible to retain the rhythm of Soane’s prose which, it should be remembered, was written to be spoken not read. I have occasionally modernised spelling where the original might lead to confusion, and have also removed the capitalisation, since this was arbitrary, varying from lecture to lecture.

Significantly, the above editorial policy adopted by Watkin only describes the issues which pertain to the editing of the R.A. lecture text, with no reference to the other words, which I have observed to be important in the performance practice of the lectures, such as the written titles of the drawings, which were also written alongside the lecture text throughout the R.A. fair copy manuscripts. Bolton and Watkin instead decide to isolate and reformat the lecture text only, editing out the adjacent information regarding the drawings and ignoring the significance of the original manuscripts’ page layout. Whilst both Bolton’s and Watkin’s editions of the written R.A. lecture texts give a reader access to the arguments and discursive content of Soane’s R.A. lectures, their choice to remove the titles, information and positioning of specific lecture drawings in relation to this text makes it very difficult for the reader to read and consider the specificity or significance of the written in relation to the visual argument. It is indeed reasonable to conclude that Soane himself clearly foregrounded this interface between drawings and lecture text through his decision to retain both the layout of the page and the drawing titles alongside the lecture text in his R.A. fair copies.

In reproducing the lecture text only, and in reformatting this lecture text to retain none of the layout features such as the positions of drawings, Watkin’s and Bolton’s editions of the lectures have left out what I would argue are vital forms of evidence that exist outside of the lecture text – they have marginalised such information as ephemeral and removable. Indeed, we could say that these previous different versions of the R.A. lecture texts themselves indicate a hierarchy of knowledge at play in the architectural historical editorial act, where in this instance the textual has been prioritised over the drawn, and over other types of knowledge related to the relationship between text and drawing. In so doing, the removal of these specific features, which give clues about Soane’s process of preparing and performing his lectures, can be said to have directly impacted upon how Soane’s lectures have been understood to date in terms of being texts with separate drawings.

Watkin’s words cited above are one of the only places where he refers to the status of Soane’s lecture text (what he describes as the lecture’s ‘prose’) as having been ‘written to be spoken’. This is an important admission by Watkin as he is acknowledging that the status of Soane’s lecture texts as a spoken text has influenced the way they are written and expressed, and that these qualities are significant to be reinstated in the reading experience of his own edited versions of Soane’s R.A. lecture texts (as compared with Bolton’s
previous published edition where this aspect was edited out). However, I would point out that when Watkin correspondingly writes that the lecture texts were ‘written to be spoken not read’ (my italics), the type of ‘reading’ which Watkin is referring to is the silent engagement by the reader with words on the page. I highlight this definition of reading partly because I am myself emphasising the significance of the fact that Soane’s lecture texts were subject to another type of reading – as explored in the previous section ‘Reading Out’ – namely, a spoken form of reading, or reading aloud. Whilst the earlier R.A. manuscripts appear to have been very much written, like the R.I. manuscripts, to materially script their reading aloud, we can observe that the R.A. fair copy manuscripts, which both Bolton and Watkin reproduced in their own subsequent published editions, were not produced to be spoken.120

It is interesting to note that when Secretary of the R.A. Henry Howard read aloud Soane’s R.A. lectures on his behalf for five years between 1832 and 1836, he seems not to have done so from the more legible R.A. fair copies containing the reduced copies of the lecture drawings (some of which had been produced by that time).121 This is noteworthy because we know that, when Soane was conversing with Howard by letter several years earlier in 1829,122 he wrote that ‘to enable any other person than myself to read the Lectures, the Text must be corrected and a fair copy thereof made’.123 One would assume from this that the R.A. fair copies eventually made containing the reduced copies of the lecture drawings were the results of what Soane was proposing in his letter to Howard of 1829. However, Howard instead seems to have ended up reading Lectures 1-6 from the earlier 1819 R.A. manuscript in 1832, 1834 and 1836,124 and Lectures 7-12 from an even earlier 1815 manuscript in 1833 and 1835.125 These now bound manuscripts not only

---

120 Even if indeed, as Watkin notes, aspects of the form and content of the lecture texts contained in these fair copies retain qualities of being originally written to be spoken.

121 Lectures 1-4 produced between 1809 and 1813 and Lectures 8-12 produced between 1832 and 1841. Even as Howard continues to read over the five years 1832-36, and more fair copies appear to have been produced, he does not read from them.


124 Now bound together as SM Archives, Soane Case 156 (1819).

125 Now bound together as SM Archives, Soane Case 154 (1815).
contain Soane's notes that record the dates of Henry Howard's readings of particular lectures as just summarised, but also contain the pencil notes added to the manuscript by Howard himself which correct parts, omit parts, and mark up specifically for reading out loud, as can be seen in Images 27 and 28.
PART I

Lecture the P

Image 27

Image 28
Reading Soane’s R.I. Lecture Manuscripts Again Through Transcribing Them

I have transcribed in typescript form the manuscripts of all six of Soane’s R.I. lectures. These unedited transcriptions are presented in printed form as a separate appendix to this thesis (Appendix 1). As I have already noted, the manuscripts from which these transcriptions are made relating to the R.I. lectures – which are each about 10,000 words and on average 50-70 pages long – have not been reproduced before. Whilst such manuscripts must have been read or at least consulted by previous curators and archivists, such activity is not documented and there is no evidence of a copy ever being made.

First used in the sixteenth century, the verb ‘to transcribe’ is defined by the OED as meaning: ‘To make a copy of (something) in writing; to copy out from an original; to write (a copy).’ The term ‘transcription’ on the other hand, which comes from the earlier ‘transcribe’, is conceived of both in terms of being an act and an object: ‘The action or process of transcribing or copying’ (very similar, therefore, to ‘transcribe’), but also: ‘The product of this process; a transcript; a copy.’ Etymologically, both terms come from the Latin transcribere, combining trans- meaning ‘across, through, over, to or on the other side of, beyond, outside of, from one place, person, thing, or state to another’, and scribere meaning ‘to write’. Read together, the two parts of the word can be literally approached to mean: to write across or over from one place, person, thing, or state to another.

---

129 As well as meaning the making of a written copy from a written original, it is important to note that the terms ‘transcribe’ and ‘transcription’ are also frequently used to describe making a written copy from a spoken original. The terms have also come to be applied in differing ways within other contexts that do not necessarily imply conventional writing. These include, for example, adaptation of a music composition (first usage in the late nineteenth century), the biological transcribing of DNA to RNA (twentieth century) and the transcription of sound to broadcasted sound (also twentieth century). In terms of the relevance for the archival material and historical period of my study of the early nineteenth century, I restrict my discussion here to the meanings of ‘transcribe’ and ‘transcription’ as a written act and written product made from a written original.
I was initially motivated to transcribe Soane’s R.I. lecture manuscripts to study aspects of them away from the archive. But by physically making these typescript copies of the handwritten originals, I became interested in the ways that, through transcribing (correlating with the OED definition just given for transcription as an act), I began to be able to read and analyse the manuscript, and in turn Soane’s R.I. lectures, in new ways. As editor of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley’s papers Betty T. Bennett has written, ‘Many editors regard transcription as a mere mechanical operation.’ I was specifically interested in thinking further about transcription as far from being a neutral or ‘mechanical’ method of simply replicating and reproducing a written document (a reading of transcription which could correspond to Austin’s ‘constative’), but as a self-reflexive practice and performative act in its own right which actually aids in the reading and revealing of historical evidence. Indeed, it is the way it achieves and performs the action of enabling evidence that in this research project I partially position the method of transcription of Soane’s lectures as a performative practice of architectural history. Here, as I will describe in the following section, I also became concerned with the significance of the fact that evidence in the manuscript could be read and engaged with in a way that was different to when the lecture manuscript was submitted to a previous and more conventional ‘reading’ (as explored in ‘Reading In’) which occurs through acts of looking (not writing) to notice and process the meaning of the form and content of words looked at.

My transcription method has attempted to reproduce properties of the original R.I. manuscript that appear to have played an important role in Soane’s performance practice of architecture, but which are not usually transcribed. This includes, firstly, transcribing changes in handwriting to explore the interactions between different hands at work in the production of the manuscripts. Here, the practice and process of transcription re-enacts the scene of the manuscript’s construction, a key stage in preparing for the lectures. And secondly, it involves transcribing the spacing and organisation of words and inconsistent punctuation on the page to analyse the interaction

121 J.L. Austin, How to do Things with Words.
between different kinds of information or instructions for different parts of the lectures’ performance. This allowed me to consider the role and significance of the material and spatial layout on both the construction of the argument and its visual and verbal delivery.

As already discussed in my Introduction, and as Forty notes, lectures by architects in the past have frequently been explored exclusively in terms of being written texts.\textsuperscript{132} The following sections, which outline my process of transcribing the R.I. manuscripts, focus on describing the specific method of transcription which I have used, and which was developed in an attempt to further engage with (and hopefully communicate to the reader of the transcriptions) architectural meanings or evidence for Soane’s R.I. lectures, and is related to their status as practised, performed and performative. My transcription approach has thus been developed through a combination of trying to address questions generated from observations I have already made during the process of the practice of architectural history described so far in ‘Reading In’ and ‘Reading Out’, at the same time as being developed in response to (and as a partial critique of) Bolton’s and Watkin’s previous approaches to reproducing the R.A. lecture manuscripts. As I discuss in the former and first section of ‘Reading Again’, whilst Bolton’s and Watkin’s editions of the written R.A. lecture texts give their readers access to the arguments and discursive content of Soane’s lectures, in choosing to edit out the information and instructions for the lecture drawings, and reformatting the R.A. lecture text’s page layout, vital pieces of evidence relating to the performance and performance practice of Soane’s lectures in turn become obscured.

## EDITORIAL SIGNS AND SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Underlined Text in ink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Underlined Text in a different colour (Text crossed out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Text crossed out twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>Text crossed out diagonally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Text crossed out vertically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{{ }}</td>
<td>Text included within one curly bracket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>Later introduced word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^ ^</td>
<td>Later introduced word above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%%%</td>
<td>Unreadable part of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%%%</td>
<td>Unreadable part of a word underlined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%%%</td>
<td>Unreadable part of a word crossed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%%%%</td>
<td>Unreadable word underlined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%%%%%</td>
<td>Unreadable word crossed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%%%%%</td>
<td>Unreadable word underlined and crossed out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Short underscore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Long underscore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>extended underscore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Editorial addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>Not legible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>Highlighting of discrepancies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| [JS]              | John Soane's handwriting (pen)  |
| [JS?]             | John Soane's handwriting (not certain) |
| [JS 10.07.13]     | John Soane's handwriting (verified by JSM & date) |
| [>>]              | Change in handwriting (not JS)   |
| [>>?]             | Change in handwriting (not certain) (not JS) |
No. 99 drawing of the Portico of the Pantheon compared with St. Martins Church.

No. 100 Section of the Pantheon with the Radcliffe Library.

No. 101 do. with the Rotunda at the Bank.

^<>^ which Dr. Smollet after surveying all its beauties, could only be compared to an huge Cockpit.

|^| The clock reminds me that I have trespassed too much on your patience, I shall therefore conclude by observing, that as nothing contributes to the importance and
This section describes the transcription policy which I have adopted, explaining my approach and expanding on the reasons for making particular transcription choices. Significantly, when I began transcribing the R.I. manuscripts the emphasis was on producing a copy quickly, to be studied away from the original manuscript at the Soane Museum – not what in due course became important, that is, the investigation of the practice of transcription itself. Indeed, an interest in the significance of the practice of transcription only occurred once I had started transcribing.

In 2013, I borrowed a transcription policy previously used by Bartlett PhD colleague Claudio Leoni for transcribing manuscripts relating to the nineteenth-century architect and architectural theorist Gottfried Semper, itself based on the approach of an ETH colleague, Susanne Luttman, to transcribing Semper’s full text of the publication manuscript for the ‘Comparative Architectural Theory’.133 In my own policy, I retained the basic transcription approach adopted for the Semper manuscript materials of recording in typescript form the writing materials used (pen, pencil, etc.), where text had been underlined, and the various kinds of deletions and additions which appear across the R.I. lecture manuscript. Significantly, as Luttman notes, in taking such a transcription approach which records ‘all deletions, additions, and marginal notes that show the various stages of correction of the original’, the objective was ‘not only to present the finished product, but also to authentically reproduce the process in which Semper’s ideas originated, as illustrated by the manuscripts’.134 This approach was particularly relevant to my own objectives of not so much tracing the development of Soane’s ‘ideas’ in the R.I. lecture texts, but engaging with and communicating through the resultant transcription other aspects concerning the Soane office’s ‘process’ of preparing for specific lectures (which was not an aspect explored by Leoni or Luttman), such as their performance practice, as suggested by the written R.I. lecture manuscripts.

At the same time, I added several further symbols and adopted a number of specific new conventions to record unique dimensions of Soane’s R.I. manuscripts. Image 29 shows a key for the editorial signs and symbols of the

adapted policy which I used for the R.I. manuscript, whilst Image 30 shows a page of the ‘raw’, unedited transcriptions which I produced. For the most part, I discovered later, the Semper policy follows many of the standard procedures of producing what is known within the discipline of scholarly editing as (a specific form of) literal, ‘diplomatic transcription’ – a term which, as Kline and Perdue write, describes an approach where ‘all details of inscription [in the original manuscript are] recorded symbolically in the reading text or adjacent descriptive footnotes’. Correspondingly, as is set out in *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology: 1450 to 2000*, the definition of this type of transcription is given as follows:

A diplomatic transcription of a document is one that reproduced faithfully and accurately, or as closely as possible, verbatim et literatim, the exact form of the original, such as the precise original spelling and punctuation [...]  

The policy I used for Soane’s R.I. manuscripts, and the Semper policy it is based on, are both examples of the former type of diplomatic transcription which Kline and Perdue describe – where typescript language and editorial symbols are used to reproduce the various mainly textual but also visual and material features of the manuscript. Additionally, through adding my own descriptive notes regarding the textual, material and visual features of the R.I. manuscript which could not be represented in typescript form, I also to some degree adopt elements of their latter ‘adjacent descriptive’ approach to diplomatic transcription.

In this thesis, I more often than not additionally provide photographs of the original manuscript pages I am discussing and show in transcribed form, recognising the inevitable fact that some, particularly visual, features of the written manuscript cannot be communicated to another reader through the transcription alone. In focusing above all on the process and encounter of

---

137 For an example of one system of the latter type of diplomatic transcription involving describing in words the deletions and additions and other visual and material features of the manuscript, see G. Thomas Tanselle and David L. Vander Meulen, ‘A System of Manuscript Transcription’, *Studies in Bibliography*, Vol. 52 (1999), 201-212, 207-212.
transcribing the original source materials, I have neither sought to photograph every page of the two bound R.I. manuscript volumes, nor to present photographic facsimiles alongside the text of every page of my collated transcription in Appendix 1. This is in contrast to the Semper approach which chooses to present every transcribed text page of the manuscript alongside photographic facsimiles of the original pages (in turn photographically providing the reader with contextual information about the material, visual and spatial qualities of the words transcribed), an approach which has become even more common as it becomes easier to store and make accessible on the internet large amounts of digital data.

Typescript editorial conventions retained from the Semper policy, but also used commonly through standard transcription practice, include using grey or black letters and lines to record letters and marks written in pencil and black ink, and the application of typescript lines under words when they were underlined or through words when they were crossed out in the original manuscript. In terms of typescript editorial symbols, I retained again from the Semper policy, double brackets (( Text )) to signify the beginning and end of words crossed out diagonally, and triangular brackets < Text > to signify the extent of words which were added to the manuscript within the main or marginal lecture text. Reflecting now, I think that these symbols are probably too close for visually communicating to the reader of the transcription the opposing meanings of deleted and added words. As the R.I. manuscript also often crossed out words vertically, I added the symbol: | | Text || to the existing policy. Other features particular to the R.I. manuscript which I wanted to accommodate – like vertical curly brackets written down the left-hand side of the lecture text – were recorded in a similar way with the new symbol: {{ Text }}. Furthermore, in order to distinguish between words added to the manuscript within the lines of the main or marginal text, and words added above the lines, I chose to introduce another common editorial symbol, that of the ‘caret’, and these upwards pointing arrows were used on either side

138 The advantages of which are also discussed by Michael Hunter, Editing Early Modern Texts: An Introduction to Principles and Practice (London: Springer, 2006), 75.
139 But which has in turn resulted in further transcription approaches which do not have the same emphasis on accuracy as in the past editorial practice, such as crowdsourced transcriptions, and transcriptions generated by automatic text reading software. For discussion of recent issues regarding transcription in the humanities, see for example Tim Causer, Justin Tonra and Valeries Wallace, ‘Transcription Maximized; Expense Minimized? Crowdsourcing and Editing the Collected Works of Jeremy Bentham’, Literary and Linguistic Computing, Vol. 27, No. 2 (2012), 119-137.
of the text in question ^ Text ^. Whilst each of these symbols can be systematically interpreted by the reader of the transcription as meaning specific things about the original R.I. manuscript, such symbols also had shortcomings, particularly by not communicating immediately and visually enough the arrangement of text added on the page.

The Semper transcription policy was also typical in assigning editorial symbols to indicate parts of and whole words which were not readable by the transcriber. Here, whilst I followed this convention in principle, I chose to adopt a new symbol of a repeated % symbol in place of the words which were not legible. I chose to change the symbol because of symbols available on my keyboard; however, the use of a percentage sign over another sign was otherwise arbitrary. Referring to other transcription policies, whilst we can see that the convention of recording illegible text is standard practice, the symbols used to represent this vary greatly. Another standard editorial convention employed in the Semper policy which I followed, but which is also widely used within editorial practice to signify editorial interpolations, were square brackets: [ ] to demarcate symbols and comments added to the transcription of the original manuscript by the transcriber or editor. It is replicated throughout my transcriptions, and where occasionally there is not enough space in my typescript layout to type all the words on a line as they are written in the original manuscript, this is noted in a separate electronic note added to the transcript, and the symbol / is added to the end of the line. Spelling is never modernised or corrected. Similarly, when there are abbreviations written in the original lecture manuscript, I retain the form of these abbreviated words as they appear in the manuscript, never expanding them. When a smaller handwritten number or letter is written to abbreviate a particular word, I choose to use a typescript superscript symbol to reflect this – for example, in the case of the word ‘Dwg’, which was used continually in the R.I. manuscript to stand in for the word ‘Drawing’, or the abbreviation ‘D”’ for the word ‘Ditto’, which was also used continually to signify a repeat of the words or drawing title written directly above it.

Transcribing the Handwriting: Reading the Hands Again

As noted at the start of Part I: ‘Reading In’, differences in handwriting are readable from the very first encounters with the manuscript. The following subsection focuses on my attempts to transcribe these shifts in handwriting, and the ways in which the doing of the transcribing of these shifts enabled me to both re-encounter and read further evidence in the R.I. manuscript for Soane’s performance practice of the lectures. As can be seen in Image 30, which shows an example of my original ‘raw’ transcriptions, and Image 29, which lists the transcription policy which I have adopted, during the actual making of the R.I. transcription in the archive I used editorial symbols to record perceived shifts in handwriting as I encountered them in the manuscript.

Images 31 and 32 overleaf, on the other hand, show a later colour-coded version of two of my transcript pages of the first two opposite manuscript pages of the second lecture at the R.I. in 1817, which show a particularly interesting set of Johnson, Shakespeare, Pope and Addison quotations added on the left-hand side of the page. Applying different colours to the words I recorded in order to indicate that they were written by different hands operates as a means for me to further consider and analyse the form and content of the R.I. manuscript, specifically enabling comparison to ascertain which words were written by what hand. At the same time, the colour-coded transcript is also a way to show in this thesis particular aspects of the manuscript revealed by the practice of transcribing it. Looking again at the colour-coded transcript which replicates the first two pages of the second R.I. lecture of 1817, we can see that the hand which wrote most of the lecture manuscripts is represented in black text, whilst amendments and annotations are added in blue, and those words added in another further distinct handwriting are represented in red.

Carrying out the transcription not only enables the recording of changes in handwriting but also a deeper engagement and increased familiarity with the different handwritings themselves. The interest which I developed through transcribing the R.I. manuscript – my reflection on the differing appearance and techniques of handwriting and my attempts to identify which handwriting belonged to whom – has a particular historical relevance to, as
Tamara Plakins Thornton notes, the obsession with analysing and identifying handwriting during the long eighteenth century, which is the period in which the R.I. manuscripts were produced.\(^\text{141}\) The handwriting of the main scribe of these manuscripts (again, represented in Images 31-32 in black) is neatly slanted to the right and is easy to read due to its consistently sized and disciplined individual letter-parts written above and below the line, and the regular spacing between both the joined-up letters and the separate words. Referring to the Soane office Day Books which systematically record the activities and projects which each of Soane’s assistants worked on daily between 1791 and 1837,\(^\text{142}\) and which also includes a record of office time spent preparing for the lectures, we can identify the scribe of the R.I. manuscripts for 1817 to be George Bailey.\(^\text{143}\) Bailey later became the first curator of the Soane Museum when Soane died in 1837, and originally joined the Soane office at the time when Soane began first preparing for his R.A. lectures in 1806, later becoming a paid clerk. My own further enquiries show Bailey’s hand to have scribed most of the R.A. manuscripts too – a fact identifiable again through a combination of the written content and handwriting of dated Soane office Day Book entries over the decade prior to the R.I. lectures in 1817.\(^\text{144}\)

I previously observed in *Reading In* that the most common of the handwritten annotations to the R.I. manuscripts are quotations, comments and annotations added to the left-hand side of the page by Soane. Examples of these added words by Soane are represented in the colour blue in Image 31. Through the process of transcribing the six R.I. lecture manuscripts, we notice that Soane’s handwriting is often illegible, reinforcing the impression that his own additions to the lecture manuscript were likely to be ‘notes to self’, perhaps intended to be read silently and privately, and not requiring the same visual clarity as Bailey’s handwriting of the lecture text opposite which


\(^{143}\) SM Archives, Day Book, 31 May – 3 June 1817, 142-143. These Day Books are discussed in more detail in *Part II, Drawing Out to the Lecture Drawings’ Use*.

\(^{144}\) SM Archives, Day Books 1806-1820.
To discharge, 


Johnson  


Poem.

Ladies and Gentleman.

"And when good will is show'd, though it come too short, 
The actor may plead pardon. 

Antony & Cleop. Scene 5  

p. 180

Read not my blinshes in the world re-

p. 190

As heaven with stars _ the roof with 

On this foundation _ fame's high tem 

Pope

Professed teaching is highly disagreeable to 

The Geor Whartons Virgil  

Vol. 1. p 394

Mr Addison observes "there are several 

Pope

If in the endeavour to discharge 

the task I have undertaken I occasionally 
differ in sentiment, with some of my 
contemporaries, respecting the beauties 
and defects of modern Works, I beg 
to be distinctively understood as 
neither presuming ^nor^ or wishing to 
set up my opinions in preference 
to theirs, for no man have 
more respect than myself for the 
talents and integrity of the 
Architects of the present day, or be 
more ready on all occasions to 
do justice to their well founded 
pretensions to fame _ and 

approbation._ Encouraged
Encouraged by the very flattering reception I have experienced, I shall now proceed "with fresh alacrity, and force renewed, to discharge the duty I have undertaken."—happy shall I ever consider myself in any opportunity of evincing my gratitude and regard for a profession to which, by the partiality and kindness of Friends I owe all the advantages I now possess. be assured, it is not the least satisfaction of my life to have the pleasure of addressing the
needed to be immediately decipherable for reading aloud while delivering the actual lecture. Soane’s handwriting is also much smaller and much ‘freer’ than Bailey’s, and there are many inconsistencies that can be observed across the manuscript in terms of the letter sizes and forms that he uses. As historian and archivist Chris Woolgar comments, during the early nineteenth-century a ‘free hand was a mark of distinction: it set one apart from those who made their living as clerks, writing neat hands or the office hands of government departments’. 145

In Image 33, we can compare Soane’s handwriting added to the left side of the page with notes of the books from which the words have been copied from, alongside Bailey’s lecture text written on the right. Whilst Soane’s handwriting is also slanted to the right, it does not have the same controlled qualities of Bailey’s italic style. Instead, his writing combines small, shallow, flowing letters with more expressive, individual letter-forms, such as a flick of the ‘d’ which rolls back, often over into the previous letter(s). His rendering of some letters, such as the ‘n’, frequently resembles other letters (for example the ‘u’, ‘r’ or ‘m’), which in turn forces the reader to rely on the context of the word rather than the isolated letter-forms themselves to read meaning. Transcribing and working over time with many documents that were handwritten by Soane creates a familiarity with his handwriting. This ability to recognise Soane’s hand is itself a form of tacit knowledge, which even in retrospect of closely analysing and describing here remains difficult in words to articulate and pin down precisely.

In addition to the way that the nuances of Bailey’s and Soane’s handwriting become more visually familiar and recognisable through the repeated act of transcribing their shifts, the different handwritings are also felt by the transcriber to ‘interact’ in a way that is different to when they were previously encountered through reading the manuscript without copying or making a transcription. By ‘interact’ I mean the impression felt whilst doing the transcription of the ways in which the hands behind the handwritings appear

145 Chris Woolgar, ‘Wellington, His Papers and the Nineteenth-Century Revolution in Communication - Inaugural Lecture as Professor of History and Archival Studies 20 November 2008’ [web version] (Southampton: University of Southampton, 2009), 19, accessed 15 January 2016 https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/66250/1/CWIaugweb.pdf. Woolgar discusses Wellington’s handwriting from the 1830s which, although later, is visibly similar to Soane’s. Making reference to a similar point regarding free handwriting style as distinction and individuality in an English context within this period, see Thornton, Handwriting in America, 13-14, 38-39.
admit that many of our great
Cathedral are most admirably
calculation to increase their
dimensions and melancholy that extend so
powerfully into the devotion of
beyond the spirit of monkish times... whilst
the lighter and more elegant attempts
claim our attention and command
general appreciation.

It has been advanced that the
powerful and inspiring effect
is visible in the exterior and interior
of our great Gothic cathedrals cannot
be obtained by any combination of
Greek architecture. — A Paul.

As in proper order is usually
in proof of the
appearance, for the comparison will
be

be difficult to explain
of the window
scriptural subjects represented in
deep and glowing colours and its
walls decorated by the labour of
the painter and sculptor.

no comparison can be made, even
then with all its great merits.
By what structure
Palladian has too many
of
to be involved with, or textually, temporally and materially affect one another in the manuscript. The significance of this interaction occurs textually, for example, through the ways the overall message of the words in the manuscript can be read to have changed through specific interventions and editing by different hands. The interaction of the hands behind the manuscript as having themselves taken place over time is additionally also felt by the transcriber – whereby, as one transcribes, there is an engagement with the order of who wrote what when, and in relation to which and whose other words (and thus an engagement with the Soane office’s process or practice of preparing for the lecture). This textual and temporal interaction that is specifically engaged with during the practice of transcribing also plays out materially and spatially on the page, with attention being drawn to different hands writing in different places and in different materials.

The affective encounter with the past which occurs through attempting to faithfully remake the manuscript through transcription corresponds with the affective knowledge of experiencing the past through the present that is often associated with the practice of re-enactment, as theorised by Schneider, McCalman and Pickering. Indeed, the process of re-enacting the manuscript actively operated as a means to both compare and identify the interacting handwritings in the differing ways just described. One particularly significant example of this occurring through this process of close reading through transcribing the shifts in handwriting was that I began to notice a third hand (represented in blue). This hand indeed felt to be intervening and possibly even editing the existing text to such a degree that I continually wondered whether it might be Soane writing in a larger, looser script.

Images 34–37 show photographic examples of this third hand which appears throughout the first and second 1817 R.I. lecture manuscripts, whilst Images 38–41 show my colour-coded transcriptions of pages of specific double pages where this third hand can be observed to add to the manuscript. Indeed, this third hand seems to play the role of proofreader – adding single and sets of words to the existing lecture text (both on the left-hand side of the page and above Bailey’s text), as well as adding quotations. Whilst not making significant interventions to the textual meaning of the lecture text, there is

---

146 Rebecca Schneider, *Performing Remains*; McCalman and Pickering, ‘From Realism to the Affective Turn: An Agenda’.
the sense of adapting and refining the text so that it flows better (perhaps for its future impending purpose to be read aloud?), expanding and rephrasing particular points made in the lecture text, and, through the adding of the quotations, possibly increasing the dramatic effect of the lecture. Perhaps the most distinctive characteristic of this handwriting is the way it combines different widths of pen-line within single letters and words. Here, it appears that the thin part of the pen-nib has been used for the parts of the letter which slant diagonally upwards to right, including the elegant flicks into and between letters (which in fact, more often than not, do not actually connect the letters). The longer edge of the same pen nib however has produced – this time in a downwards direction – thicker and more densely inked vertical letter-parts. Thin and sharp, up and right; thick and dense, down and round. Another recurring feature of this handwriting is the way vertical parts of the letters, which specifically fall below the line (known as a ‘descenders’) neatly stop, long enough for the ink to settle on the page surface, but nevertheless mostly achieving a squared-off end-point to the letter form.

Again, whilst not playing a significant role in changing the meaning of the lecture text, it does seem that the third hand is also behind the striking-out lines which appear throughout the manuscript. This certainly seems to be the case on page 33 for example, shown in Image 34, where the words ‘which being’ are added to the text above the line in order to replace the next few lines which have been struck out under it. In fact, casting one’s eye across the whole 1817 manuscript volume, and noticing the correspondences between the words added and the nearby struck-out lecture text, as well as the thickness of this striking-out which is closer in ink tone and density than any of the other inscriptions in the manuscripts, it does indeed appear very likely that this third hand is responsible for taking out parts of the final lecture text to be read aloud, for adding and taking away words to simplify and clarify or, again, to make sentences flow better. Image 38, on the other hand, which notices that the numbers of drawings have been added by another (possibly by the same third) hand, also draws attention to the potential involvement of the third hand not only in preparation of the lecture texts, but also in preparation of the lecture drawings, as scripted in the manuscript. Whilst we will never know if this third hand marked up the R.I. lecture manuscript on its own, or in the presence of, or under the direction of, Soane, my observations, enabled through the practice of transcription, nevertheless suggest a multi-way interaction and scene of preparation of the R.I. 1817 lectures.
thus accounted for, from the text of Vitruvius, who tells us: "that
"Corinthian columns are of the same
proportion as the Ionic, and that
the Entablature is taken either from
"the Doric-Ionic Order, and that of
"the Entablature of the Doric or Ionic
"are joined with a different capital
"a third Order is produced."

which D. Smollett after
surveying all its beauties,
could only compare to an
huge cockpit!

incorrect idea
capacity of the
beautiful
concave
Smollett con
cockpit!

The cl
I have hepa
Diocletian, great Public buildings erected by him, and his vicissitudes and revolutions 'till the close of the 4th Century.

The Emperor Diocletian was a convert to Christianity, and was succeeded by Constantine, under whose reign the Arts and Architecture made many struggles to revive and to decorate the Basilica of St Paul he stripped the beautiful peristyle of the Mausoleum of Adrian, and to decorate the Basilica of St Pau.

The Emperor Constantine who was so dazzled with its splendid magnificence that he is said to have performed the useful task of pointing out the general disposition of the whole of the Ground Plan which is retained in the present beautiful forms, most admirably to recommend them,

We must now turn our attention to the Fair admirers of Architecture, who attended its progress, at its completion, and by converting many of the ancient Temples of Paganism into places of devotion for the exercise of the new religion:__ unhappily for Architecture, his zeal was not so easily satisfied,--he demolished the most superb monuments of the Heathen World.

From the time of Septimius Severus to Constantine, the Arts gradually declined assemblage of his great o Scull, & pursuance of the Emperor,__ his great o Scull, and to decorate the Basilica of St Pau.

The Emperor, __ his great o Scull, and to decorate the Basilica of St Pau.

The Emperor, __ his great o Scull, and to decorate the Basilica of St Pau.

The Emperor, __ his great o Scull, and to decorate the Basilica of St Pau.

The Emperor, __ his great o Scull, and to decorate the Basilica of St Pau.

The Emperor, __ his great o Scull, and to decorate the Basilica of St Pau.
And the dim windows shed a solemn light.
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and high consisting of various

parts and different combinations. Of this new system, Salisbury
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Architecture: __.
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whether it originated in this Country
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To whatever causes this novel,
By investigating who Soane spent time with in the lead up to his 1817 R.I. lectures, and also bringing this third handwriting into contact with other handwritings elsewhere in the Soane Museum archive – such as in specific letters to Soane during this period and also in other written documents – it is possible to draw some further conclusions that I would not have reached without doing the transcription. By using the phrase ‘doing the transcription’, I mean to signal the repeated actual making of the marks whilst transcribing, that is, the actions of doing it, the process of this practice, and the choice and enactment of this mark-making. One particularly significant finding that I have made through this process of forensically recording changes in handwriting is that a woman named Norah Brickenden, who has previously been understood as a friend and sometime love interest of Soane, and whose handwriting resembles that which is in the R.I. manuscript, seems to provide a plausible identity for the third hand.

As Darley chronicles, after Soane’s wife Eliza had died in November 1815, and particularly between August 1816 and April 1817 (the latter month of which the Soane office was heavily occupied in preparing for the first series of R.I. lectures), Brickenden and Soane came into contact often. Image 42 shows a painting of Brickenden by Clara Maria Pope, currently hanging in Soane’s Dressing Room on the ground floor of the Museum between the Library and the Colonnade. Brickenden was a young woman whom Soane seems to have first met in Spring 1811 at a friend’s house in Devon. Regarding this meeting, Darley writes how Soane seemed to have become ‘superficially ensnared by the impressionable vicar’s daughter from Hereford’, whom she also describes to have been ‘the silliest if not the youngest of the company’. Following this incident, Darley also narrates how gossip began to circulate in their social circle regarding the status of Soane’s and Brickenden’s relationship, with the two being observed together, and by the end of July 1813 Eliza

148 Darley, John Soane: An Accidental Romantic, 245
149 Darley, John Soane: An Accidental Romantic, 247.
150 Soane Museum P15. Clara Maria Pope, Portrait of Norah Brickenden (n.d.).
151 Darley, John Soane: An Accidental Romantic, 203.
Expressed her disapproval of Soane’s new friend.\textsuperscript{152} In 1814 Soane arranged an inclusion, not to Eliza’s knowledge, of a £1,000 bequest to Brickenden within a new draft will.\textsuperscript{153}

There are two archival documents from which we can begin to identify the third hand in the R.I. lecture manuscript. These consist firstly of a bound volume of transcriptions made by Brickenden of newspaper reports published in the press of Soane’s 1817 R.A. and R.I. lectures (a double page of which can be seen in Image 43),\textsuperscript{154} and secondly, a letter which accompanies this set of newspaper transcriptions.\textsuperscript{155} Whilst there is no date on the letter, only the words ‘Tuesday Night’, Bolton identifies the date to be 1817, presumably because the letter directly refers to the book of transcriptions which it explains is imparted as a gift, and which contains copied press reports dated between 23 February and 12 June of that year.\textsuperscript{156} Brickenden, who refers to herself as ‘Ellen’, opens this letter with the words:

\begin{quote}
I part with this book as with a dear and faithful friend - it has beguiled / many an hour of sorrow - but I bequeath it to you as a memento of that / affection that neither time nor circumstances can change. When you / look at it will you think of your once fondly loved Ellen [...]\textsuperscript{157}
\end{quote}

It is important to point out that Brickenden’s making of the handwritten copies of newspaper notices of Soane’s lectures in this way, and giving them as a gift to Soane, was not a unique act. Indeed, within the same bound volume containing the transcriptions, alongside Brickenden’s accompanying letter, there are further transcriptions of the R.A. lectures and letters produced by Soane’s other close female friend Barbara Hoffland.\textsuperscript{158} And yet, it

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{152} Darley, \textit{John Soane: An Accidental Romantic}, 203.
\item \textsuperscript{153} Darley, \textit{John Soane: An Accidental Romantic}, 229.
\item \textsuperscript{154} SM Archives, Soane Case 23, \textit{Copies of Newspaper Notices of Lectures on Architecture at the Royal Academy and Royal Institution} (1817).
\item \textsuperscript{155} SM Archives, Soane Case 23/17. This letter is loosely kept within the bound volume containing the copies of newspaper notices.
\item \textsuperscript{156} Bolton, \textit{Portrait}, 248. The transcript volume contains newspaper reports of R.A. lectures from 23 February, 2, 23, 30 March and 6 April from the \textit{Champion}; from 1 March and 22 March from the \textit{Morning Post}; and 1 April from \textit{Morning Chronicle}. It contains newspaper reports of R.I. lectures from 5 and 9 June from the \textit{Sun}; from 7 and 12 June from the \textit{Morning Post}; and 9 June from \textit{Morning Chronicle}.
\item \textsuperscript{157} SM Archives, Soane Case 23/17.
\item \textsuperscript{158} SM Archives, Soane Case 23.
\end{itemize}
reading again
is interesting to note, particularly within this section which otherwise discusses the value of the *practice* of transcribing, that here is a historically specific example of meaning being attributed to the doing and process of the transcription itself (as well as the artefact), which, it seems, was a means to enable the engagement with a loved one and to further their bond. She goes on, coincidentally using the term of ‘a third hand’, albeit for another end:

[...] What I wanted to say was - / that I trust no other person, but yourself, will ever trace a line in this / book. Our friendship is so peculiar and sacred a nature, that I should / think it degraded by the intrusion of a third hand.

There is a third letter written by Brickenden, also held in the Soane Museum archive together with these other documents, and which appears to have been written *before* the letter and transcription book above was received by Soane. On the letter is written ‘Saturday Night, June 7th’, but there is no year specified. Fascinatingly, we can read from the letter’s content, which includes the words ‘I must tell you how more than delighted I have been with your Lecture this morning’, that it seems to have been written immediately following the first R.I. lecture of 7 June 1817 which Brickenden must have attended. This letter, seen in Image 44, provides a further handwriting sample to read the third hand of the R.I. lecture manuscript against. Whilst written in a much thinner pen nib which gives the words a much spikier appearance, many of the same letter forms, including the looped ‘l’, ‘w’ and ‘h’, as well as the occasional squared-off tail of the ‘y’, show correspondences with the R.I. manuscript’s third hand.

As previously noted in my *Introduction*, unlike the R.A., the R.I. from the time of its establishment in 1799 had admitted women, and Soane invited his female companions to see him deliver his lectures there. Brickenden is indeed one of several women’s names which appear on the list shown in Image 5 for Soane’s later series of R.I. lectures delivered in 1820. This letter also identifies as ‘Ellen’, in turn allowing us to connect the author of the two letters and transcription volume as one and the same. Furthermore, as Bolton notes, the way this letter refers to ‘Six years ago in Coombe Royal’ – and we

159 SM Archives, Soane Case 23/17.
160 SM Archives, Soane Case 23/16.
161 SM Archives, MBii/1/10, 20 May 1820.
otherwise know that Soane and Brickenden met in Devon – ultimately allows us to identify Brickenden as penning the letter.

As a conclusion to this section on the handwriting, it is worth noting that recording every change between handwritings is different to noticing changes in handwriting as one (silently) passes over them while reading without transcribing. We could say, that this latter more conventional form of reading is an activity which takes place through looking and scanning the visual appearance of words on the page with the eyes, and processing the meanings of the form and content of the word(s) that one sees. The reading which takes place when transcribing, on the other hand, also occurs partly through the eye: it is a repeated process of looking at the handwritten word in the manuscript and then looking at the copied word in the transcription as it is being made. During this process of transcribing, the hand that writes the manuscript again mediates these two actions of looking between manuscript and the transcription-in-progress.

This extra step of physically writing with the hand which happens between looking from the original manuscript page to transcription page, or as is the case in this project of Soane’s lectures, from R.I. manuscript page to typed transcription on-screen, slows down and emphasises the nature and sequence of ‘actions’ of looking, writing, reading and interpreting evidence regarding handwriting during the practice and process of transcribing. Indeed, with every change in handwriting within the manuscript, a decision is required by the transcriber about what and how to record this – is it Bailey, Soane, or another hand? In my transcription of the R.I. manuscript, as described above, I record the handwriting shifts with the editorial symbols: [JS] for Soane, and: [>>] for another hand which is neither Soane nor Bailey. Whilst both of these symbols are sometimes appended by a question-mark – ultimately signalling uncertainty regarding whether the handwriting definitely changes or not – the adding of this question mark still needs to be decided on.
Transcribing the Layout: Reading the Form and Content Again

It is important to explain that my transcription approach, which focuses on transcribing the changes in hands, and on the layout and spacing (as will be discussed in this section), is also informed by the Soane office’s own methods of transcribing the lecture manuscripts of others. In 1806, for example, Soane transcribed the third lecture of Thomas Sandby, Soane’s predecessor as R.A. Professor of Architecture, and he had one of his assistants copy the second of Sandby’s lectures. Then, in 1807, in further preparation for the R.A. lectures which would begin in 1809, Soane himself transcribed Lectures 1 and 6, and his assistant George Bailey transcribed Lectures 2-5 of the lecture manuscripts.\(^{162}\) In not getting his assistants to transcribe all these lecture manuscripts, and in carrying out three himself, it is reasonable to guess that Soane approached the actual doing of the transcription not simply as the means by which a copy could be produced, but as a valuable activity in its own right for his practice of preparing to lecture.

Related to the suggestion that the practice of transcription itself potentially operated for Soane as a way of reading and engaging with the work of others, it is also worth highlighting that transcription formed a significant activity in the preparation for his lectures, with the resulting transcription artefacts being meticulously dated.\(^{163}\) I find Soane’s and Bailey’s transcriptions particularly interesting for the way they not only transcribe the words, but also at the same time attempt (in a manner which relates to my own approach discussed in the previous section) to transcribe the different hands at work that later edited and added to Sandby’s own lecture manuscript. As Watkin notes, Sandby’s original manuscripts were later read by Edward Edwards,\(^{164}\) who changed the tense of these lecture texts from the first to the third person, clearly for the purposes of reading them aloud.\(^{165}\) What Watkin does not mention is that Soane’s transcription (shown in Image 45), and the

\(^{162}\) SM Archives, Al 31B; Also see Watkin, *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought*, 40-41. For further transcriptions dated 1813 of Sandby’s Lecture 4 and 5, see SM Archives, 1/52.


\(^{164}\) Edward Edwards was R.A. Professor of Perspective and read Sandby’s lectures on his behalf between 1797 and 1798, as Henry Howard would do for Soane in the 1830s. See Watkin, *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought*, 41.

transcriptions that Bailey created for Soane (shown in Images 46-48), both take the approach of recording the changes in hand in Sandby’s manuscript. Looking closer at Soane’s transcription, we can see that it is another hand, possibly Bailey’s, which has in fact recorded Edwards’ hand in the margin of Soane’s transcription. Furthermore, by looking at a detail of Bailey’s transcription, as shown in Image 47, he also textually describes on the left hand of the page material features of the manuscript, for example which words had been ‘scratched out’. We could say, following on from my explanation above, that Soane and Bailey to some degree take a ‘diplomatic transcription’ approach to the Sandby manuscripts.

Significantly, these Soane office transcriptions also replicate the layout of Sandby’s manuscripts, maintaining the page division of being split in two – which I have already noted was common for the period – but also recording the information, as can be seen in Image 48, for the drawing titles which Sandby placed at intervals on the left side of the page. Does the practice of organising the page in this way, which I have already observed to be an important feature of Soane’s own R.I. (and also R.A.) lecture manuscripts, provide evidence that Sandby’s influence on Soane’s lectures was not only at the level of what Soane spoke about and his method of showing large watercolour drawings, as Watkin has already argued? Indeed, it seems possible to also say that, through use of the spatial layout of the page to script the visual and verbal components to communicate architecture in advance of lectures, we can read Sandby’s influence to have also impacted the methods of Soane’s performance practice.

As with transcribing the different hands, my own practice of transcribing the layout of the R.I. manuscripts re-enacted and drew my attention to dimensions of the preparation of Soane’s lectures, and also performance and performance practice, that would not otherwise have been uncovered or engaged with. Indeed, by replicating the layout of every page, I

---

166 For an example of a related diplomatic transcription approach which attempts to replicate all visual aspects of the transcribed manuscript – and a manuscript from the same historical period as Soane’s R.I. lecture manuscripts – see Kenneth Neill Cameron (ed.), *Shelley and his Circle, 1773-1822* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1961).
further engaged with the idea, which I had already observed when these manuscripts were submitted to a silent reading, that these manuscripts clearly scripted the visual and verbal. However, through the repeated practice of transcribing this layout and spacing, I not only noticed the spatial division of different kinds of information, but also the interplay between the long dashes, which pepper the entire lecture text and constitute a standard form of representing spoken pauses in writing from the period,\textsuperscript{167} and the titles of drawings opposite. Images 49 and 50 show two of my own transcriptions of pages 36 and 37 of Soane's second R.I. lecture 1817 in raw form, together with my own handwritten annotations added on top. From these transcriptions, it is possible to read between the title of the drawing written on the left-hand side, and the textual content of the lecture, which refers to the same buildings, on the right. But it is not only this, however, for it is also possible to locate the precise moment in the text when some of these drawings were shown. Indeed, it seems that it is possible to read how the dashes not only signal a pause in the spoken delivery, but also typographically script and signify the physical act of showing a drawing in the lecture. This suggestion by the manuscript of the physical act of showing a drawing object follows on from the observations already made in 'Reading In’ regarding the Somerset House drawing comment ‘leave this + take away all the others’ recorded on the right of these two transcription pages (itself written above an even more intriguing quotation from Virgil, also added in Soane’s hand, asking the question ‘is (this episode) not stitched in a little inartificially?’).

In addition to showing my raw transcriptions of these pages, I also show colour-coded versions in Images 51 and 52 of the same pages which highlight the three hands at work.

But as I continued to transcribe I not only noticed that there were correspondences between titles and typographic pauses in the adjacent text,

\textsuperscript{167} For discussion of Laurence Sterne’s use of “elocutionary” punctuation of the dash in The Sentimental Journey, see: M.B. Parkes, Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West (Abingdon: Routledge, 1992).

\textsuperscript{168} Soane is writing this comment in response to criticisms of William Chambers written in the lecture text opposite. See SM Archives, Soane Case 157, Lecture 2, Royal Institution Lectures (1817), 37. Soane also wrote these words in his commonplace book from his copy of Warton’s Virgil, on what appears to be the date 15 June 1817 (one day after the second R.I. lecture); SM Archives, Soane Case 172, MS Extracts etc. relating to Architecture. J. Soane (1815), 373. Virgil, The Works of Virgil: In Latin and English. The Original Text Correctly Printed from the Most Authentic Editions, Collated for this Purpose. The Aenid translated by ... Christopher Pitt, the Eclogues and Georgics, with notes on the whole, by ... Joseph Warton, Vol. 1 (London: printed for R. Dodsley, 1753), 384–385, note to line 633.
but also that there appeared to be a varying approach to the order in which the drawings were shown in relation to the words that were spoken. Indeed, in Images 49-50 we can see that drawings of the architect William Chambers's mausoleum, Marylebone church and Somerset House (which I have numbered) appear to have been scripted to be shown after the written descriptions of them were made. By comparison, in Images 53-54, which show my transcriptions of pages 24 and 25 which come earlier in the same second lecture, we can see that the drawings which were shown at this point in the lecture can, in contrast to the first example, be recognised to have been shown before the description in the lecture text of the buildings depicted in the drawings was to be spoken.

Indeed, whether or not this was an effective or successful performance method for scripting the action of showing drawings at the same time as speaking words,⁶⁹ it nevertheless demonstrates the use of the written manuscript to attempt not only to aid in the coordination of word and drawing in the lecture, but also to script the staging of word-drawing temporal relations as they pertained to different types of drawings. Indeed, in addressing one of the first research questions I pose in this thesis – of whether the words led the drawings or the drawings led the words – we could say from this evidence, engaged with specifically through the process of the practice of re-enacting through transcription the manuscripts form and content, that it was both. Whilst in the first example the lecture drawings could be described as following the words (or are the words introducing the drawings?), in the second example the drawings – which, it should also be noticed, are specific types of comparative drawings – appear to play a more active role of leading the words by coming first in the performance. Whilst in the first example the drawings appear to play a subservient and illustrative role, in the second example of drawings there is the suggestion of these comparative drawings doing something more than that which is described in the words.

⁶⁹ See a letter written to Soane by the journalist James Perry dated '8 June', probably between Soane's second and third R.I. lecture of 1820, which suggests the lecture drawings were shown too quickly. SM Archives, Priv Corr IV.P.1.2. For criticism of Soane's coordination and 'delivery' of the words and drawings in his R.A. lectures seven years earlier, see R.H., Examiner, No. 42, 21 January 1810, 43.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>View of design for a Mausoleum, by Sir W. C.</th>
<th>design for a Mausoleum made at the command of the late Prince of Wales, and that for a church for the opulent Parish of Mary-le-bone(!)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plan of do.</td>
<td>It is difficult to account for those noble designs not having been realised. In his great Work Somerset Place, excluding the view of the Thames, from the large Quadrangle is such a defect that neither the convenience in the arrangement or the magnificence of this noble structure can sufficiently atone for: Sir W. Chambers having Sir William Chambers—This great artist professes to have formed his taste more on the models of the great Italian Masters than the higher feelings of Grecian Art, ... his Works are *&lt;-&gt;?&gt; must be judged agreeably to their principles, and it would then be admitted that particularly in the front next the Strand, he has happily combined the simple elegance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elevation of Mary le bone Church by Sir W. C.</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Section of do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>View of Somerset Place another.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

particular in the front next the Strand, he has happily combined the simple elegance of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>View of Farnese Palace.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Stoppani,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Piazza Bra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Pitti Palace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Fontana di Trevi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. of Palladio[...].> with the long unbroken lines of Michael Angelo to the exterior of the Farnese Palace, [...] of Raphael in the Stoppani [...] of Michele San Michele in the Piazza Bram at Verona, [...] of [...] Filippo Brunelleschi in the Pitti Palace at Florence, uniting the boldness of these great restorer of Art with the playfulness of Salvii in the Fontana di Trevi [...].

With all the powerful claims to approbation, Somerset Place has not escaped the severities of anonymous criticism: [...] as a scientific publication after a variety of practical observations on the principal parts of this great National Work, then notices the front next the Strand in these words [...] "The most striking defects of the front towards the Strand is the extravagant height "of the Basement [...] the tallow of "the Arches, the heavy, inelegant "decorations of the Windows [...], the "absurdity of decorating them all...

Image 50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>View of design for a Mausoleum, by Sir W. C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Plan of do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Elevation of Mary le bone Church by Sir W. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Section of do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>View of Somerset Place another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

design for a Mausoleum made at the command of the late Prince of Wales, and that for a church for the opulent Parish of Mary-le-bone have been so justly ignored that it is difficult to account for those noble designs not having been realised. In his great Work Somerset Place, excluding the view of the Thames, from the large Quadrangle is such a defect that neither the convenience in the arrangement nor the magnificence if this noble structure can sufficiently atone for. Sir W. Chambers having Sir William Chambers. This great artist professed to have formed his taste more on the models of the great Italian Masters than the higher feelings of Grecian Art. His Works must be judged agreeably to their principles, particularly in the front next the Strand, he has happily combined the simple elegance of

A he has happily combined, particularly in the front next the Strand. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>View of Farnese Palace</th>
<th>with the long unbroken lines of Michael Angelo in the exterior of the Farnese Palace, of Raphael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Stoppani</td>
<td>in the Stoppani; of Michele San</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Piazza Bra.</td>
<td>Michele in the Piazza Bram at Verona, of ^Fi^ Filippo Bruneleschi in the Pitti Palace at Florence, uniting the boldness of these great restorers of Art with the playfulness of Salvi in the Fontana di Trevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Pitti Palace,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Fontana di Trevi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Front of Somerset House next the Strand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leave this + take away all the others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is not (this episode) stitched in a little inartificially?

With all the powerful claims to approbation, Somerset Place has not escaped the severities of anonymous criticism in a satirical publication after a variety of peevish observations on the principal parts of this great National Work, thus notices the front next the Strand in these words. "The most striking defects of the Front towards the Strand, is the extravagant height of the Basement; the tallness of the Arches, the heavy, inelegant decorations of the Windows; the absurdity of decorating them all in..."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>drawing of Temple of Peace; 182 2 Note Office, and Assembly Room at York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>View of the great Hall in the Baths of Diocletian do, Consol Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Section of Hall of the Baths of Diocletian, and the Consol Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>View of Temple of Minerva Medica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>do, doric Vestibule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sections of Temple of Minerva Medica and doric Vestibule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Section of Coliseum, and the Circus at Bath.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. By comparing the Geometrical Elevations of the same room and the Assembly Rooms at York with the Temple of Peace, a scale is formed.

2. The Perspective View of the great Hall in the Baths of Diocletian and the Consol Office in the Baths give imperfect Ideas of magnitude. The comparison must be made by Geometrical Sections. It is the same with the Temple of Minerva Medica and the great Hall at the Baths, the Perspective deceives us as to magnitude:  

8. When we compare the Circus at Baths with the Coliseum can we doubt of its capacity to contain 80,000 Spectators, or can we cease to admire the noble Ideas of the Ancients?  

Instead of showing the comparative Immensity of this Temple of Peace, by the large room at the Bank I could have wished to have selected Westminster Hall; had there been time to have made the Drawing, and I was still more
more anxious to have shewn the large
and magnificent Hall in Carlton House
as being more generally known to my
audience than the Assembly Room at York
or those at the Bank: this however
I could not presume to do without
permission of Dr. Willard: + Royal Master:

The foundation for the revival
of the Fine Arts was happily
commenced by Brunelleschi,
Julius Second completed:
... his glorious idea of rebuilding the
Basilica of St. Peter, consolidated all * united:
the energies of the Italian Artists,
... out of this mighty assemblage of
high talents, Bramante was selected
to design and construct the intended
Church: *[++] this was an almost happy choice <[+]> _

first
the powers of Bramante to conceive
and execute great Works, could only
be equalled by the decided taste
and exalted mind of his highly
gifted Patron: ... * this mighty
fabric <[+]> of the Basilica of St. Peters ^ after engaging
successively:
for a Century and an half the
great Artists of Italy, and consuming
the immense resources of the Holy
See[?], exhibited such mighty proofs of

Elevation of St. Peter's
with the Bank,
Ravilfe Library,
and
Pantheon in WA front:
Through my own project of transcribing the R.I. manuscripts I wanted to
directly respond to the observations I had made about the active role previous
editorial policies had played in the historiography of Soane’s lectures by
specifically incorporating this drawing-related written information which
Bolton and Watkin had both left out when they reproduced the R.A. lecture
texts. It is important to be clear here that, whilst I was influenced by Bolton’s
and Watkin’s written transmissions of the R.A. lectures, the type of
manuscript which Bolton and Watkin reproduced relating to the R.A. lectures
was a different kind of manuscript to the one which I have transcribed
relating to the R.I. lectures. Indeed, unlike the case of the R.A. lectures where
a great many different manuscripts containing the R.A. lecture texts exist, in
my situation there was only one R.I. manuscript to choose from and this was
the one that was prepared to be read aloud in the R.I. lectures themselves.
Unlike the fair copy R.A. manuscripts containing the R.A. lecture texts which
Bolton and Watkin copied, these R.I. manuscripts still contained the types of
marginal annotations and amendments which seemed to play a significant
role in scripting the lectures’ eventual reading and performance. Focusing on
transcribing firstly the handwriting, and secondly the layout, spacing and
punctuation aimed to specifically engage with these aspects.

Importantly, transcribing as a practice allows one to study the original source
material, whilst transcription as an object (as shown in Appendix 1) can, in
turn, through being a new presentation of the original R.I. manuscript,
operate as a medium for communicating the history by foregrounding
particular aspects of the lecture manuscripts and new evidence that appear to
have played an important role in the Soane office’s performance practice of
lecturing within them but which have not been recognised before. Here, I am
interested in transcription’s dual function of operating simultaneously as, on
the one hand, a research tool or practice for reading and revealing the
evidence, and as, on the other hand, a research artefact or object.
Transcription is a means for showing and telling the history and its process of
being read to the audience that is the reader.
Part II:
Drawing In, Drawing Out,
Drawing In, Drawing Out,
Drawing Again
Introduction: Drawing

*Part I* explored Soane’s lectures through evidence that can be read from the R.I. lecture manuscripts, whilst *Part II* explores what can be read subsequently of the same performance practice of lecturing through a different body of documents: Soane’s lecture drawings.

As I have investigated in *Part I*, clues about these drawings’ visual and physical impact on the lectures and their role in Soane’s performance practice of lecturing are suggested continuously by even the briefest of reading encounters with the manuscripts. This includes information about the ways that written instructions about the spoken and drawn components of the lectures appear to have been developed interactively, and the suggestion from the manuscript that the Soane office deliberately scripted the actions of the lecture performance of showing drawings whilst speaking specific words.

In *Part II: Drawing*, I combine the words ‘in’, ‘out’, and ‘again’ with the term ‘drawing’ in a related but different formation to the way they are combined with the term ‘reading’ in *Part I*. This reflects the related but different process of reading the lecture drawings carried out in the second part of the thesis. Here, rather than three sections, I repeat the actions of ‘Drawing In’ and ‘Drawing Out’ across four shorter sections to accommodate a more intense process of directly and contextually engaging with different kinds of evidence related to Soane’s lecture drawings. These four sections (‘Drawing In’, ‘Drawing Out’, ‘Drawing In’, ‘Drawing Out’) are concluded with a final section, ‘Drawing Again’, which mirrors the concluding section of *Part I* (‘Reading Again’) by considering performative evidence generated through re-enacting printed facsimiles of Soane’s lecture drawings.
PART II

Drawing In: to the Lecture Drawings and Their Storage, Cataloguing and Viewing Spaces Over Time

In this section I start by drawing in close to the lecture drawings in the Soane Museum archive, introducing their appearance and material qualities, and outlining their changing storage across the different buildings of 12-14 Lincoln’s Inn Fields and the Soane Museum’s cataloguing processes over time. Whilst I start by briefly contextualising the lecture drawings, and making reference to Watkin’s existing research on them, I postpone a fuller account of what subjects the drawings depict (which is the work Watkin’s scholarship largely addresses) to the subsequent section which focuses on how the lecture drawings have previously been described.

As will be referred to in more detail in the later section ‘Drawing In: To Reading the Lecture Drawings in the R.I. Lectures’, viewing the lecture drawings today takes place within the Soane Museum’s Research Library spaces located in the first-floor front and rear drawing rooms of 14 Lincoln’s Inn Fields. This town house is located next door to numbers 12 and 13, which are occupied by most of the public parts of the Soane Museum, Soane’s former architectural office spaces and also private quarters. Soane bought number 14 in 1823, converting the back of the residence into an extension of the Museum (the Picture Room, Museum Corridor, Monk’s Parlour and Monk’s Yard) by 1824, and converting the front main house (in which the current Library is located) by 1827. Soane always intended for this house to be rented, which it was from 1828 until the end of Soane’s life, but it was not included within Soane’s personal estate and endowment of the Museum as the result of a disagreement regarding his will. It was sold in 1874 and occupied by a succession of different freeholders, before in 1996 being acquired again by the Museum. In 2006 it was restored and in 2009 the Research Library was relocated to its premises.¹

As has been noted by Watkin, Soane did not himself execute the majority of the drawings which were shown in his lectures; rather, he had them

produced by the boys in his office, at his own expense. Identifying that ‘[m]ost of the lecture drawings were produced between 1806 and 1815 at a time when the Napoleonic Wars had drastically reduced the number of architectural commissions’, Watkin also reflected on the labour involved in producing the lecture drawings during and after this period:

The industry that went into the making of Soane’s lecture illustrations was little short of astonishing [...] So much time was devoted to this task that the office must have seemed like a factory. [...] Soane assigned the bulk of this labour to his articled pupils, of whom he had between four and six each year, working the long hours of 7.00 a.m. to 7.00 p.m. in the summer, and 8.00 a.m. to 8.00 p.m. in the winter.

These lecture drawings were made in watercolour, with pencil used to outline and emphasise the silhouettes and decoration of the numerous depictions of ancient and modern buildings from Britain, Europe and further afield. The total number of lecture drawings prepared for the lectures amounted to somewhere in the region of 1,500, of which only 815 were actually shown. Perhaps the most striking characteristic of these drawings is their contrasting tone and bright colour, which are used to indicate differing building materials, or to emphasise a building (or buildings) against a landscape which itself is often varied, or to differentiate between the parts of a single building or a set of buildings, often composed one in front of another or appearing at different distances from the viewer. Tonal washes create shadows within the decorative detail of entablatures and under cornicing, down and around columns, within covered recesses, and in the voids of windows and doors. Drawn in a combination of perspective, section, elevation and plan, and sometimes uniting more than one of these ‘aspect’ types to a single drawing, the lecture drawings do not conform to one method or strategy of representation. Whilst the perspectives adopt a pictorial approach, with buildings set in elaborate landscapes and often including figures that inhabit their scenes (see Images 55-57), others, such as the building details and plans, are more like instructive diagrams, with thicker outlines and large words written to accompany the drawings (see Images 58-62).

---

2 For an account of the assistants who made these drawings, see Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 397-399.
3 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 397.
4 Watkin, Visions of World Architecture, 1.
Image 69

Image 70

Image 71
Whilst some vividly compare buildings by overlaying elevations, a comparative technique in which, according to Watkin, Soane was a ‘pioneer’ (see Images 63-64), others compare buildings side by side, or one above the other (see Images 65-66). As can be appreciated by viewing the drawings in Images 55-68, whilst the watercolour medium creates uniformity in appearance across the drawings as a coherent body of architectural representations produced for Soane’s lectures, notable resemblances and differences between the drawings are nevertheless immediately apparent, and there is an evident sense that they were made by different artists (as Watkin discusses), or during different phases of doing the lectures. Whilst it is difficult to identify who made the drawing if it has not been signed, or during precisely which phase if there is no date, examples of these perceptible stylistic variances occur through the use of specific pictorial devices (for example, the placement of figures), varying colour palate (some are very yellow whilst others are more blue), or the approach adopted to the practical application and layering of paint (sometimes thickly and opaquely, sometimes more of the bare paper is left to show through). Drawings also vastly differ in their degree of finish, with some appearing highly laboured over and finessed (often not at the same time), whilst others have still visible sketchy pencil lines or appear to be much cruder.

The lecture drawings have several kinds of written inscriptions on them which provide information about their production and use in the lectures, at the same time as constituting an important aspect of their material and visual appearance. On their fronts, in the top left-hand corner, they often have a number written directly onto them, or onto a separate white label glued onto the drawing’s surface (Images 69-71). This number records the specific lecture to which the drawing once belonged, as well as its position in relation to the other drawings in that lecture. Other numbers are written in the top and bottom right-hand corner of the fronts of many of the lecture drawings, in either red, brown/black ink, or pencil, apparently as a separate numbering of these drawings since Soane’s lifetime (Image 75). Sometimes, at the bottom of the front or back, there is a small signature of the boy in Soane’s office who made the drawing, as well as a date and description or title of what the drawing is of (Images 72 and 74).

---

Many of the drawings also have written on them, rendered in thick dark paint, larger titles which presumably were aimed to verbally announce to the audience what they depict (Images 61 and 62). Titles are also sometimes written on separate pieces of paper, glued to the middle of the top of the front of the drawing. Spots of glue that remain on the drawings suggest that more of these separately attached written titles existed at some point in the past but were later removed (Image 70). On the backs of the drawings are further inscriptions, written in a range of hands and in different pens, pencils and colours of ink (Image 76). The backs of the lecture drawings appear to be a field of inscriptions; as with the numbers noted onto their fronts, these inscriptions record the inclusion of individual drawings in specific dated lectures, as well as, their precise position in that lecture.

Most of these drawings are mounted. Originally executed on a thin sheet of paper, they have mostly been later mounted on another layer of stiffer paper, presumably to make them more robust as objects to be transported between Soane’s office and the R.A. and R.I., or when moving them around the museum where they were stored. In the case of the largest lecture drawings, which measure up to seven feet, the drawing was made in two parts and then connected. Together with their backing sheets, they are thick objects and form a heavy pile when laid on top of one another. Sometimes the paper on which these drawings are mounted forms a border around the drawing, whilst at other times a drawn frame has been added with several lines of pen and ink or thicker paint directly around the edges of the drawing (Images 69-74). Holes, which go through the backing sheet, can often be noticed in the corners of many of the drawings, suggesting they were pinned to the drawing board or to the wall for display. Holes running down the left-hand side also remain from some of the drawings’ previous life of being stitched into volumes by later curators of the Museum (Image 71).
Whilst the changes to the inventories and cataloguing of the books, and the movement of the physical library spaces during and after Soane’s lifetime have been traced by historians in some detail, the movement and storage of the drawings and their cataloguing have not been studied. One document which helps considerably in carrying out this task is an uncatalogued handwritten account by the tenth Soane Museum Curator Margaret Richardson whilst she was still Inspectress of the Museum in c.1989. This account is a draft introduction to an intended printed volume (which was not in the end published) of a new ‘Concise Catalogue’ outline list of Soane’s drawings. This ‘Concise Catalogue’, together with Richardson’s introduction, was originally produced to accompany the microfilm of all Soane’s drawings which was being created at that time by Chadwyck-Healey under the curatorship of Peter Thornton. Richardson’s account traces, in her own words, ‘how Soane kept his collection of drawings in his own day and [...] the various rearrangements made by successive Curators after his death in 1837’.

Whilst Richardson sets out the various changes which different curators of the Soane Museum have applied to all the different kinds of drawings in Soane’s collection (ultimately in an attempt to identify which parts of the collection may have retained the Soane office order), one aspect of this account of particular interest to my study is Richardson’s mentioning of changes to the lecture drawings’ physical whereabouts and cataloguing.

It is a fact that unearthing and narrating this institutional story of the lecture drawings would be very difficult without the guidance of an expert such as Richardson, who was writing from the position of practically working daily with the drawings collection. Throughout my work of reading the lecture drawings as evidence for Soane’s nineteenth-century performance practice, and whilst following in the footsteps of Richardson, I have been reminded that the knowledge which makes up such a history of the material and spatial

---


8 Sir John Soane’s Museum Architectural & Ornamental Drawings including illuminated manuscripts, topographical subjects and other drawings (Chadwyck-Healey, c.1989). This resource consists of 55 reels of 35mm colour microfilm.

9 Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 3.
Image 77
distribution and afterlife of the lecture drawings indeed does not only exist in written documents, but in the knowledge, actions and often embodied practices of the people who have worked with this material at different times during and since Soane’s lifetime. The following spatial description tries to give this part performance, part architectural history of the lecture drawings a shape by writing and imaging it. As well as directly examining primary evidence contained in different curators’ inventories and reports, it draws heavily on Richardson’s draft introduction. In so doing, I also extend and consider the implications of Richardson’s observations that the lecture drawings, above any other group of drawings in the collection, are the ones which have challenged and been most rearranged in various ways by previous curators. In this description I directly quote from the reports of some curators of the Museum, such as Arthur Bolton, where attention is drawn to the physical labour of handling drawings, and which in turn relate to and have influenced my own performances of handling the drawings in the archive later in Part II.

Richardson shows how lecture drawings were stored both in the Monk’s Parlour and in the Upper Drawing Office during Soane’s lifetime. The drawings held in the Monk’s Parlour were stored in a ‘large antiquarian chest’, which can be seen in Joseph Gandy’s watercolour from 1824 (Image 77). This piece of furniture is still in position within this same space located on the ground floor of number 13, next to the Picture Room, although the lecture drawings are no longer stored here. The Upper Drawing Office, on the other hand, is located one floor up at the back of number 13, within an innovative top-lit space constructed as a ‘floating box, free of the main walls’, hung above the Colonnade. The Upper Drawing Office in its current form (see Image 78) was built in 1821; however, it too no longer houses the lecture drawings.

---

10 Richardson, 'Introduction to the Concise Catalogue', 4.
11 Richardson, 'Introduction to the Concise Catalogue', 4.
12 Richardson and Stevens (eds), John Soane: Architect: Master, 152.
Image 78
Whilst this current space is where we can guess the drawings would have been produced for the later second phase of R.A. lectures between 1832 and 1836, drawings for the earlier 1817 and 1820 R.I. lectures, and indeed most of the first phase of R.A. lectures delivered up to 1820, would have been prepared in the previous incarnation of this space, known as the Upper Office, existing from 1812 and shown in the Soane period view of the same year in Image 79. Whilst the Lower Office also existed at this time, there would not have been enough desk space for the lecture drawings to be prepared there; indeed, this latter space seems to have been mainly cupboards, including, for example, what is now known as the ‘Adam Cupboard’ in the Colonnade.

Richardson points out how we can read from the inventories produced in 1837 by George Bailey, first Curator of the Soane Museum, how the lecture drawings were stored both in the Monk’s Parlour and in the Upper Drawing Office. Richardson states that ‘Bailey numbered the RA Lecture Drawings (Drawer 25-30, Monk’s Parlour) in red ink in the top right-hand corner’ – as indeed can be read on these drawings today and as I show in previous image 75 – and ‘left them in their original Soane order, itemising each one.’ Bearing in mind that, as my own research shows, Bailey was heavily involved in scribing and coordinating the lectures for the R.A. and R.I. (although he did not lead this process; this is further explored later in Part II), it is not surprising that he retained the order of the drawings. Indeed, as Richardson also comments, it is likely he put such systems in place. She writes of Bailey that:

For many years before [Soane’s death in 1837] he had virtually acted as Soane’s office manager. It was Bailey who sorted, arranged and catalogued the papers and drawings in the office, as many entries in the Day Books testify. Indeed it is likely that Bailey himself created the arrangement of drawings in Soane’s time and knew more about the practical running of the office than Soane did.

---

34 As stated in my introduction, these later lectures were read on behalf of Soane by R.A. Secretary Henry Howard.
35 Richardson and Stevens (eds), John Soane: Architect: Master, 153.
36 Many thanks to Helen Dorey for verbal explanation of this space.
38 Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 5.
himself. [...] It is probable, therefore, that the locations given in
the first Inventory reflect Soane office practice.¹⁹

Commenting further on this logic behind the ways in which the lecture
drawings were both physically stored and numerically indexed, Richardson
suggests that the lecture drawings, both at the time of Bailey’s 1837 inventory
and earlier, were specifically ‘arranged in the order of the Lectures for which
they were used as illustrations.’²⁰ Here, Richardson uses the term ‘practice’,
albeit in passing, to expressly refer to the significance of the Soane office’s
early nineteenth-century ways and methods of arranging and storing the
drawings according to their use in the lectures. This definition of the ‘practice’
of the lectures corresponds with my own definition, laid out in my
introduction, of the process of the practical doing and executing of the
lectures.

Looking at Bailey’s inventories directly, pages of which are shown in Images
80 and 81, it is interesting to consider the wording of the titles in the drawing
inventory for the lecture drawings. Referring to those which were ‘used’,
Bailey writes:

The Drawers, N³⁸. 25. to 30, in “the Monk’s Parlour”,
Contain a Collection of Drawings used by
Sir John Soane to illustrate his Lectures
on Architecture delivered in the Royal
Academy.²¹

Referring to those drawings ‘not used’ and held in the Upper Drawing Office,
Bailey writes:

Drawer 43.
Sundry Miscellaneous Drawings prepared to
Illustrate the Lectures on Architecture delivered

²⁰ Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 5. Bolton originally notices or analyses this in
1924, as recorded in his report to the Trustees; see SM Archives, ‘Further Report on the Classification
²¹ SM Archives, George Bailey, ‘An Inventory of the Various Works of Art, Natural Curiosities, Fittings,
and Fixtures etc. in Sir. John Soane’s Museum, in January 1837, taken by the Curator, by Order of the
PART II

In the Drawer, No. 28, are several of the most important and curious Drawings, and by
the late Local to illustrate his Lectures on Architecture delivered in the Royal
Academy, 1824.

Drawer No. 25 contains Drawings, chiefly on
Antiquarian Subjects, and numerous
Red Lak., right hand corner, etc., as
follows,

1. 50. Several Examples of the Ancient

2. 56. Various of Ancient

Image 80

Image 81
by Sir J. Soane in the Royal Academy but not used, and duplicates of others, that have been used.22

Between 1842 and 1904, Richardson notes that the lecture drawings remained in the same order and numbering system as Bailey had recorded them, and stayed in the same locations of the Monk’s Parlour and Upper Drawings Office.23 She then points out that it was only with Walter Spiers’ curatorship between 1904 and 191724 that the first changes were made to the physical ordering and associated cataloguing of the lecture drawings. Richardson explains how Spiers,

[...] completely reorganised the RA Lecture Drawings in the plan chest in the Monk’s Parlour and Drawer 43 in the Upper Drawing Office grouping them by subject, e.g. ‘Ancient and Modern Buildings showing their comparative sizes’, Classic orders, primitive huts, Greek buildings, Roman buildings, Rome, Italy, Paris, France and Austria. He arranged the buildings in Great Britain and London in alphabetical order.

These changes are recorded in the detailed drawing inventories which Spiers produced of all the drawings in Soane’s collection, which, Richardson notes, ‘stand as probably the first professional catalogues of architectural drawings’.25 By referring directly to Spiers’s inventory, we can read, as shown in Images 82 and 83, that the lecture drawings (again, with reference only to the R.A. lectures) were kept in the same drawers 25–30 in the Monk’s Parlour as recorded by Bailey in the previous century.26 Drawer 43, on the other hand, which Bailey recorded had previously held lecture drawings which were ‘not used’, now contained ‘Royal Academy Lecture Drawings Cont’d’, and more specifically: ‘London Buildings Continued’.27

24 Soane Museum curators between first Curator George Bailey and sixth Curator Walter Spiers were as follows: Joseph Bonomi (1861-1878), James Wild (1878-1892), Wyatt Papworth (1893-1894), George Birch (1894-1904).
This meant that drawer 43 in the Upper Drawing Office (referred to by Spiers as the ‘Students Room’) became at this point a continuation of the drawings held in drawer 30 in the Monk’s Parlour. Spiers’s new numbering system started at ‘I’ for each drawer, running continuously for the contents of each drawer, but within each drawer there were separate subject groupings as per Richardson’s description. In addition, and as can also be seen in the two columns of numbers running down the left of the drawing titles in the inventory, whilst Spiers ‘renumbered all the drawings’, he also ‘compiled a Concordance in his catalogue showing Bailey’s original numbering system’. This is helpful for comparing the two systems, allowing us to read the ways in which Spiers’s rearrangement often resulted in lecture drawings being moved between the different drawers (in their two locations), as well as often resulting in sequences of drawings staying together (thus Spiers both disturbed and retained different elements of Bailey’s and potentially Soane’s original drawing order).

The most significant changes, however, to the storage and cataloguing of the lecture drawings were carried out by Arthur Bolton, the seventh Soane Museum curator (1917-45), who edited and published in 1929 the R.A. lecture texts, photographically reproducing images of some of the lecture drawings in print for the first time. These changes were informed by and occurred in parallel to a broader programme which Bolton initiated of reorganising the library, Soane’s book collection, and the built spaces in which they were stored and could be read by researchers. From 1924, as Richardson notes, the lecture drawings were moved from the Monk’s Parlour and Upper Drawing Office, their homes since Soane’s lifetime, to new drawers in a new ‘Advanced Students’ Reading Room and Architectural Library’ (shown in Images 84 and 85), which was newly created within the first-floor North and South Drawing Rooms of number 13. As Eileen Harris shows, this space, which offered a ‘clubby atmosphere’ and operated as ‘an alternative to the RIBA’, was created in an attempt by Bolton to make Soane’s book collection, which was then stored throughout the house, more accessible and less confusing to negotiate.

---

30 Bolton, Lectures on Architecture.
as well as to create a space where the books and large folios could be viewed.\footnote{Harris, “O, Books!”, 247. Prior to this, Soane’s library and book collection had been located since the 1790s in both the Breakfast Room in 12 Lincoln’s Inn Fields, and in Soane’s second residence until 1810 at Pitzhanger; see Margaret Willes, ‘Building a Library: The Books of Sir John Soane’, Reading Matters: Five Centuries of Discovering books (New Haven, Conn., and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 130-131.}

In doing this, Bolton split the books into two: books which he believed to be of interest to students and historians were moved to this new Architectural Library, while all non-architectural items were consigned to a General Library,\footnote{Savage, ‘Hooked on Books: Interpreting John Soane’s Library’, 44.} which continued to be housed in the existing library spaces of the Museum directly below and which Soane had built in 1814 on the ground floor.\footnote{Harris, “O, Books!”, 242-244.} In this reorganisation, as Nicholas Savage writes, ‘Bolton’s intention was to make what he considered the “useful” part of Soane’s library more “accessible” to the architectural student and historian of the day’, concluding, however, that ‘the effect of his rationalisation was to obscure the true character of the library as a whole by imbuing it with an institutional purpose essentially at odds with its private origin.’\footnote{Savage, ‘Hooked on Books: Interpreting John Soane’s Library,’ 44.}

Not only the lecture drawings but most of the rest of the drawing collection were moved into this new space; as Richardson writes, Bolton ‘designed and had made three new plan chests containing 48 drawers in all, in which he managed to accommodate the majority of the architectural drawings.’\footnote{Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 7.} One of the things that comes through Richardson’s description is that Bolton’s reorganisation and centralisation of the storage of the drawings within the same spaces in which they could also be viewed was a direct response to previous difficulties and to the associated cumbersome labour for the Curator of physically retrieving and carrying drawings from differing storage locations on different floors at 13 Lincoln’s Inn Fields to separate viewing spaces and back again. Drawing heavily from Bolton’s own descriptions in annual reports to the Trustees from the mid-1920s,\footnote{For individual annual reports written by Bolton for the years 1922-24, see SM Archives, Soane Museum Annual Reports 1917-1930, Vol. 2 (1917-1930).} Richardson dramatises how, for example,
The Curator had to drag the elephantine folios of the Adam collection up the corkscrew staircase to the Upper Drawing Office and bring them down again at the conclusion of every visit, however brief.\textsuperscript{38}

Likewise, she reflects how,

Drawings kept in the Pompeian Model Stand in the North Drawing Room had to be carried downstairs and then to the back of the Museum.\textsuperscript{39}

Furthermore, she shows how Bolton made his case for the reordering of the lecture drawings in their new storage spaces specifically, as with the library, on the basis of improving accessibility. The difficulties of identifying and physically retrieving lecture drawings depicting Soane's own designs from the rest of the vast number of lecture drawings was continually bemoaned by Bolton and, as Richardson described, ‘brought dread to the heart of the Curator when a visitor arrived’.\textsuperscript{40} From the Museum’s \textit{Annual Reports} we can read in a 1922 ‘Report on the Completion of the Architectural Library of Sir John Soane’s Museum’ that within the Monk’s Parlour, ‘the diagrams’ (by which he means the lecture drawings)

\[
\text{[...]} \text{are most difficult of access, being dispersed in deep drawers, over weighted, and further liable to injury from their large size (4.0 x 2.0), especially as the old drawers are planned end on, instead of lengthwise.}\textsuperscript{41}
\]

In a fascinating report of the previous year of 1921, Bolton writes:

It must always be remembered that ease of access makes all the difference to use. Students and others desirous of seeing these Drawings naturally value their time, whilst from the Curator’s point of view the waste of time in trying to find large drawings in deep and unsuitable receptacles is lamentable. There is also no proper place to exhibit of turn over drawings of this character, and a good deal of damage has been done to them in the past from this

\textsuperscript{38} Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 7.
\textsuperscript{39} Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 7.
\textsuperscript{40} Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 10.
cause. In the Report of 1918 it was pointed out ‘there are too many drawings in the drawers containing these diagrams, 150 to 160 being the average, which, combined with their great size, renders them needlessly difficult to take out and return.’ No one would seriously suggest that a Basement like the ‘Monk’s Parlour,’ is a proper place for keeping valuable coloured Diagrams, executed by some of the best Architectural Draughtsmen of the time, drawings which must always be valued as representative of the work of the Soane School.\footnote{SM Archives, ‘Report for the Year 1921’, Soane Museum Annual Reports 1917-1930, Vol. 2 (1922), 68-69.}

The ‘drawers’ and ‘sets’ which Bolton established during this time continue to be the groupings which (as I will reflect on further below) the museum follows today in ordering Soane’s drawing collection, with the term ‘drawer’ meaning the physical drawers of the furniture which Bolton designed (as described above), and the term ‘set’ meaning the individual groups of drawings held within these drawers. Referring to the drawing collection in general, Richardson explores that, for the most part, whilst Bolton maintained the former groupings which Spiers had adopted, he reorganised the actual order of these sets ‘and interspersed among [these groupings/sets] the Royal Academy Lecture Drawings’.\footnote{Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 8.} Indeed whilst many of the orderings of the drawings stayed the same, Richardson expounds how:

On the other hand, [Bolton] caused considerable disturbance when rearranging the RA Lecture Drawings (which he called ‘Diagrams’). Spiers had already destroyed the original order of the drawings, but he had kept them together in the Monk’s Parlour and in Drawer 43 in the Upper Drawings Office. Bolton, however, completely re-shuffled the drawings and formed new sets, each containing about 15 drawings which he sewed together.\footnote{Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 8-9.}

As Bailey’s rearrangement of the lecture drawings is still the ordering system encountered by current researchers, and as this has very much structured (as I will go on to explain) the reading of the lecture drawings which I have been able to make, it is worth quoting his own description of it written in his 1924 Report to the Trustees. In this Bolton writes:

\begin{quote}

\end{quote}
An attempt was therefore made, when it soon became apparent that the Collection really fell quite naturally into the usual historical method in which architecture is treated, that is today drawings of Renaissance work in Italy came under the names of Palladio, Vignola, San Michele etc., or otherwise as manageable groups like Roman churches, Palaces etc., the same work in England divided itself readily under the names of Inigo Jones, Wren, Vanbrugh, Gibbs, Adam etc. The Curator then found that the balance of more or less theoretical classical illustration fell into groups such as Doric, Ionic etc., Orders, temples, tombs, arches, obelisks etc. In fact, the satisfactory result was arrived at that the seemingly unclassifiable really fell under group headings as simple as the above outline. It is obvious that a student would want to see what drawings, of Wren’s work, for instance, had been made, and to have in, say, two packets, one of his churches, and other his houses, is infinitely better than to have to make the attempt to collect, say, 40 drawings dispersed under an arbitrary classification.45 [I have added italics]

It is interesting to observe the rhetoric of how Bolton articulates his rearrangement of the lecture drawings in terms of being inevitable, ‘natural’, ‘obvious’ and neutrally utilitarian (to enable access); effects which I heighten further by italicising some of his words. Do drawings ever fall naturally into a method or grouping system? Is it really obvious what a student might want to see in a collection or archive?

In 1964, John Summerson, eighth Curator of the Museum between 1945 and 1984, designed a fourth plan chest which added sixteen further drawers to the existing cramped 48 drawers Bolton had created for the Architectural Library.46 Initiated and fuelled by Bolton’s previous endeavours to expand the Museum’s research provision, and with a gradually growing interest at this time both in Soane and in Soane’s library and collections, it was decided that further extra space had to be found to house such activities. In 1969, 12 Lincoln’s Inn Fields was reoccupied by the Trustees with a view to extending the Museum, with the original Soane Museum Act of 1833 having to be changed to a new charity commission order.47 Whilst this move altered the

47 This Scheme was ordered by the Secretary of State for Education and Science under the Charities
terms of the 1833 Soane Museum Act, it allowed for the first-floor Drawing Rooms of number 13 to be reclaimed as Museum space (as Soane had indeed left them), and, from 1971, for the Research Library and viewing of material in Soane’s library, drawing collection and archive to newly occur as an expanded ancillary activity on the first floor of number 12. At this point, the four plan chests containing the entire drawing collection in drawers 1-48 and 61-76, which included the lecture drawings, were moved together with the bookcases into these premises next door (which are now occupied by the current exhibition galleries). Whilst Summerson produced a more detailed catalogue of many of the drawings, he essentially retained the logic and order of Bolton’s ‘drawers’ and ‘sets’.

No changes were made to the storage or ordering of the drawings during Peter Thornton’s period of curatorship between 1984 and 1995; indeed, the ‘Concise Catalogue’ outline list which Richardson produced to accompany the microfilm during this time – as well as the ordering of the microfilm itself – continued to follow Bolton’s previous ‘drawers’ and ‘sets’. Whilst the order, groupings and respective storage spaces of the drawings stayed the same, in order ‘[t]o enable filming’ of the drawings in 1987-88, under Thornton’s initiative ‘all the strings binding the flat drawings in folders’ which Bolton had assembled in the 1920s ‘were cut’. Some of these holes, as referred to at the beginning of this section and shown in Image 71, are still visible on one side of the some of the lectures. In addition to enabling the drawings to be cleaned and repaired, we could reflect that cutting the strings of the drawings would have altered the material encounter with the lecture drawings (and to some degree all the drawings) to more closely assume their character as objects to be used and handled, rather than as pictures sewn into volumes.

Whilst Margaret Richardson, who was Curator between 1995 and 2005, did not make changes to the storage, ordering or viewing spaces of the lecture drawings, or to the broader drawing collection as a whole, her influence was

48 Many thanks to archivist Sue Palmer for explaining this series of events to me.
50 Note that during Summerson’s Curatorship additional drawers 61-76 and 77-84 were also created.
still significant during this period (as it had also been during her role as Inspectress over the preceding eleven years, 1984-95). As her draft introduction to the ‘Concise Catalogue’ testifies, Richardson’s influence took place at the level of analysing and generally professionalising the approach to the drawings collection.53 One of the changes she implemented was to rehouse the drawings in new conservation-grade folders where possible, and she also focused on proactively encouraging the use of the drawings collection by researchers. During this period, a typescript hard copy of the ‘Concise Catalogue’ was made available for researchers to use within the Research Library; it was eventually made digitally available on the museum’s website in c.2000.54

Under Tim Knox’s curatorship (2005-13) came the 2009 move (referred to at the beginning of this section), when the Research Library was again relocated from number 12 to its current premises in number 14, the rear North room of which is shown in Image 86. This is where I have worked throughout this doctoral project, although primarily in the spaces at the front of the building. Over the course of the previous 188 years (from 1821 until 2009), this was the fifth move and sixth set of different architectural spaces in which the lecture drawings could be viewed (from Upper Office, to Upper Drawing Office, to Monk’s Parlour, to Architectural Library, all in number 13; to Research Library in number 12). Whilst, as already described, the lecture drawings can be viewed by researchers within the spaces of the Research Library, with the 2009 relocation from number 12 to 14 the physical places where the lecture drawings are stored moved to the rooms in both number 13 and 14, listed opposite, where they are still located today:

53 Note that prior to working at the Soane Museum Richardson had previously worked at the RIBA drawing collection and had also published on the subject of architectural drawings. See for example, Margaret Richardson, ‘Soane’s Use of Drawings’, Apollo: The International Magazine for Collectors, Vol. 131 (1990), 234-241; Margaret Richardson, ‘Architectural Drawings: Problems of Status and Value’, Oxford Art Journal, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1983), 13-21.
54 This was a previous c.2000 incarnation (no longer online) of Sir John Soane’s Museum, London http://www.soane.org/
| Drawer 1-16 | number 14, first floor front (Research Library) |
| Drawer 17-32 | number 14, first floor rear (Research Library) |
| Drawer 33-48 | number 14, second floor front (The Adam Study Centre) |
| Drawer 49-56 | number 13, Colonnade |
| Drawer 57-60 | number 13, Model Room |
| Drawer 61-76 | number 14, second floor small front room |
| Drawer 77-84 | number 14, ground floor rear |
| Drawer 85-92 | number 13, Model Room |

55 Thanks to Sue Palmer for explaining that drawings in current drawers 85-92 have always been in the Pompeian Stand since Soane (although not always with those numbers).
During the course of Abraham Thomas’s short curatorship between 2013 and 2015, the drawings collection continued to be digitally photographed and a new website with an updated public interface of the collection, including the drawings and lecture drawings, went live in September 2015.\textsuperscript{56} Prior to this, what was available online consisted only of the ‘Concise Catalogue’ text-based outline list of the drawers and sets, together with a selection of specific, more fully catalogued groups of drawings and accompanying images. With the new website came a completely different online interaction with the drawings and access to the lecture drawings. Whilst still organised according to the same system and order of drawers and sets, the use of these terms was largely superseded by a three-part reference number, for example ‘18/5/1’ (denoting what was previously referred to as the drawer/set/drawing number). Whilst the new \textit{Sir John Soane Collection Online} pulls from the same data as the ‘Concise Catalogue’, information about individual drawings is no longer viewed within a list of the other drawings in its drawer and set, as was the case when one previously searched the text-based ‘Concise Catalogue’. Instead, individual entries are viewed for each drawing when one searches the collection, complete with the presentation of an image of that drawing and the title of the set within which that drawing is found. Whilst at the beginning of my own research only some images of a small selection of the lecture drawings were available online, the new website has meant that almost every lecture drawing is now visible and has a separate collection entry.\textsuperscript{57}


Drawing Out: to the Lecture Drawings’ Existing Historical Treatment

Whilst the previous section drew into reading the lecture drawing closely and directly and considering the changing status of the lecture drawings in the Soane Museum processes of cataloguing and storage, this section draws out to considering the lecture drawings more contextually by considering the ways in which the same documents have been considered by other historians. Out of this critical review of this normative history emerges a new set of questions in relation to the lecture drawings, concerning Soane’s lectures as a performance practice, and approaching architectural history as a performative practice.

As I have already summarised in my introduction, in his 1996 study of Soane’s lectures Watkin devoted a chapter to the lecture drawings, and he also curated an exhibition of the lecture drawings at the Soane Museum in 2007.\(^58\) In the previous section, by means of introduction, I cited Watkin’s account of the labour that was carried out by the boys in Soane’s office in producing the lecture drawings. Characterising Soane’s lecture drawings as ‘an unprecedented though little known, visual record of ideas about architectural history at the turn of the eighteenth century’,\(^59\) and as exemplary of Soane’s ‘inventive visual imagination’,\(^60\) Watkin’s focus throughout his accounts of the lecture drawings is to define the scope of the buildings and architectural historical subject matter which were visualised. In addition to the range of differing strategies of representation which were used, the lecture drawings are not limited to representing one building type, style or era. Commenting that ‘[n]othing like these drawings and the visions of world architecture that lay behind them had appeared before’, Watkin has written in detail about the varied content of these drawings of buildings from different times and places.\(^61\) Indeed, Watkin analyses the drawings as falling into three categories:


[...] first, those based on engravings from architectural folios on Soane’s shelves, notably Piranesi; then those drawn by pupils on many site visits in London; finally, a large number were based on Soane’s designs and on drawings by earlier architects in the collection.62

As Watkin explores, and as with the written emphasis of the lectures, a large number of the lecture drawings which were copied from engravings focus on the depiction of ancient architecture, particularly from Greece and Rome, whilst another key subject is that of views of the primitive hut.63 Gothic, Italian Renaissance, English and French Baroque and Neoclassical buildings are also widely represented.64 As Watkin notes, in addition to the vast number of the then contemporary buildings in London which Soane had his assistants draw directly,65 other drawings of buildings and landscapes also based on sketches and surveys carried out on site include those of Stonehenge, Amesbury Abbey and some made whilst on a trip to Paris. In addition to the odd drawing made by Soane earlier in his career, other original drawings which were frequently shown in the R.I. and R.A. lectures include drawings by his R.A. colleagues and elders William Chambers and Thomas Sandby.66

Watkin also concentrated on identifying the ‘source[s] of illustrative material”67 for the lecture drawings, and he noted the other artists and published works which influenced what they depicted as well as their methods of depiction. In addition to reading influences for his novel comparative technique, from architectural theorists Fisher von Erlach, Leroy and Durand,68 other sources of inspiration highlighted by Watkin include the work of Piranesi ‘for the compelling romance of his visual presentation of the monuments of Rome, ancient and modern’,69 and first R.A. Professor of Architecture Thomas Sandby, whose lecture drawings (and topographical drawing and painting practice in general) were also made in watercolour and directly influenced Soane’s lecture drawing subject matter (‘the idea of many

63 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 401.
64 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 401.
65 For details of London architecture recorded in the lecture drawings see Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 406-407.
66 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 396-408.
68 Watkin, Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought, 396, 402.
of them came from Sandby’).\textsuperscript{70} Reflecting on the process of copying and working from engravings, one of Watkin’s main conclusions regarding the lecture drawings is to appraise Soane’s ‘ability to digest the vast mass of visual material presented in the architectural, archaeological and topographical publications from the late seventeenth century to his own day’, and commenting that ‘to turn it into a coherent body of illustrations was truly remarkable’.\textsuperscript{71}

Whilst Watkin has referred to the ‘striking’, ‘inventive’, ‘stunning’, ‘gripping’ and ‘memorable’ appearance of specific lecture drawings, and the ‘vitality and originality’ of their methods of depiction and representation, he does not describe how exactly particular drawings achieved these qualities nor does he probe why they might have been drawn in particular ways or why there may have been a need to invent. Watkin’s note that ‘the unusual expedient of transforming these black and white engravings into gripping watercolours’\textsuperscript{72} seems to be the only occasion where he hints at considering the matter of making the drawings suitable for communicating to an audience in the lecture itself.

One of Watkin’s key conclusions for his study as a whole involves the lecture drawings (which he names, as previously noted, the ‘illustrations’). He writes:

\textit{In one sense, the illustrations were a more valuable achievement than the lectures themselves, for he was more successful in assimilating and presenting the result of his study in the illustrations than in the lectures themselves.}\textsuperscript{73}

This positive appraisal of the lecture drawings is reinforced through the way Watkin highlights that such drawings were also often reported by the audience to have been the most ‘compelling’, ‘successful’\textsuperscript{74} and ‘pleasing’\textsuperscript{75} part of the lectures to be received by Soane’s audiences. In commenting that the

\textsuperscript{70} Watkin, \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, 401-402, 408.  
\textsuperscript{71} Watkin, \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, 400.  
\textsuperscript{72} Watkin, \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, 403.  
\textsuperscript{73} Watkin, \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, 400.  
\textsuperscript{74} These are the words Watkin uses, not direct quotations of the audience members: Watkin, \textit{Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought}, 396, 400.  
\textsuperscript{75} As in the previous footnote, this is the word Watkin uses, not a direct quotation of an audience member: Watkin, \textit{Visions of World Architecture}, 2.
lecture drawings were more of an ‘achievement’ than the writings
(specifically, by representing Soane’s research process more fully), and more
‘successful’ than the written/spoken lecture (when received by the audience),
we could say that Watkin (implicitly) communicates the position that the
lecture words and drawings did different things, and had differing capacities,
both during the lectures’ production and their reception.

In turn, we could also say then that Watkin exhibits and performs more than
one attitude within his study to the status of the drawings in relation to the
written lecture. On the one hand, as in the quotation above, he concludes a
view about the lecture drawings’ active role. On the other hand, through the
more extensive attention he pays to analysing and reproducing the written
lecture, he performs a bias towards the texts. I would also like to draw
attention to the separation Watkin expresses between ‘the illustrations’, and
‘the lectures themselves’, by which he means the written lecture texts.
Watkin’s definition of the written lecture texts as ‘the lectures themselves’
aligns ‘lecture’ with written text, rather than with illustration/drawing or with
written text and illustration/drawing.

In a document published on the Soane Museum’s website entitled ‘Guide for
the cataloguing of drawings by John Soane and his office’, the archivist Jill
Lever describes architects’ drawings as a ‘way of communicating with’. In
relation to this, she goes on to cite ‘the architect himself, the client, the
builder... the estimator, viewer at exhibitions’ amongst the receivers to whom
different kinds of architectural drawings are strategically drawn to be read
by.⁷⁶ Lever’s point, within the context of giving advice about deciding what
dimensions of an architectural drawing may be significant to catalogue, is
that architectural drawing conventions should be approached as reflecting a
drawing’s particular purpose of communication. Architectural drawing
conventions, which were beginning to be standardised in Soane’s lifetime
(such as frame, border, material, paper, text, adopted view, etc.), can
themselves be interpreted to reflect a conscious attempt to aid in this
communication.

⁷⁶ Jill Lever, ‘Guide for the cataloguing of drawings by John Soane and his office’ (London: John
Lever’s list of receivers can easily be extended to include a member of an audience in a lecture. Indeed, bearing in mind the way that architect’s drawings are often characterised in terms of being a strategic medium created for the purpose of being read by a specific person in particular circumstances, it is interesting to consider how Soane’s lecture drawings have not been considered in terms of the ways they may have been deliberately drawn to communicate within the particular scenario of the lecture. Indeed, as I have already just shown, it is the buildings and architectural ideas represented in the drawings which have been the focus of studies to date, but with little consideration of their significance as representations which were made to be delivered and received in lecture form. It is significant to consider how conceptualising the lecture drawing as a type of architectural drawing itself prompts a purpose of performance.

I would like to propose that there could be a new way of defining and approaching these lecture drawings as architectural drawings which were drawn to be used for the particular purpose of performance. As shown over the course of this ‘Reading Out’ section, largely through an appraisal of Watkin’s normative history of these artefacts, whilst Soane’s lecture drawings have not been previously considered in terms of participating in a performance practice of architecture, it is important to highlight that my reading of these early nineteenth-century architectural drawings in such a way, informed by performance history and theory, is not arbitrary to their historical and architectural context. Indeed, such questions have in the first place arisen out of a process of reading the material, visual (and to some degree embodied) evidence contained in and suggested by the lecture drawing objects themselves and their afterlife (as described in the former ‘Drawing In’ section), in conjunction with the previous observations made of the R.I. manuscripts which evidenced a performance practice of architecture through the practice of reading and writing in Part I.

It is important to unpack what it might mean for a drawing to be or to have been drawn to perform, as well as how, if a lecture drawing has been
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deliberately made for the purpose of performance, this might itself constitute a form of performance practice of architecture. Linking with the definitions I have already set out in the ‘Conceptual Framing’ at the beginning of my Introduction to this thesis (although in truth such definitions have in fact arisen out of the observations I am describing here and in Part I), I understand the term ‘performance practice’ to mean: the Soane office’s process over time of developing ways of doing and executing the lectures. These ‘ways of doing’ relate to the status and specificity of lecturing as an activity prepared for, carried out in front of and staged to be received by an audience. Consideration of the ways the lecture drawings were drawn to perform can thus be understood as part of this performance practice of lecturing. To consider a drawing in terms of it being drawn to perform within the situation of the lecture could mean the ways in which the drawing was deliberately drawn to address the audience, or to take into account various different conditions of the drawing’s reception when shown. Within my ‘Conceptual Framing’, which referenced key thinkers in performance history and theory, I also broach, for example, how Marvin Carlson, Gay McAuley and others in architectural history, such as Jane Rendell, have drawn attention to the significance of considering the material and spatial context of a performance for understanding its meaning, whilst others, such as Rebecca Schneider, have particularly drawn attention to the role of the performance’s temporal aspects.

The first concerns the material and physical context of reception in the R.A. and R.I. lecture spaces. How, for example, were the drawings drawn to be viewed from afar? The second concerns another aspect of the condition of reception of the drawings in the lecture and that is the temporal nature of the lecture itself; that is, the fact that the lecture event happened over time. These lecture drawings, which as noted previously were often shown in sequences of more than one-hundred during a single one-hour lecture, could not have been shown or displayed all at the same time. Thus, the question is how were they drawn to perform and address the audience in succession, one after the other? Here we might think back to some of my first observations in Part II, about the varying representational strategies adopted across the lecture drawings for comparing buildings within a single drawing, including arranging elevations next to, or above, and also below other elevations; or through overlaying and layering silhouettes, sections and plans of different buildings directly on top of and in front of one another. Considering the context and situation of the performance of the lecture, we might extend
these existing comparative typologies which are evident in a single lecture drawing. Here, by taking into account the implications of the temporal status of the medium of the lecture itself, we could also consider the intended and received effects of staging comparisons between more than one drawing, shown over the time of the lecture event.

A third condition of reception through which these lecture drawings may be considered concerns whether they were drawn and executed in particular ways to be spoken with. It seems clear from observations of the manuscripts that the Soane office paid careful attention to scripting the relationship between word and drawing whilst preparing for the lectures. In an undated loose note stashed at the back of this 1814 list, Soane wrote, as seen in Image 87:

\[\text{Drawings.}\\ \text{Only such are given as}\\ \text{were indispensably for}\\ \text{illustrating to the eye}\\ \text{what he could not do}\\ \text{so clearly by word}^{78}\]

This fascinating note-to-self seems to record direct and conscious reflection by Soane on the issue of the relationship between the written and the drawn in connection with the activity of lecturing. Within these draft lecture notes, Soane appears to be expressing an attitude that ‘only’ drawings are provided or ‘given’ which were essential for communicating ideas in visual form, which could not otherwise be communicated in written language. But what does the word ‘given’ mean in this context? Is it an act of presenting and listing drawings in the manuscript, and therefore to do with the practice of preparing lectures; or, is it an act of presenting and physically showing drawings in the lecture, and therefore to do with the practice of performing lectures? And to whom are the drawings being ‘given’ – specifically, to whose eyes are they intended to be an illustration – the reader of the page or the audience of the stage?

\[78\] SM Archives, 1/260/1.
Whatever situation the note was originally written to refer to (regarding lecture preparation or performance, or both), one way we could approach reading it is as a statement by Soane about using drawings in relation to words in his lecturing practice in general. On a simple and rather obvious level, we can start by acknowledging that this note expresses Soane’s awareness or belief that drawings have different communicative capacities compared with words.
Drawing In and Turning Over: Reading the Lecture Drawings in the R.I. Lectures

Having established the ways in which Soane’s lecture drawings as a body of documents have previously been understood and classified before, and then emerging from this process of reading, having set out several new observations and questions about the lecture drawings by approaching them as participating in a historical performance practice, this section ‘draws in’ to the specific matter of which sequences of lecture drawings exactly were shown at the R.I. The following not only presents the reader with information about which drawings were shown, but also closely focuses on describing the process undertaken in trying to read which lecture drawings were shown and in what sequence, and it reflects on the significance of describing this process as a performative practice of architectural history.

Images 88-90 list the lecture drawings which were shown by Soane at the R.I. in his first lecture of 1817. Each drawing title is taken from the wording used in the R.I. lecture manuscript (although sometimes it is supplemented by wording used in the separate drawing lists for these lectures). 79 These titles, as I showed in Part I, were written on the left-hand side of the page, adjacent to the lecture text which was read aloud. Alongside some of the drawing titles presented, I supply Soane Museum drawing catalogue reference numbers. These reference numbers note where I have identified the physical lecture drawing in the drawing collection that seems to be the object referred to in the written manuscripts and which was shown in each lecture. As I will explain in detail in due course, identifying which specific lecture drawings were shown at the R.I. may be confirmed to some degree of certainty through the existence of handwritten inscriptions on the backs of these drawings (I showed an image of these inscriptions in previous Image 76). Importantly, whilst Watkin published lists of the sequences of lecture drawings shown in each of the twelve R.A. lectures, he did not publish equivalent lists for the R.I. lectures, nor consider the specificity of the drawings shown at this institution.

79 For drawing lists of R.I. Lecture 1 1817, see SM Archives, MBii 1/23. For R.I. Lecture 2 1817, see SM Archives, MBii 1/38.
Lecture 1 (1817)

1. Drawing of the French Academy in Rome (SM 22/2/4)
2. Drawing of Noah’s Ark, and Man of War (SM 23/2/10)
3. Drawing of Hut in Forest
4. Drawing of Conical Hut (SM 27/2/1)
5. Drawing of Hut with Flat Roof
6. Do. with Pointed Roof
7. Do. with a row of Posts in the Centre
8. Drawing of Hut with a Double Row of Pillars (SM 86/1/1)
9. Do. with the Centre Space the Widest (SM 86/1/2?)
10. Do. with Supports Under Rafters
11. Drawing of the Mausoleum of Mausolus (SM 26/5/2)
12. Drawing of the Lake of Moeris (SM 27/3/1)
13. View of the ruins of Palmyra (SM 20/2/1)
14. Ditto of Balbec (SM 20/1/2)
15. Drawing of Sepulchre at Persepolis
16. Drawing of excavation at Coine\no
17. Do. cavern at Elephanta
18. Plans of Excavations
19. Another
20. Plan of the Temple of Jupiter Serapis (SM 19/9/1)
21. do. Temple of Isis
22. do. Temple of the Sun (SM 20/2/3)
23. Elevation of ditto (SM 20/2/5)
24. drawing of Pyramids at Cairo (SM 27/3/2)
25. drawing of the large Pyramid and St. Paul’s (SM 22/9/5)
25*. (SM 19/2/1)
25**. (SM 19/2/8)
27. Elevation of the Mole of Hadrian (SM 20/4/9?)
28. Elevation of the Monument of Cecilia Metella (SM 26/5/5)
29. Section + plan of do
30. Elevation of Pyramid of Caius Cestius
31. Section of do.
32. Drawing of the Eight Regular Mouldings (SM 24/6/1)
33. Drawings of various examples of doric Orders
34. doric. order. Minerva
35. Theatre of Marcellus (SM 25/2/3)
36. Draw. of Doric Order from the Baths of Dioclesian (25/2/5)
37. Do. 10 Mastus
38. Drawing of various ancient Examples of the Ionic Order
39. Ionic Order _ Vitruvius (SM 25/3/2)
40. do __________Issus
41. do __________Minerva Polias
42. do __ 10 Masters
43. Drawing of Corinthian Order _ Lanthorn of Demosthenes (SM 23/7/4)
44. do . . . Stoa. (SM 23/7/2)
45. do. Antonius & Faustina (SM 25/4/1)
46. do. Portico of Parthenon
47. Various example of Corinthian
Order (SM 23/6/1)
48. 10 Mastus (23/6/2)
49. drawing of Triumphal Arch at
Aousti (SM 20/7/7)
50. Tomb of Scipio
51. drawing of Order of Temple of
Solomon (SM 24/2/2)
52. Drawing of the origin of
Corinthian (SM 25/6/1)
53. drawing of Egyptian Capital
54. another
55. drawing of Corinthian Capital
(SM 23/9/4)
56. Elevation of Covent Garden
Church
57. do. York Stairs (SM 74/3/2)
58. Order of the Arch of Titus (SM
24/1/3)
59. do._ Baths of Dioclesian (SM
24/1/2)
60. drawing of the Arch of Titus
(SM 20/7/4)
61. drawing of French Order (SM
24/2/6)
62. do____ of Britannie Order by Mr.
Adam (SM 24/2/7)
63. drawing of Order of Monsieur
de la Roche (SM 24/2/9)
64. Drawing of a new Order as
executed in a Villa at Windsor
(SM 24/2/8)
65. Drawings of Antique Capitals
(SM 23/6/8)
66. View of the Temple of
Erechtheus (SM 19/3/6)
67. Elevation of the Incantada at
Salonicha (SM 24/4/2)
68. Drawing of Temple at Tivoli
(SM 19/7/5)
69. Fontuna Viriles in Rome (SM
19/8/2)
70. Minerva at Athens (SM 19/2/2)
71. Temple on the Ilissus (SM
19/3/3)
72. Arch of Constantine (SM
20/7/1)
73. Septimius Severus (SM 20/7/3)
74*. Arch of Titus (SM 20/7/4)
74. drawing of the Arch of Hadrian
at Athens (SM 19/3/1?)
75. do. part of the Theatre of
Marcellus in Rome (SM 20/5/1)
76. drawing of Cariatides
77. do. of Persians (SM 25/7/2)
78. drawing of Cariatides in La
Salle des Suisses (SM 24/4/3)
79. do. of Persian Court by Inigo
Jones (SM 74/2/11)
80. do. ... do. (SM 74/2/12)
81. drawing of the Portico of the
Admiralty
82. do. of the front of Castle Ashby
(SM 74/4/8?)
83*. Elevation of St. Paul’s Covent
Garden
83. St. Martin’s (SM 75/5/3)
84. drawing of the Entrance front
of Claremont (SM 75/5/3)
85. do. of the Mansion House (SM
75/5/3)
86. do. with temporary awning (SM
18/7/1)
87. do. Entrance Front of
Kedleston (SM 18/3/5)
88. do. Holkham (SM 17/1/18)
89. Drawing of Vestibule at
Holkham (SM 17/1/17)
90. Drawing of the Portico at Holkham
91. Drawing of the Queens House at Greenwich (SM 74/4/5?)
92*. Drawing of the Temple at Tivoli
92. do. with perforations in Basement (SM 19/7/6?)
93. do. La Maison Luarree[?]
94. do. with perforations in Basement (SM 23/1/11)
95. do. of St, Martins Church
96. do. raised on a Basement with perforations in the same (SM 23/1/7)
97. Drawing of Trajan’s Bridge and Westminster (SM 21/1/13)
98. Drawing of the Portico of the Pantheon compared w. St. Martins Church (SM 23/1/4)
99. Section of the Pantheon with the Radcliffe Library
100. do. . with the Rotunda at the Bank (SM 23/2/7)
Indeed, whilst it is widely known that Soane showed many of the same drawings at the R.A. and R.I., the actual sequence of drawings which were shown at both of these institutions differed, and sometimes drawings were shown at the R.I. which were not shown at the R.A. Whilst many individual and groups of lecture drawings shown at the R.I. have previously been referred to by Watkin and other historians (as described in the previous section), the work of identifying which sequences were specifically shown within the six of the R.I. lectures has not been carried out before.

I devoted a large amount of time within the middle of this project to this task of identifying the R.I. lecture drawings. Through shifting focus from the emphasis which has been previously been placed by other historians on the lecture drawings’ content, to the issue of how these drawings depicted such content or could have materialised and physically demonstrated architectural knowledge on stage within the performance of the lecture event itself, it became particularly important to try to identify the actual drawing objects in question. This was spurred on by observations described in the previous sections about the ways the lecture drawings appeared to have been intentionally drawn to address an audience and specific circumstances of reception – that is, they seemed to be architectural drawings drawn for the specific purpose of performance. In attempting to identify the specific R.I. lecture drawings, I was pursuing the idea that the lecture drawing objects themselves may have actually done something in Soane’s lectures, and that, by examining the actual objects, one might be able to access aspects of these past performances.

As was also the case when devising a bespoke approach to the manuscripts which remain from the R.I. lectures (which are different to the manuscripts remaining from the lectures at the R.A.), it is also important to highlight the different kind of task involved in identifying the R.I. lecture drawings, compared to identifying the R.A. lecture drawings (work previously conducted by Watkin, Bolton and Spiers). As discussed and shown in images within Part I of ‘Reading Again’, whilst the Soane office produced fair copies of the R.A. lectures which contained reduced versions of the lecture drawings shown in these lectures, neither such fair copies nor reduced drawings were produced for the R.I. lectures.
Since more than one lecture drawing often exists of a single building (produced, for example, at different times, or represented numerous times in different elevations, plans or perspectives, or perhaps copied from multiple different other artists’ depictions of the same building), without the help of reduced drawings such as in the R.A. lecture fair copy manuscripts which specify clearly which view or drawn version of the building was used, it is much harder to identify which exact lecture drawing contained in the drawing collection was the one that was actually shown in the R.I. lectures.

As mentioned above, whilst in many cases it is often easy to locate within the drawing collection a particular lecture drawing which is described in the R.I. manuscript as having been shown in a particular lecture, in many other cases there are multiple drawings which exist in the drawing collection that are suggested by the titles provided in the manuscript. The process of identifying the R.I. lecture drawings is thus not a straightforward process, and rather must be conducted by reading between multiple different kinds of materially and spatially distributed written and drawn information. This process begins with reading written descriptions of the drawings in the nineteenth-century R.I. lecture manuscripts and then identifying correspondences with similar written descriptions of the lecture drawings written later for the Soane Museum ‘Concise Catalogue’ of drawings (which, at the time I carried out the work, was accessible online in text-only form). It then involved looking at digital images of the lecture drawings on screen (which I had previously identified as relevant from the written catalogue) from a computer within the archive, as seen in Image 92. This was followed by reading between and attempting to match, on the one hand, the visual appearance of these digital versions of the drawings, with, on the other hand, the textual content of the manuscript’s written drawing titles. Often this involved cross-referencing back to the words of the lecture text (located adjacent to the drawing titles written in the manuscript), which often gave more specific clues and information about the drawing which was shown at that point. Whilst this last stage could be done by reading the physical manuscripts, it was often easier to refer to my own transcriptions of the same manuscripts, which I could also digitally search, and which did not require the archivist to carry the manuscript volumes down a flight of stairs.
Image 92
It is interesting to consider that at the beginning of this doctoral project the process of identifying the R.I. lecture drawings was even less possible. In fact, even since carrying out this work of identifying the R.I. lecture drawings, the presentation of the online Soane Museum drawing catalogue has further changed and been updated, as described in the first ‘Drawing In’ section. Prior to digitally photographing all the drawings and creating a complete digital archive of such images, researchers previously had to refer to black-and-white microfilms of these documents. As I already note, Richardson states in her draft introduction to the ‘Concise Catalogue’ that the microfilm was created in 1988 under Peter Thornton’s curatorship, an initiative that afforded significant new opportunities for researchers by giving them access to the drawing collection in new ways, particularly by making it possible to study the contents of the drawing collection without visiting in person or encountering it solely through reading written catalogue entries.\(^5\)

Despite these advantages, when I first tried to study the lecture drawings via the microfilm at the beginning of my doctoral project in 2013, this technology seemed to obscure the reading of those aspects of the lecture drawings which I found the most intriguing and which also appeared to relate to their purpose of performance. Important issues that were not possible to consider via the black-and-white microfilm included the fact that the original lecture drawings were in colour. Indeed, it could be said that the manner in which the lecture drawings are encountered via the microfilm actually encourages a particular reading of them. The black-and-white images visible on the microfilm are often very unclear and they simplify the drawn image into contrasting dark and light areas, an effect further heightened in the prints which the microfilm machine can itself produce, as seen in Image 93. These encounters with the microfilm seemed to me to enable, for the most part, only an inspection of what building or subject matter the lecture drawing depicted, rather than to facilitate consideration of the ways the drawings were produced or aspects of their physical scale and materiality. Indeed, Richardson states that one of the reasons for initiating the microfilm was to ‘minimize the wear and tear in handling the drawings themselves.’\(^6\)

\(^5\) Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 2.
\(^6\) Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 2.
Such reflections are directly significant to my study considering that other aspects of the drawings, such as their qualities as artefacts that were to be handled, or that they were drawn and designed in a manner that made them particularly suited to being shown within the context of a lecture, were not readable from the microfilm.

Another issue that was impossible to consider from the microfilm relates to the fact that the order the lecture drawings were encountered on the microfilms was usually a completely different order to the sequences they followed in the lectures. As described in the first ‘Drawing In’ section where I give an account of the changes in the cataloguing of the lecture drawings over time, the microfilm retains the rearrangement and interspersing of the lecture drawings within the rest of Soane’s drawing collection, as initiated by Bolton in the 1920s. In so doing, the linear mode of viewing a microfilm also significantly structures the type of reading of the lecture drawings that is possible, in contrast to an experience of ‘proximity’ when negotiating and clicking between folders of digital images of the same drawings. The impact of the newly afforded digital encounter is that it enables the researcher to easily look across the collection and, therefore, to much more readily consider and compare different lecture drawings located in different parts of the catalogue. The need to look at drawings in completely different parts of the catalogue could be either to assess which is the correct drawing between two similar drawings catalogued in different places, or to consider the effect of a drawing when shown in a lecture before or after another lecture drawing, also catalogued in different places. In both these cases, the digitisation of the drawings allows the researcher to quickly move back and forth between drawings that catalogue-wise, and as I again describe above, may be also physically stored far apart.
On a typical day, I request several drawing sets which I have identified according to the processes described above – that of reading the manuscript (and my transcription of the manuscript), the Museum’s drawing catalogue, and looking at the digital drawings. I hope that some of these sets might contain specific single or series of drawings that were shown at particular points in one of the six R.I. lectures. The procedure of actually examining the lecture drawings has in time become a set of coordinated, physical actions that I have learnt to carry out with more skill over time. They are almost like a dance – awkward at first, and with mistakes, but which has in turn become a more practised and proficient series of timed movements carried out within the Soane Museum’s current Research Library spaces.

Each ‘set’ of drawings is held in a bespoke blue cardboard folder made to closely fit the largest drawing held in each set. These acid-free card folders replaced Bolton’s 1920s brown paper folders when the drawings were moved to number 14 in 2009. Sometimes, if a set only contains a few drawings, it shares a blue folder with one or two other sets. These stiff folders, whose size is determined by the drawings inside them, range greatly, from approximately one metre wide, to much larger ones that are longer than the span of two arms stretched out to their limit, and which almost cover the 1920s desk (originally designed by Bolton, as referred to above) on which I am viewing them in the Library. Usually, I only ask to see four sets of drawings held in their blue folders at any one time; any more than this makes it too heavy to pull a folder, should it be needed, from the bottom of the pile. The amount of time, too, to go through four folders I have found to be approximately one day. Unless I am in the Library the following day, the folders are put back in their drawers by the drawing curator or archivist each evening, and because these drawers, as described above, are not only located in the library spaces of number 14 where I view the drawings, but are distributed in further other spaces both upstairs and in the main museum spaces of number 13 too, it seems important not to over-request material which later expends others’ time and exertion.

---

There is space in the front room of the Library for two researchers who sit at facing tables on either side of the librarian, archivist or drawing curator’s table located at the front of the room (who sits with their back up against the front window). If there is not another researcher in, then I have both these tables on which to read and handle the lecture drawings and negotiate this dance of sorts. Having two tables does not exactly simplify the coordination of the drawings, however; indeed, with it comes the added variable of incorporating further movements of turning to and travelling back from one table to the other. On one of these tables I have a pile of drawing folders for the day, from which I decant one folder at a time over to the other table for examination. This movement involves lifting a lecture drawing through the air from one direction to another, whilst swivelling one’s body and feet. The air which lightly catches the drawing as it both travels through the air and is brought downwards onto the receiving table creates a slight resistance and a parachute of air which influences the execution and rhythm of the movement. On other days, when the opposite table in the front library room is occupied, I either examine drawings on top of the other folders I have selected to view that day, or, as is more often the case, I use the back room’s tables to decant drawing folders to and from throughout the day, often with the help of the archivist or drawing curator. Whilst most of the time I request the drawing sets that I would like to see prior to, or at the beginning of, the day, and the archivist or drawing curator brings them to the library space where I examine them, sometimes I accompany the drawing curator to fetch the lecture drawings from their other locations outwith the confines of the Library.

Carrying and moving the folders of drawings, be it from table to opposite table, or top to bottom of a pile, from back room to front room, or upstairs to downstairs, have become different elements of this dance of identifying the R.I. lecture drawings. If the folder is small, then it is approximately equivalent to the extent of one’s own body’s dimensions, and the space and slipstream it occupies when moving. When a folder containing drawings is large, however, which is very frequently the case, it is often also heavy and the weight of the drawings inside it, which are also often unevenly distributed, fall to the centre of the folder. In these cases, not only do you have to hold the folder’s thick edges, but you also must additionally hold and push up the middle and sides from below to keep it as flat as you can.

Whenever I first moved large folders around I felt self-conscious that I may be perceived as damaging the drawings. When moving the folders around you
must coordinate the length of the folder, with movement in a particular direction, in relation to the spatial layout of the library spaces, its furniture and doorways, as well as stairways to other drawing locations. When coming down the stairs you cannot have the folder even vaguely flat. In fact, the cardboard of these folders, which has both flexibility and rigidity, seems particularly suited for this purpose of transporting up and down between floors, where indeed they must be almost curled up to fit down Soane's close-turning stairways. Moving a large folder through a doorway is also difficult. This can be done by temporarily holding it vertically whilst you pass through the door (with the weight falling precariously vertically down), before bringing it into a horizontal position again. Alternatively, if it is a long drawing with a short side that fits across the width of the doorway, whilst it may be possible to keep the folder relatively flat, the main weight of drawings inside it are still awkwardly situated in front of and away from your body and centre of gravity as you pass across. Further effort is needed, as described above, in briefly preventing the folder from buckling and twisting.

Opening the folders, then handling and turning over the actual drawings become the next phases of the dance. Each drawing folder has a large front cover which, when opened, folds back over the left-hand edge of the table onto which the drawings are to be examined. If it is a large folder, this front cover-flap hangs right down, sometimes in an unwieldy way, reaching onto and across the floor next to the window. Because the cardboard is thick, the challenge is to prevent it from folding permanently as it comes into contact with another surface or piece of furniture, for example the two lamps for illuminating archival material positioned on either side of the table. As the folder is opened, it often makes a loud ‘pppht’ noise as the card catches the air before coming over and reaching the floor. In each folder, folded tabs on the three sides (the ones which do not have the front cover attached) create an envelope of sorts, protecting the corners and edges of the set(s) of drawings held inside.

As I describe above, the folders of the sets of drawings which I request to view have been identified through a combination of reading the drawings’ titles in the manuscript, the descriptions in the catalogue, and looking at the digital images of the fronts of the drawings on screen. It is not until I have physically examined specific drawings within these sets, however, and read their back inscriptions, that I can tell if they were the ones shown at particular points in the R.I. lectures. The physical action of repeatedly turning over the drawings
contained in the folders, one after the other, over the course of a whole day, becomes another practised movement of the dance associated with reading this material. Like the act of transporting the folders between spaces, this movement needs to be synchronised. Often a drawing is so large that extra ‘reach’ is needed beyond the length of an arm when it is normally extended, so balance is required not only to hold the drawing, but also to turn it around and over. These sets of movements therefore involve turning the drawing on these differing axes (of, around and/or over) with your hands and arms, whilst reaching and simultaneously keeping enough of the body’s weight back from the drawing which is being turned, and coordinating this with footwork that modulates the way the body is stabilised and grounded throughout the sequence. Such movement also requires control beyond the objective of not losing balance. As intimated above, the turning and reaching whilst moving the lecture drawings must also be done in accordance with avoiding clashes with nearby computers, lamps and chandeliers, with tempering the speed of turning which is invariably accompanied with sound that attracts attention, and with further managing and preventing the uneven weight of a single drawing from itself buckling.

There also feels some need to be elegant in these sequences of moving and handling the lecture drawings. But why would one feel they must be elegant in an archive? What, indeed, is ‘elegance’ and how might this relate to the practice of architectural history? I have constantly considered the resemblance between practising and refining physical movements, and other issues such as poise which are also associated with dance, with that of my own experience of learning to move and handle the lecture drawings well in the Soane Museum. The *OED* gives definitions for the word ‘elegance’ as a condition applicable to matters of language, taste and mathematical theorems. With specific reference to its meanings associated with ‘appearance [and] movement, etc.’, the *OED* provides the further explanation of: ‘grace or simple beauty, combined with good taste; freedom from awkwardness, coarseness, or clumsiness; refined tastefulness.’ The requirement I felt for elegant physical behaviour in the archive whilst handling the lecture drawings certainly encompasses some of these dimensions, specifically an awareness of the ‘grace[ful]’ visual ‘appearance’ and manner of the actions I was performing. Could this special kind of elegance be prompted by the peculiarities and expectations of the Soane Museum archive and its codes of conduct?
These sequences of moving and handling the lecture drawings have, as just described, gradually become more economical and less ungainly with time. This has been developed in response to an awareness of carrying out these actions in front of others in the archive – but it is also in response to a need to find an efficient way to move these very large, fragile artefacts at the same time as caring for and preventing damage to them when handling and moving them. This display of expert movement ‘free [...] from awkwardness, coarseness, or clumsiness’ is a way of actually caring for the drawings at the same time as performing expertise in the presence of others; it is a partial response to a pressure of looking like you know what you are doing in the archive, driven also by the inevitable physical labour associated with (generations of) drawing curator’s or archivist’s retrieval of the drawings so that they can be examined.

In gaining proficiency in the physical sequences of movements, and describing them in terms of their technical aspects such as coordination, balance and control, it is as if the activity of handling the lecture drawings could be understood in terms of ‘technique’. In dance scholars Sherrie Barr and Wendy Oliver’s feminist assessment and reworking of ‘the dance technique class’, they point out how ‘[d]ance technique is an extraordinarily broad term, one that includes vocabulary, style, and cultural values’.\textsuperscript{84} This, in turn, reminds us that ideal categories such as ‘elegance’ (together with the ‘grace’ and ‘beauty’ given by the \textit{OED definition}), whilst associated with some forms of dance technique and training, are of course not universal.

To the question which Richardson set out at the beginning of her study of the differing curators’ rearrangements of Soane’s drawings – namely, to assess to what degree the Soane drawing order had been disturbed/retained by the 1980s – she makes an overall conclusion, particularly relevant to my study, which involves the lecture drawings. Relating to Savage’s points cited above regarding the ‘obscur[ing]’ effects produced through Bolton’s early twentieth-century ‘rationalisation’ of Soane’s eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century book collection and library spaces,\textsuperscript{85} she writes:


\textsuperscript{85} Savage, ‘Hooked on Books: Interpreting John Soane’s Library’, 44.
It is true that the distinction which Soane made between his own office designs and RA Lecture Drawings, which he kept at the back of the Museum, and his ‘collections’ of drawings and prints by other architects and artists, which he kept in the Pompeian Model Stand, was totally changed when Bolton created the new Architectural Library in 1922-23.\(^{86}\)

But what kind of ‘obscur[ing]’ effects and wider historical implications exactly has this merging of the office designs and lecture drawings since Soane’s day had on a subsequent understanding of, or the historiography of, Soane’s lectures? Whilst clearly improving the overall accessibility and usability of the drawing collection for many, it is clear – as I have encountered first hand – that Bolton’s reorganisation of the drawings and the lecture drawings has directly obscured engagement and consideration of the issue at the heart of my own thesis, that is, the lecture drawings’ use in the practice (the process and doing) of the lectures over time. As Richardson and Bolton before her note, these drawings were originally organised according to their use in the lectures. With this in mind, perhaps we could read the physical ordering of the storage of the lecture drawings in Soane’s day (as recorded and maintained in and through Bailey’s 1837 inventory) as itself reflecting the ‘performance practice’ of the lectures? I understand this in the terms set out in my Introduction, whereby the repeated practice of physically organising the drawings comprises a specific practical way in which the lectures were done specifically according to their purpose of being performed and shown in such large numbers in varying, specific order, and with words, in front of an audience over time. Over time, therefore, the possibilities for reading this performance practice has become more distorted, albeit it has done so in order to enable a different kind of use – by later readers and researchers of the drawings, as well as by curators and archivists who have also had to practically use the collection. At the same time, an equivalent argument could be made that these post-Soane changes to the ways the drawings have been grouped have, in a Butlerian sense, performatively reiterated and reinforced over time particular architectural historical norms and criteria (regarding being grouped according to what buildings the drawings depict), which have in turn structured not only what knowledge is signalled by the institution as being significant and valuable to read, but also what knowledge is actually

---

\(^{86}\) Richardson, ‘Introduction to the Concise Catalogue’, 12.
possible to read from these nineteenth-century architectural drawings and their associated two-hundred-year-old architectural practice of lecturing. In many senses, the historical work which I have carried out – the process of which this section has just described – in pursuing the performance practice of Soane’s lectures has in fact been reading against the grain, and sometimes even trying to reverse the changes enacted by Spiers and Bolton in the early twentieth century. Indeed, throughout trying to identify the R.I. lecture drawings, I could not understand why there was no correlation between the sequences which I was assembling and the ways in which they were arranged physically and conceptually. Furthermore, whilst the task I have undertaken of identifying each R.I. lecture drawing is possible in theory (by physically inspecting inscriptions on each one’s verso-side), the labour of both the researcher in collaboration with the Drawings Curator or archivist is so great that to complete the six R.I. lectures would take much longer than the research time of a single PhD.

Relating to these reflections ultimately about the implications of the way the Soane office’s performance practice has been archived, Richardson summarises and concludes that:

[t]he biggest change has been the re-shuffling of the RA Lecture Drawings, both by Spiers and Bolton, who, as we have seen, regrouped them into what he considered were more manageable sets. Fortunately, Bailey had numbered them all in red ink, and Spiers made a useful Concordance, so it would be possible one day to reassemble the drawings in their original order.  

Drawing Out: Other Evidence for the Lecture Drawings’ Use

This section ‘draws out’ from the process of directly handling and turning over the R.I. lecture drawings which posed itself as a means of accessing dimensions of their previous use, to considering the use of the lecture drawings more contextually through other pieces of (mainly) written evidence in the Soane Museum archive. Here I address one of the key questions of this thesis (which was initially prompted by reading the R.I. lecture manuscripts) regarding the status of the relationship between words and drawings in Soane’s practice of lecturing, specifically, of whether the words led the drawings or vice versa. The following refers to evidence for the drawings’ use in terms of their relation to the words found in the Soane office Day books, in preparatory notes for the R.I. and R.A. lectures, as well as in the R.I. lecture manuscripts themselves.

The Soane Museum archive not only holds material documenting Soane’s intellectual, antiquary and design interests, acquisitions and outputs, but also much information related to the business of architecture during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.\(^8^8\) Documentation of this kind includes his keeping of receipts and, of particular relevance to my research, the production of Day Books between the years 1787 and 1834 which document the professional activities and financial matters of the office.\(^8^9\) Devoting a page to each day, and bound in separate volumes, the office day books, which can be seen in Image 95, record the arrival time of Soane’s assistants at work each day, followed by a series of brief notes describing the activities that each boy carried out during the course of a morning and afternoon (apparently often written by each of the boys themselves). Each entry is usually preceded by the name of the building project or a specific client, to whom time spent by the office would be billed. Whilst this information concerning the day-to-day activities of Soane’s office assistants is located on one side of the Day Book pages, the other

---


\(^8^9\) SM Archives, SM Day Book (1787-1834). For description of the Day Books, see Margaret Richardson, ‘Soane’s Use of Drawings’, 234-241, 236.
DRAWING OUT
side (over the years, sometimes right, sometimes left) appears to have been mostly left for a different kind of information. This included noting what money had been paid to and from Soane, often written in Soane’s hand. The Day Books give useful clues about the role of named pupils in the lead up to and immediately following specific lecture events. They also record a range of preparatory and post-lecture activities which appear to have been repeatedly done and together can be read to constitute different stages of the practical process and performance practice of preparing for, doing and being involved in the immediate aftermath of the lectures over time. Of particular interest to my research here is the way the different activities specifically regarding the lecture drawings are described in relation to one another, and what this reveals about the role of the drawings in Soane’s practice and process of lecturing. I am also concerned with the possibilities for reading and situating these drawing-related activities in relation to the other activities also described in the Day Books – such as writing the lectures – and considering what this in turn reveals about the relationships between the practices of drawing and writing within the Soane office’s broader practice of lecturing.

As I have already mentioned in my introduction, on 24 April 1817 Soane wrote in the office Day Book that he had declined the R.I. Managers’ invitation to lecture, a decision which he seems to have withdrawn, since subsequently he went on to accept the invitation several days later on 28 April 1817. Prior to this date, the R.I. lectures are not referred to in the Day Books; indeed, it is not until approximately one month later that they are mentioned again. On Friday 30 May 1817, nine days before the first R.I. lecture, the following notes were written one under the other on the right-hand side of the page:

Mr Soane
About Lecture drawgs
Bailey.

Mr Soane’s Lectures
About Drawings
Foxhall

Mr Soanes Lectures
About various drawings
Parke.91

Whilst each of the three entries is worded slightly differently, we can interpret that they express essentially the same sentiment: that Soane’s clerk George Bailey (who as described above was also first Curator and compiled the first inventory of drawings in 1837), and assistants Edward Foxhall and Henry Parke were all concerned on this day with some aspect connected to more than one drawing for Soane’s lectures. In a manner demonstrated throughout the Day Books and with respect to the lectures at the R.I. and R.A., the title of ‘Mr Soane’ or ‘Mr Soane’s Lectures’ or another similar wording is given, highlighting that this office activity was to be carried out at Soane’s own expense (as opposed to being billed to a client). Further towards the bottom of the same page another note is written:

Mr Soane
Making a drawing of the
Temple of Minerva Polias
at Athens _
Burges.92

Instead of indicating a general unspecified activity regarding drawings for the lectures, Henry Burges’s note refers to the more specific act of ‘Making a drawing’ (that is, it suggests the act of physically producing it), whilst at the same time he specifies and names the subject matter of the drawing in question.

This pattern of sometimes specifying the drawing that is made, whilst at other times indicating a more general activity of being ‘about’ the lectures, is typical from the beginning of preparing for the lectures from 1806. The following day, a Saturday, there are several further Day Book entries which were ‘About

91 SM Archives, SM Day Book, Friday 30 May 1817, 142.
92 SM Archives, SM Day Book, Friday 30 May 1817, 142.
various drawings’ in addition to the making of two drawings: ‘Horse Guards’ by Parke and Holkham by Burges. Above this, however, George Bailey introduces another activity:

Mr Soane
Writing Lecture.
Bailey⁹³

We know from my discussion of the R.I. manuscripts in Part I that Bailey was indeed the main scribe of the lecture texts; indeed, this entry suggests that it was on this day that he was busy writing parts of the R.I. manuscripts which are in the Soane Museum archive. Continuing into the following week, we can see that Bailey continued this lecture-writing activity on the following Monday, alongside being ‘About drawings for the 1st Lecture’, and then on Tuesday that he was ‘Writing another copy of 1st Lecture’. This record of two written copies of Soane’s first R.I. lecture of 1817 tallies with the existence of both an earlier draft and a fair copy of the lecture manuscript for this lecture bound into the volume for the 1817 R.I. lectures.⁹⁴

If 31 May was the first time that writing was carried out for the R.I. lectures to be delivered only a week later, and taking into account that there was no working on a Sunday, the total time to write the draft text before making a copy would have been only two days (Saturday and Monday). Is this enough time to compose and write a lecture? If it was, then, in relation to the question of whether the drawings led the words of the text or the words of the text led the drawings during the process of composing a lecture, we may surmise that, because prior to 31 May drawings were being made that were mostly used in the first R.I. lecture,⁹⁵ it was the drawings that were leading. Alternatively, is it more likely that this declared instance of ‘writing lectures’ for the R.I. within the Day Book followed on from another non-disclosed pre-draft or earlier notes that are no longer extant, but which were potentially made by Soane, and from which Bailey in turn worked?

⁹³ SM Archives, SM Day Book, 31 May 1817, 142.
⁹⁴ SM Archives, SM Soane Case 157, Royal Institution Lectures (1817). This volume has an earlier draft of R.I. Lecture 1 at the front, followed by fair copies of Lecture 1 and Lecture 2 which were read aloud.
⁹⁵ A lecture drawing of the Temple of Minerva was shown as Drawing No. 71 in Lecture 1 1817 and Drawing No. 21 in Lecture 2 1817. Lecture drawings of Holkham were shown as Drawing No. 89-91 in Lecture 1 1817. A lecture drawing of Horse Guards does not appear, however, in the R.I. drawing lists.
The activity of ‘about lecture drawings’ continues to occupy Parke and Foxhall that week on the Tuesday and Friday (although not Wednesday or Thursday). On the following day of Saturday 7 June, there is an entry in Soane’s own hand:

Royal Inst.
Read 1st Lecture

Here and there Soane interjects into the Day Book. Whilst his daily activities, including preparation for his lectures, are not specified in the same way as those of the pupils that work for him, the way that he occasionally writes, often in a different place on the page, nevertheless communicates a sustained impression of control, both of overseeing the process and in terms of there being a perceptible hierarchy in the office. Whilst Bailey may seem to be higher up in this order when compared with the other boys (which is additionally communicated by the fact he also deals with other activities such as accounts, etc.), and also in terms of the production of the lectures, the continual coming in of Soane signals an overall authority. This is reinforced by a later note by Foxhall, also written on the day of the first R.I. lecture in 1817, and which, through use of the pronoun ‘your’, reads as if, when the pupils are writing in the Day book, they are directly addressing Soane. On this day, Bailey and Foxhall wrote:

Mr Soane
Preparing drawings for
the 1st Lecture at the
Royal Institution.
Bailey.

Mr Soane
About Lecture drawings
and attending your first
Lecture at the Royal Institution
Foxhall

96 SM Archives, SM Day Book, Saturday 7 June 1817, 145.
97 SM Archives, SM Day Book, Saturday 7 June 1817, 145.
The term ‘preparing’, as distinct from ‘about’ or ‘making’ drawings, is used repeatedly by Bailey on the actual day on which, or on the day before, a lecture was to be delivered. If being ‘about drawings’ was an activity leading up to a lecture and concerned more than one drawing, and the word ‘making’ was used alongside this more general drawing-related activity in reference to the production of a specific, named lecture drawing, what might the phrase ‘preparing drawings’ have meant? Whilst all the drawing and writing activities I have just described from the Day Book could be understood in a more general sense as ‘preparing’ for the approaching lecture, does Bailey’s ‘preparing drawings’ connote a specific form or stage of the preparation? It is worth noting that in this instance of Bailey using the phrase ‘preparing drawings’ we already know that he also had the long-time and presumably elevated role of scribing the written texts for the same lecture earlier in the week, and that his ‘preparing’ of drawings on the day of the lecture was carried out whilst Foxhall’s activity of being ‘about lecture drawings’ continued alongside it (indicating some distinction in the drawing-related activity or differentiation between the roles each boy had in preparing for the lecture). To reiterate, whilst being ‘about’ drawings is unspecific and ‘making’ drawings indicates physical acts of producing or creating them, ‘preparing’ more explicitly suggests a form of doing which involved getting the drawings ready for some kind of use in the future (that is, it was not just the practice but the performance practice!). In so doing, this potentially suggests that Bailey’s documented act of ‘preparing drawings for the 1st lecture’ constituted an activity directed particularly towards the impending lecture event. After being made, what else had to be done to the group of drawings in advance of being shown in the lecture itself?

These two Day Book entries also suggest not only activities which occurred prior to the lecture, or which constituted the preparatory part of the practice of lecturing which took place in Lincoln’s Inn Fields, but also the possible activities taking place during the lecture as it was performed within the R.I. lecture theatre, located between the first and second floor of 21 Albermarle Street. Whilst Foxhall’s note clearly confirms his presence at the lecture event itself, we cannot tell if he was ‘attending’ as an audience member, or whether he was assisting with the coordination or performance of the lecture on stage. Meanwhile, whilst it is clear that Bailey was occupied during that day with preparing for the lecture, it is not clear (as it is with Foxhall) that he attended the lecture event itself.
Similar observations can be made in the following week in the lead up to the second lecture of 1817, where the same trio of boys were involved in various capacities. On Monday, Bailey was ‘About drawings for the 2nd. Lecture’, on Tuesday and Wednesday he was ‘Writing Fair Copy of the 2nd Lecture...’, then on Friday, he combined being ‘About drawings for the 2nd Lecture, and Writing parts of the Fair copy’. Across the same week, Foxhall is recorded as both being ‘About drawings for 2nd lecture’, and as carrying out the more specific act of being ‘About drawing of White hall’ (it is not clear if being ‘about’ a named drawing is different to making it). Parke, on the other hand, was engaged in producing two drawings (note here that Parke uses the verb ‘drawing’ rather than ‘making’), one consisting of an elevation of Covent Garden church, and the other being a section which compared the great hall at the baths of Diocletian with Soane’s own transfer office at the Bank. On the Friday, underneath Bailey’s own separate entry, which as previously discussed almost always appears first on the page in the Day Book, the additional pupil of Burges joined Foxhall and Parke ‘About drawings for the 2nd Lecture’. The next day, the Saturday on which the second lecture took place, three boys (and so a larger group than for the previous Saturday) are indicated as being involved in the same activity as follows:

Mr Soane.
Preparing drawings for
the 2nd Lecture at the
Royal Institution ___
Bailey
Foxhall
Burges
Copland

Corresponding with observations of the previous week, whilst the activity of ‘preparing drawings’ is noted only on the actual day of the lecture, this time it is recorded not only to have been carried out by Bailey (whose name is repeatedly written first on the page, which is likely not a coincidence), but also to have involved Foxhall and Burges in ‘preparing drawings’, the

---

60 SM Archives, SM Day Book, Monday 9 June – Tuesday 10 June 1817, 146.
61 SM Archives, SM Day Book, Saturday 14 June 1817, 148.
apparently specific form of drawing-related lecture preparation. As with the previous week, we cannot ascertain from this Day Book entry alone what constituted ‘preparing drawings’, the different ways that each of the pupils contributed to it, or where it took place. Did these pupils help prepare the drawings in the Upper Drawings Office, or at the venue, or both? Whilst Foxhall’s note for the previous lecture indicates that he was actually in attendance at the venue, no such information is given for the second lecture.

On Monday 16 June, immediately following the weekend of the second and last R.I. lecture of 1817, a final activity in the Soane office’s process of coordinating the drawings before and after a lecture is written into the Day Book:

Putting away the Lecture drawings etc.
Parke.

Previously in Part I, I made observations regarding the different kinds of notes – such as amendments to the textual content, but also comments regarding delivery and audience size – which were continually added by Soane to the R.I. manuscript after individual lecture events. I argued that these comments document and evidence some of the repeated features of the performance practice of Soane’s lectures over time (reflecting on a previous lecture, but also preparing for and improving for the next). But as can be read from the above Day Book entry, it is also possible to read post-lecture activities which relate to the lecture drawings. We can assume ‘Putting away Lecture drawings’ was a considerable physical task owing to the fact it apparently took one day, but also because it concerned such a large number of drawings (101 drawings in Lecture 1 and 79 drawings in Lecture 2, so 180 drawings over two lectures) and included many which were very large. It is also noteworthy, I think, to draw attention to the way the phrase ‘Putting away the drawings’ also suggests that the lecture drawings had specific places to be put away to, or a specific way and order in which they were to be put back. This corroborates the evidence suggested above by Richardson and

---

102 It seems however, that the ‘preparation’ encompassed a number of phases including stacking, inscribing and ordering right up until the lecture began, and included crossing two venues and the transport between.

103 SM Archives, SM Day Book, Monday 16 June 1817, 149.
Bolton that the lecture drawings were kept and stored in the order in which they were used.

Whilst the above observations notice a pattern in the activities of preparing lecture drawings for the two R.I. lectures of 1817 over the course of two weeks, this becomes more significant when we consider the correlations between this pattern and that of the second series of R.I. lectures in 1820. Indeed, in the week leading up to the first lecture of 27 May 1820, and in the following three weeks preparing for the four lectures on 3, 10 and 17 June, we can observe a related pattern of repeated activities carried out by different members of the Soane office. As with the 1817 lectures, Bailey continues to do the writing of the lectures throughout the period, and is again always the first person to write in the Day Book as well as always making a separate entry to those of the other boys in the office whose names are often grouped under the description of a specific activity. In addition, Bailey continues to be involved in ‘preparing’ various aspects of the lectures both on the day immediately before the lecture and on the day of the lecture itself. In addition to ‘Writing Lecture and preparing drawings’ (day of first lecture), we can also see that he is engaged in the slightly differently worded activities of: ‘preparing Lecture’ (day before second lecture), ‘preparing Lecture, and drawings’ (day of the second lecture), ‘preparing for the 3rd Lecture’ (day before third lecture), ‘Prep. for the 3rd Lecture’ (day of third lecture) and ‘Preparing for the 4th Lecture’ (day of fourth lecture).

Here, we can read what seems to be a clear distinction between, on the one hand, Bailey’s activity of ‘writing’ carried out during the week (with the exception of it also being done on the day of the first lecture) and, on the other hand, the activities of ‘preparing lecture’, ‘preparing drawings’ and ‘preparing for the [2nd, 3rd and 4th] lecture’ carried out on the day before and on the day of the lecture itself. This is once more evidence – indeed, perhaps more suggestive than the evidence of the 1817 lectures – of activities relating

---

295 Unlike the 1817 lectures, Soane and Bailey seem to have been engaged in preparing drafts of the 1820 R.I. lectures in January 1820. See, for example, SM Archives, ‘Index to or Summary to each of the Lectures, for the R. Inst 1820 and General Index to the Six Lectures; Royal Institution; 1820’ (January 1820). This also evidences the fact that originally there were six, rather than the eventual four, lectures which were delivered at the R.I. in 1820. That the series of lectures were cut short in 1820 was also noticed in the press; see the report of Lecture 4 in the Morning Post, 20 June 1820.
not only to preparing the written lecture and preparing the drawn lecture, but also of preparing something in between. We should note that this is more clearly suggested in other earlier notes in the Day Books, for example where the words ‘writing to the drawings’ are written. This is an intriguing phrase that Bailey repeatedly writes in relation to earlier R.A. lectures and can be used specifically to consider the relationship and relative status between drawing and writing in the production and preparation of the lectures. On Thursday 2 March 1815,\(^{106}\) for example, Bailey writes:

Mr Soane
Writing Lecture and writing

to Lecture Drawings.
Bailey

A week later, on Saturday 4 March 1815,\(^{107}\) this turn of phrase is repeated:

Mr Soane
Writing to the drawings in
the 4th Lecture. Writing part of Lecture

Bailey

Whilst it is not possible to be sure what this activity is exactly, it again suggests evidence of attention paid to the correspondence between the writing and drawing in the Soane office’s practice of lecturing over time, and highlights that this activity of ‘writing to the drawings’ is different to writing on its own.

Further indicating both this repeated ‘practice’ of preparing for the R.I. lectures which I close-read above, and the differentiation which seems to have existed between the roles in this practice, the other boys in the office – consisting of Foxhall, Mee, Burges and Papendick – continue to be ‘making’ and ‘about drawings’ in the preparation for the 1820 lectures. This time, however, alongside what sounds like a more over-encompassing activity, carried out by Bailey on the day before and the day of the lecture, of ‘preparing [a specific named] lecture’ and ‘preparing lecture, and drawings’,

---

\(^{106}\) SM Archives, SM Day Book (1814–1816), 63
\(^{107}\) SM Archives, SM Day Book (1814–1816), 66.
the boys in the office also describe their activities on these days as involving ‘preparing drawings’. At the end of the series, on the Monday after the fourth lecture, in a manner that recalls the post-lecture activity of ‘putting away drawings’ after the 1817 series, on Monday 19 June Bailey wrote ‘Arranging Lecture drawings’. 108

Drawing Again: Re-enacting the Lecture Drawings’ Use in the R.I. Lecture Theatre

In this section I outline a further method of architectural history which has been developed specifically in response to evidence I observed to be contained in and suggested by Soane’s lecture drawings and their afterlife. This method also draws from and applies evidence for the lecture drawings suggested by the R.I. manuscripts and discussed in Part I. The method of working discussed here, as I have already outlined at the end of my Introduction, consists of the use of life-size printed facsimiles of some of the lecture drawings with a group of sixteen people, in what I have called a ‘practical history seminar’. This event was held on 29 April 2016 within the current R.I. lecture theatre space at 21 Albemarle Street, London. This section subtitled ‘Drawing Again’ returns to and processes evidence in the lecture drawings which I have already engaged with or which has seemed to be proposed by the process of the practice which I describe in the previous ‘Drawing In’ and ‘Drawing Out’ sections (where I repeatedly engaged with the lecture drawings directly and then contextually). In a manner that relates to the method of transcription of the R.I. lecture manuscripts in Part I: ‘Reading Again’, and which re-enacted the scribal interplay and layout which scripted between words and drawing on the page, this devised method of using the facsimiles, also informed by performance history and theory, similarly seeks to re-enact specific aspects of the lecture drawings. As I will conclude at the end of this section, this method of architectural history enables further readings of the lecture drawings’ role in Soane’s lectures as a performance practice, whilst at the same time further engaging with and accommodating the practised, performed and performative qualities of architectural historical enquiry.

It is important to highlight here that initially I felt much resistance to the idea of re-enacting Soane’s lectures, including his lecture drawings, within the space of the R.I. lecture theatre (or indeed in any other place). This may appear surprising in a research project attempting to make the claim for architectural history as a form of performance or performative practice. At the beginning of this project, however, I was suspicious of the ubiquity of re-enactment, feeling that re-enacting lectures had had its day and was clichéd in art and performance practice, and I was aware that to some degree it had also been done in the recent past by a number of art and architectural
I was also aware of a number of theatrical presentations which Watkin had given at the Georgian Group and within the current R.I. lecture theatre to accompany the publishing of his own work on Soane’s R.A. lectures. Watkin’s presentations – as I pieced together over the course of my doctoral research from patchy accounts by a range of people who had attended them – appeared to involve the delivery of excerpts and highlights of the twelve R.A. lecture texts, whilst showing 35mm slides and digital images of the lecture drawings. In the Georgian Group presentation, I gather Watkin seems to have enrolled his brother, who is an actor and who was dressed up and wigged in the part of Soane, whilst responses of ‘booing’ and ‘hissing’ from the audience were staged at particular points by other Georgian Group members to re-enact the Royal Academicians’ infamous dismay at Soane criticising a living artist in a lecture of 1810. Other theatrical effects were also apparently incorporated, for example, the lights were brought down to signify Soane’s wife’s death in 1815, upon which the actor playing Soane took his glasses off, followed by the lights being brought up again. Indeed, these existing instances of re-enactment initiated and practised by Watkin were more interesting to me (as part of the afterlife and legacy of Soane’s lecturing practice, but also as a form of performance practice carried out by a conventional neo-classical architectural historian) than the need to re-enact Soane’s lectures again myself.

And yet, every time that I presented my work on Soane’s lectures in seminars, presentations and conferences, without fail someone in the audience would ask if I had considered doing a re-enactment. I constantly considered whether re-enacting Soane’s lectures may have been more appealing if I was a traditionally trained architectural historian employing a by now conventional method. It is also important to highlight that when I initially engaged with the vast body of writings on re-enactment as a cultural, historical and artistic practice alongside conducting archival work at the Soane Museum, I
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109 See, for example, art historian Paul O’Keefe’s re-enactments of Ruskin’s 1853 Edinburgh Lectures at The National Gallery of Scotland: accessed 7 November 2015, http://www.paulmokeeffe.com/page4.htm


became more interested in what possibilities such ideas posed for experimenting with forms of textual re-enactment. Indeed, as I have already described, initially I experimented with both transcription and approaching reading and writing as kinds of re-enactment, rather than a form which occurs in front of a live audience.

However, as I hope is clear from the preceding thesis, throughout my research I had been closely concerned with acknowledging and drawing out the embodied and physical qualities of such textual transcription and archival work, which also includes my encounters with the material R.I. manuscripts, and handling the lecture drawings. Indeed, I became interested in situating this archival work as not only involving Collingwood’s conception of the historian’s intellectual re-enactment of a past ‘act of thought’, but as a valuable form of practical and performative architectural history which had significant evidential capacities in its own right and was able to draw attention to the roles of the archive’s ‘architectures of access’ in the construction and process of reading architectural historical meaning.

I chose to structure the seminar which I held at the R.I. around experimentation with five different sequences of lecture drawings. For varying reasons during my archival work these examples had proposed specific questions about their role in Soane’s broader practice of lecturing architecture and its significance as a form of nineteenth-century performance. At the end of the first ‘drawing out’ section, I asked questions about whether the lecture drawings were drawn with the specific purpose to perform within the situation of the lecture, and whether they were perhaps actually drawn to address the audience and other conditions of the lecture’s material, spatial and temporal reception. Following on from this thinking, the five different examples of lecture drawings which I chose to explore through facsimiles were selected for the way they seemed to adopt different types of representational strategies related to their different modes of sequencing one after the other, and how they each also seemed to have been combined with the words of the lecture in specific ways. Whilst up to this point I had considered the lecture drawing objects in the archive and their relationships with the corresponding lecture texts by reading the words off the page, this

---

113 Schneider, *Performing Remains*, 104.
seminar allowed for a different type of embodied engagement with these questions to take place. It involved testing what happened if one physically worked with the facsimiles which stood in for the lecture drawings, whilst the lecture texts were read out loud.

The first set of facsimiles were a series of four comparative drawings shown by Soane as a climax to the end of the first lecture at the R.I. in 1817. The first of these drawings depicts Old Westminster Bridge in front of the much larger Roman Trajan’s Bridge, both crossing over the Danube river (see Image 98).\textsuperscript{114} The second, compares the portico of the Pantheon in Rome with the portico of St Martin’s church in London (see Image 99).\textsuperscript{115} This was followed by a third drawing depicting in gradually increasing sizes: Soane’s Rotunda at the Bank of England, inside the Radcliffe Library in Oxford, inside The Pantheon; with St Peter’s in Rome as the largest depicted structure, apparently holding all the other buildings inside of it (see Image 100).\textsuperscript{116} The fourth and final drawing ended the lecture by representing Soane’s Rotunda at the Bank inside the Pantheon (see Image 101).\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{114} Drawing of Trajan’s Bridge and Westminster. SM 23/1/13.
\textsuperscript{115} Drawing of the Portico of the Pantheon Compared with St. Martins Church. SM 23/1/4.
\textsuperscript{116} Note while the other drawings in this short sequence have inscriptions on their versos confirming their inclusion at this point at the end of R.I. Lecture 1 (1817), we cannot be sure that the drawing SM 23/2/2 (see Image 100) was the one shown at this point in the lecture because it does not have a similar inscription. There is not another lecture drawing in the Soane Museum drawing collection which fits the description written in the R.I. manuscript ‘\textit{Section of the Pantheon with the Radcliffe Library}’.
\textsuperscript{117} Section of the Pantheon with the Radcliffe Library and the Rotunda at the Bank. SM 23/2/7.
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The examples I have just described iteratively compare and contrast ancient and modern buildings, not only within the frame of a single drawing, according to size, but also through the ways in which the same buildings recur across the sequence of the four drawings, at different scales, and in relation to different combinations of other buildings. The second set of lecture drawings which I selected to test at the practical seminar adopted a different representational strategy, which was equally suited to being sequenced. This set of silhouette elevations, which depict Blenheim Palace, develop in appearance over the course of three drawings.\(^{118}\) Whilst the first of these well-known lecture drawings shows Blenheim drawn in complete silhouette, as if in the distance, (see Image 104),\(^{119}\) the second shows it drawn in more detail (see Image 105).\(^{120}\) The third drawing shows the same building drawn with even more detail and in complete focus, and when viewed after the others, apparently as if close to the viewer (see Image 106).\(^{121}\) These drawings were shown one after the other – apparently always in the same order from outline to detail, or from far to near.\(^{122}\) They formed drawing numbers 47–49 of the 80 drawings which were shown in R.I. Lecture 2 of 1817, and then drawing numbers 72–74 of the 101 drawings which were shown in the R.I. Lecture 4 of 1820. Prior to the seminar, this progressive sequence of drawings – in a different way to the comparatives described above – had particularly prompted the issue of being drawn with the temporal qualities of the situation of the lecture event in mind.

\(^{118}\) For discussion of these drawings, see Watkin, *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought*, 194–5, 372–3, 444.

\(^{119}\) *Distant View of Blenheim Palace*. SM 75/4/10.


\(^{121}\) *Near View of Blenheim Palace*. SM 75/4/8.

The third set which I selected, comprised a series of drawings which Soane had shown at the end of the R.I. Lecture 1 of 1820, and which adopted a further different representational convention to that of the bridge and dome comparatives, and of the Blenheim silhouettes. They also seemed to suggest further different effects when they were sequenced in conjunction with the words that were spoken. This set comprised three drawings apparently only shown at the R.I. (as 54–56 of 58 drawings), and not at the R.A., depicting the cemetery of Père la Chaise in Paris from three different successive, encircling viewpoints. The first of this sequence is a particularly long drawing at over two metres in length (718mm x 2163mm), constructed in two parts and stored folded in half. Its view looks down and across the landscape, giving an overview of the cemetery’s varying topography, slopes and footpaths (see Image 111).\(^{123}\) The second, smaller drawing takes a different viewpoint, looking up and at a much closer distance to several tombs in the foreground, with the further structures of the graveyard rising up steadily behind them (see Image 112).\(^{124}\) The third drawing gives yet another impression of the landscape, this time looking out and down from yet another point in the cemetery towards the city of Paris, which can be seen in the distance (see Image 113).\(^{125}\)

Reinforcing this overall impression of encircling the same landscape and viewing it from differing aspects and distances, one notices the same tall building featuring and recurring in this landscape across the drawings; the building occupies the left-hand middle-ground of the first long drawing, then it is shown from another side in the left of the background of the second drawing, before finally appearing on the right edge of the drawing in front of Paris. Indeed, whilst the previous Blenheim sequence incrementally uses varying degrees of silhouette and drawn detail to evoke different distances from the viewer across the three drawings, it should be noted that the palace is nevertheless drawn at the same scale and composed in a regular manner looking straight forward at the building, via the three elevations, from the same direction and position. The Père la Chaise drawings by comparison, whilst also playing with distance, are constructed through three differing and


\(^{124}\) Topographical Drawing of the Cimitière Père la Chaise, Paris. SM 22/6/2.

\(^{125}\) Topographical Drawing of the Cimitière Père la Chaise, Showing Paris in the Distance. SM 22/6/1.
irregularly composed viewpoints, positions and directions across the same landscape. Furthermore, whilst the progression between the Blenheim drawings is logical, steady and centred, the development between the Père la Chaise drawings is of an impression of movement from one viewpoint to another, around and through the same place, but without fixing a precise linear trajectory of the viewer within the landscape from one drawing to the next.

As already intimated, these three differing approaches and strategies not only to representing buildings within the space of a single drawing, but also to creating a progression in specific ways over the course of more than one drawing – and therefore using the lecture’s characteristic of occurring over time – each seemed to additionally communicate by employing different kinds of accompanying verbal description appropriate to the architectural subject matter being communicated. When I read, for example, the comparative drawings with their lecture texts (together with the observations I made through my transcriptions of this type of drawing as leading or coming in time before the words of the text), these drawings seemed to actively interact with the meaning and telling of the words, enabling and allowing the audience to imagine and engage with the experience of scale. The words which were said at the same time as the comparatives, for example, prompt the audience to remember what it feels like to pass under Old Westminster Bridge, and then by comparison to imagine experiencing the scale of Trajan’s Bridge which is depicted in the drawing as so much larger than and towering over the modern structure.

The fourth sequence of lecture drawings which I selected to be made into facsimiles consisted of three views of Soane’s own museum which were apparently shown at the end of the second R.I. lecture of 1820 as numbers 78-80 of 80 drawings. The first of these is a section of the eastside of the Study (819mm x 517mm), drawn by Soane’s assistant Copland in 1817 (see Image 114). The next two drawings, which depict two sections through The Dome at 13 Lincoln’s Inn Fields in 1810 and 1812, are much larger than the first (1272mm x 700mm) and appear also to have been shown together in the

126 Section through the Study (1st Sept 1817). SM 14/6/4.
second R.I. lecture of 1817 as numbers 22-23 of 80 drawings (see Images 114-5).\textsuperscript{127} It should be pointed out that these drawings do not suggest the same significance when viewed in sequence, compared to that which I have shown to be at stake in differing ways through the previous three examples consisting of the dome comparatives, Blenheim silhouettes and encircling Paris graveyard lecture drawings. Indeed, I was interested in these two lecture drawings of Soane’s own museum for different reasons to do with their possible performance practice. I was interested in their large size, in their use of the drawing format of portrait rather than landscape (and the implications there might be for physically showing and demonstrating them in the R.I. space), and in the way in which they were drawn. Although it cannot be seen well in a digital image, there is a crudeness to the way these drawings were drawn, especially when compared with similar sections of Soane’s Museum prepared for the R.A. exhibition which have a much finer quality to them. In relation to way they were drawn, I was interested in how effectively these drawings might register from a distance in the R.I. space, ultimately wondering whether this approach to drawing crudely might be concluded to reflect their purpose of being seen from far away, rather than up close as required of an exhibition drawing.

The final example chosen to test through facsimiles in the lecture theatre of the R.I. was the largest of all Soane’s lecture drawings. As Images 115-6 show it depicts the Great Court of the Temple of the Sun in Palmyra, and it measures a huge 710 x 2493mm.\textsuperscript{128} This drawing, which was shown in the third lecture of 1820, appears, like the Père la Chaise drawing, to have only been shown at the R.I. (and not the R.A.).\textsuperscript{129} It also resembles stage scenery in being constructed, like the first large Père Lachaise drawing, on two stiff sheets which must have been unfolded and would have needed two people to unveil it. Moreover, it also resembles the Soane Museum lecture drawings’ through its crude, unfinished appearance.

Above all, considering these facsimiles specifically in relation to the words which were spoken at the same time – which I had participants respectively demonstrate, and read aloud – together with other archival evidence for

\textsuperscript{127} Section of the Museum 1810. SM 14/6/6. Section of the Museum 1812. SM 14/6/7.
\textsuperscript{128} SM Archives, 20/2/4.
\textsuperscript{129} The back inscription records its use in third R.I. lecture. Note that this drawing features in bailey’s inventory as ‘not used’ in the R.A. lectures.
their staging, itself proposed a third meaning located between the words and drawings. This third meaning – which was not located completely in the lecture texts, nor in the lecture drawings, but instead seemed to occur and happen materially, temporally and spatially in their combination – had indeed been suggested during my encounters with and performances of the evidence in the manuscripts and lecture drawings throughout the project. As I describe in my Introduction, I originally engaged with these suggestions when I initially tried to read the performance and performance practice of the R.A. lectures through Watkin’s 1996 study; and they were further suggested to me whilst reading the manuscripts and lecture drawings repeatedly through one another in differing ways. Ultimately, I conclude that, despite trying repeatedly to read the possible historical, performative meanings of what the words and drawings might have done to each other and how they made meaningful contact in the performances of Soane’s nineteenth-century R.I. lecture events, this had remained frustratingly just out of reach whilst reading between the complex, physically distributed textual and drawn evidence, as well as through the medium I was trying to explore them through – that of writing and printed image. This, I argue, became the necessity and creative impetus for re-enacting the facsimiles in the space, a method that was informed as a practical and interactive seminar to pose and work experimentally through questions, rather than as a more conventional art or performance practice of lecture re-enactment with a full audience.
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Conclusion
This thesis explores architectural history as a form of performance and performative practice. On one level, it communicates new knowledge on the lectures of the neo-classical architect John Soane, uncovering a broad range of new empirical evidence on his six lectures at the Royal Institution of Great Britain (R.I.) in 1817 and 1820 which have not been studied before, and situating them both within the broader oral and performance culture of this institution and period, and within Soane’s broader practice of lecturing at the R.A. over 25 years. At the same time, through engaging with the unstudied manuscripts and large collection of previously studied lecture drawings which his office prepared to be both read aloud and shown at the R.I., my study accesses another side of the story of the Soane office’s activities of lecturing to the one which has previously been told largely by the architectural historian David Watkin. As I have explored in detail, Watkin studied the intellectual journey of Soane’s writing of his lectures and Soane’s process of engaging with other writers and works of architectural history and theory over time, and he also provided a detailed analysis of the R.A. manuscripts and lecture drawings’ content and architectural subject matter.

My architectural history on the other hand, influenced heavily by the epistemological and methodological framing of performance history and theory, builds directly on this existing history, but in so doing takes a different approach by focusing on the practical process of Soane’s lecture preparation, performance and reflection before, during and after his six R.I. lectures. Similarly, by viewing the archival material remaining from these lectures through the lens of performance, new issues are simultaneously activated to be at stake in the evidence. This has led me to read the R.I. manuscripts as scripts for performing architecture through word and drawing, and as exposing more than one hand in their construction. It has also led me to read the lecture drawings as a specific type of architectural drawing deliberately drawn to be used for the specific purpose of performance within the situation of the lecture.

These new evidential findings, the approach to reading the R.I. manuscripts and lecture drawings, and the interpretation of Soane’s lectures as a form of early nineteenth-century performance practice (in which the manuscripts and drawings once participated) have been completely realised through the approach I have taken to conducting the enquiry. Perhaps above all, this has involved an attempt to draw the reader’s attention to the process of the practice of reading the evidence in differing ways over time. In so doing, I
argue that, in addition to the critical value of using performance history and theory to read the manuscripts and drawings in ways conventional architectural history might not, I make the simultaneous case for the ways in which approaching this history of Soane’s architectural lectures itself as a practice, performance practice and, also, performative practice, plays a key role in enabling access to dimensions of Soane’s lectures and their afterlife which have seemed to be partly obscured through their existing historical treatment and archiving.

In approaching architectural history as a ‘practice’, I foreground the significance of the process of doing this enquiry, and the development of ways of doing it over time. Here, the theorists Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt’s reflections about the value of ‘practice as research’ are helpful; indeed, they write that this mode of research ‘not only produces knowledge... but also has the capacity to promote a more profound understanding of how knowledge is revealed, acquired and expressed’.1 Whilst Barrett and Bolt are writing with specific reference to the context of research enquiry in the arts, their words encapsulate qualities which I also assert as valuable in approaching architectural history as a practice. These qualities include how the doing of the reading of the R.I. manuscripts and drawings has led both to new knowledge on Soane’s lectures as performance practice, whilst at the same time emphasising and ‘demonstrat[ing] how [this] knowledge is revealed and how we come to acquire knowledge’2 through engaging with the manuscripts and drawings’ historiography and archiving.

Throughout this study I have continually mused on the relevance to my research of theatre historian and theorist Alan Read’s suggestive claim that ‘performance research paradigms’ and performance practice as a form of research can ‘claim a rigorous approach to the study of “practices”’.3 I interpret Read to be stating here that performance practice enables a particular type of engagement with the ‘practices’ of others, that is, it foregrounds and highlights in the study of others’ ‘practices’ (according to the way I define ‘practice’) their processual and often practical ways and methods of doing and working. Whilst Read is making this point in relation to its


3 Alan Read, Theatre in the Expanded Field: Seven Approaches to Performance (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 2013), xxviii.
application in a broad range of disciplinary contexts, I have been interested in
its implications for how architectural history, approached as a performance
practice, offers a particular ‘rigorous approach to the study’ of the practised
and performed dimensions of Soane’s two-hundred-year-old architectural
lectures. In continuation, it is ambiguous whether ‘the nuanced vocabulary of
making, doing and showing’, which Read refers to in relation to his point
quoted above, are qualities of the performance practice used to study others’
‘practices’, or whether they are qualities of the ‘practices’ which are being
studied through the mode of performance practice as research. Regardless of
Read’s intended meaning, I would like to make the explicit conclusion within
the context of this architectural historical enquiry that it is both. That is,

John Soane’s R.I. Lectures as Early Nineteenth–
Century Performance Practice of Architecture

I interpret Soane’s lectures as a performance practice through reading
evidence in the R.I. lecture manuscripts and lecture drawings, but also
through study of the R.I.’s early nineteenth-century institutional culture of
demonstration, which historians of the Romantic period such as Golinski and
Zimmerman have shown was informed by an established British tradition of
empiricism and scientific demonstration, at the same time as involving other
lecture genres, for example in literature, which were also consciously
approached and received as performances. Engaging with Soane’s lecturing
practice in this way through this performance ‘arts and sciences’ context of
the R.I., I argue, locates the significance of Soane’s architectural lectures
there and of his lecturing practice in general in new ways which have not
been pursued or appreciated before. Indeed, the previous historiography of
Soane’s lectures foregrounded the content and subject matter of Soane’s R.A.

4 Read, Theatre in the Expanded Field, xxviii.
5 Golinski, Science as Public Culture.
6 Zimmerman, ‘Coleridge the Lecturer’.
7 Klancher, ‘From the Age of Projects to the Age of Institutions’, 30.
lecture texts, and also largely presented the lecture drawings as illustrations of the same architectural ideas as such texts, with the result that the R.I. lectures appear as merely simpler versions of the same written and drawn content and architectural subject matter already presented at the R.A. Here I suggest that it is in light of Watkin’s treatment of the R.A. lecture’s content in so much detail, that the R.I. archival material and associated lecturing practice has gone, until now, unstudied by Soane scholars.

As I set out in my ‘Conceptual Framing’ to the Introduction, theatre and performance theorists and historians Bala and Carlson have located the value of approaching historical and cultural behaviour as forms of performance practice through a shifting which occurs from the prioritisation of textual knowledge, towards consideration of issues such as ‘embodiment, event, interaction and practice’, and the ‘spatial’ and ‘actual process of the physical realization of this text’. In addition to reading the manuscripts as scripts for speaking and the lecture drawings as drawn to perform and to address the audience and space of the R.I. lecture theatre, there is another issue which I conclude is also activated as a by-product of approaching Soane’s lecturing as a performance practice. Indeed, it is through considering the lectures’ status as practised and performed that the relationship between the words and drawings in the lectures becomes important in ways that have not previously been appreciated in their earlier treatment as a set of written texts and separate drawings. In approaching the performance practice as encompassing the before, during and after of individual lecture events at the R.I., I show how the respective capacities of the words and drawings of the lectures was consciously reflected on by Soane, and how the interaction between these elements formed an important part both of the writing of the lectures and the drawings’ practical preparation which involved other members of the Soane office.

Related to this significance of the relationship between the words and drawings, I proposed that Soane’s lecturing could also be considered as a nineteenth-century performative practice of architecture. Referring to a preparatory list of ‘Drawings Wanted’, which Soane jotted down in advance of his 1820 R.I. lectures as seen in Image 102, it is interesting to notice

---

Massive crane in May 1920

Close of the crane on the ground

obj. on the hands; around this have been various

View of the crane in the first frame

Company, lots of nice men

with the ladder. Have itself

see the wire as the Roger Academy
CONCLUSION

how Soane consciously considers the scale and material properties of the R.I. lecture theatre, in which these ‘Drawings Wanted’ would eventually be shown:

Compare Intro[?] of Pantheon
with the Lecture Room itself
and do the same at the Royal Academy\(^{10}\)

We do not know if the content of these notes were anecdotally spoken to the audience to further activate the ideas in the drawings and spoken words, or whether they formed part of Soane's own 'backstage' considerations and preparation for the R.I. lectures. Either way, they can be read as further evidencing Soane's performance practice through showing (whilst preparing lecture drawings) his awareness and consideration of the physical space and conditions of reception of the audience. In addition, I also argue that this comprises an example of evidence that starts to locate a more performative form of operation in Soane’s practice of lecturing architecture, or perhaps even a nineteenth-century architectural performative. These ‘performative’ operations (and its associated architectural practice) cuts across between the architectural content and ideas of Soane’s lectures; their form, which took place between word and drawing; and through Soane’s awareness of the architectural space of the lecture event and performance itself. It is interesting to consider how the lecture drawings which depict the Pantheon shown at the R.I. are examples of the comparative drawings which seek to communicate the concept and experience of building scale, in their comparison of ancient structures with modern structures that the audience may often have themselves encountered. But this note takes this notion further, where the idea and experience of building scale is communicated simultaneously through a combination of the drawings and accompanying words – and through comparison with the scale of the space of the R.I. lecture theatre itself, perhaps in relation to which the audience could further engage via their own embodied experience with the architectural ideas encountered though a combination of the spoken and drawn.

It is equally important to point out in conclusion to this thesis that at the same time as asserting the significance of the R.I. lectures for the way they

\(^{10}\) SM Archives, MBii/2/44.
facilitate access to a new history of Soane’s architectural lectures shifted into a nineteenth-century performance and performative discipline, it is nevertheless abundantly clear that valuing the R.A. lectures above the R.I. lectures is not only a later meaning which historians have attributed, but clearly was an attitude that Soane himself and some members of his audience also had. This is constantly reiterated in the evidence available, for example through the fact that no equivalent fair copies were ever made for posterity of the R.I. manuscripts (as they were in the case of the R.A. lectures), together with the fact that Soane was frequently identified by the press as an R.A. ‘Professor’ whilst lecturing at the R.I. Furthermore, we should remember that following Soane’s death, which by then was over 25 years after he had delivered his sixth and last R.I. lecture (the last lecture he would in fact ever deliver in person), Bailey’s 1837 inventories only mention the lecture drawings’ use in the R.A. lectures.

Reading and Drawing In, Out, and Again
Four Methods of a Performed and Performative Architectural History

This thesis also contributes to knowledge through the three methods of the practice of this architectural history which I have developed specifically in response to the observations which I have made of the evidence in the R.I. lecture manuscripts, lecture drawings and, following Schneider, the ‘cross-temporal’ live¹¹ process of the practice of the enquiry. In addition to these approaches, there is also a fourth method which I position as a performative practice of architectural history, and which consists of the structure of the thesis itself. This structure has not only been developed from, but has also further participated in the performance of evidence during this thesis. The following starts by making some conclusions about the rationale behind and value of adopting this structure as a method of performative architectural history, in turn tracing the conclusions and arguments made in the various sections across this structure in Part I and Part II. Following this, I move to summarising and concluding my use of transcription and the use of the facsimiles as performance and performative practice of architectural history. I end the Conclusion by reflecting on my approach to liveness in the reading

¹¹ Schneider, Performing Remains, 37, 57.
and writing of this architectural history and of the role of method as that which is not given but found.

As described in my Introduction, and then performed across Part I and Part II, this structure was initially dictated and informed by the process of the practice and different stages of engaging with the R.I. manuscripts. I intuitively began by close reading in to the manuscripts, and I considered the evidence and questions they themselves appeared to propose through reading them directly in this way. This was followed by expanding out to considering the same manuscripts, their questions and Soane’s associated performance practice of architecture in a more contextual way through the broader oral and performance culture of the period. I then moved to a period of transcribing the manuscripts, which not only allowed me to make a copy of them (which indeed had originally been the intention), but also enabled me to reconsider, again, and further reflect on particular features of the evidence which I had already engaged with in the manuscripts. This in turn revealed further evidence in them regarding Soane’s lectures as a performance practice. Accordingly, coming directly out of these different stages of the process of reading the manuscripts, I adopted what I felt at the time was a logical framework for organising my analysis in Part I, of ‘Reading In’, ‘Reading Out’, and ‘Reading Again’.

Significantly, however, in addition to being dictated by the process of the practice, structuring my thesis in this way also became over time a framework for self-reflecting on the practice of architectural history, or, more specifically, on the different ways of reading the R.I. manuscripts (directly, contextually, repeatedly/performatively). Here, I intensely considered the different procedures of reading primary material on its own, then exposing it to assessment of other historians’ views in the secondary literature, before addressing a combination of the two (and considering the respective access it granted to Soane’s lecturing practice) specifically through re-enacting and remaking the manuscript. Whilst the tripartite approach in Part I had enabled me (and I hope drew my reader’s attention) to further reflect on the significance of the process and differing stages of carrying out the enquiry, it equally presented its own problems. In particular, through attempting to maintain a separating out of the reading of primary, secondary and performative evidence connected to the R.I. manuscripts, I became very aware (particularly when I returned later to this work) that to do so is itself to impose an artificial construct which was far from neutral – not to mention my
further awareness of the point that there is more fluidity between these different types and acts of deploying evidence when reading the past than there is separation.

In turn, I chose to adopt a similar organising structure for exploring the drawings, but this time I amended it to suit the second stage of the research process, the nature of my engagement with the lecture drawings, as well as the differing associations that the term ‘drawing’ proposed in combination with the words ‘in’, ‘out’, and ‘again’. Whilst over the course of Part II I read the lecture drawings directly and contextually, its enquiry was different and more iterative than Part I, having occurred after my engagement with the words (through the manuscripts) of the lectures. It was also carried out in light of the particular arguments made in Part I concerning Soane’s lecturing as a performance practice of architecture and, specifically, of the primary importance observed to be at stake in the manuscripts of the scripted interface between the words and the drawings.

Part II began by ‘Drawing In’ to the lecture drawings themselves as visual and material objects, and also to exploring their changing storage, cataloguing, and viewing spaces over time. These observations resulted not only in reflections of the lecture drawings but also in the writing of an architectural history of the material and spatial distribution of knowledge of the drawings and their afterlife in the Soane Museum institution over time. Whilst initially setting out to draw in to the matter of Soane’s performance practice of the drawings, describing them in their archival situation led me in fact to activate a different matter: that of successive Soane Museum curators’ performance practices of archiving and handling them since their ‘use’ in the lectures during Soane’s lifetime. With reference to previous Soane Curators, such as the attempts of Margaret Richardson (who in a sense acted as my guide to showing and telling this history) to understand the lecture drawings, as well as Walter Spiers’s and Arthur Bolton’s early twentieth century rearrangements, I show how – again following Richardson’s observations in the 1980s – the lecture drawings comprise the most rearranged group of drawings in the collection and have progressively moved away from being stored and catalogued in terms of their use (or performance practice) in the lectures.

In the next ‘Drawing Out’ section, I drew out to how the lecture drawings have been described before, and out of this normative history I posed
questions about how there may be different ways of classifying the drawings’ visual content as part of Soane’s lecturing approach as a nineteenth-century performance practice of architecture. Here, rather than exploring the lecture drawings as pictures and in terms of their subject matter, I show how they can be considered as specific types of architectural drawings deliberately drawn for the purpose of performance and to address their material, temporal and spatial conditions of reception.

This was followed by ‘Drawing In’ for a second time, which tells the process of identifying the R.I. lecture drawings and shows how former archiving processes and treatment by other historians who group and classify the drawings in specific ways reiterate former classifications and structure any attempt to read them and Soane’s associated R.I. lecture practice today. This process of the practice of identifying the R.I. drawings also develops through a performative description of my own repeated handling of and physical working with the lecture drawings, specifically in the terms of being a performance and dance carried out in response to the codes of the archive and whose technique was proposed by the drawings’ scale, number and weight. Significantly, this performance and performative practice of handling the drawings not only came from my own encounter with the drawings in the present; indeed, it also resonated with and was influenced by descriptions (cited in the first ‘Drawing In’ section) written by previous curators, such as Arthur Bolton in the 1920s, about their handling and hauling of the lecture drawings around the Soane Museum. At the same time, it became a way of engaging with and accessing another example of related embodied knowledge suggested by these drawing objects and the manuscripts, which was to do with their physical acts of being practically prepared and also shown in the lectures themselves. Through the literal meaning and metaphor of ‘turning over’ the physical drawings, I considered how there is as much evidence for Soane’s performance practice of architecture on their backs as on their fronts. Ultimately, I performed the argument of handling and working with the fronts and backs of the lecture drawings as itself constituting a form of reading the material culture of Soane’s performance practice.

The penultimate section of Part II and final ‘Drawing Out’ section further drew out to the matter of the drawings’ use (already proposed in previous sections), and evidence for their role in a practical process and performance practice of lecturing. Here I read from the Soane office Day Books a pattern
of different stages of preparation and post-lecture activities of the lecture drawings (About, making, preparing, putting away drawings) as well as during lectures (preparing drawings), before reading these stages with evidence previously suggested in the R.I. manuscript in Part I for further stages of this practical process (numbering, writing to the drawings). In this section I also considered other evidence in the archive for the relationship between words and drawings, and I addressed the question of whether the words led the drawings or vice versa. Ultimately, I concluded that this question of which element led which is different when it is applied to the context of the preparation, from when it is applied to the context of the performance of the words and drawings.

The final section of Part II, ‘Drawing Again’, was in a sense a culmination of the performance of evidence encountered and written about over the course of the entire previous Part II and Part I. In this section, I described the ‘practical history seminar’ which I held in the current R.I. lecture theatre space, where printed facsimiles of the lecture drawings were used primarily to investigate evidence suggested and discovered during the whole thesis regarding the performance practice of using words and drawings together. Here, the interface between word and drawing, which was suggested as scripted in the manuscripts in Part I, was considered on stage rather than on page. Whilst in the previous sections of Part II I had considered evidence for the lecture drawings’ use during the preparation of the performance practice, as well as exploring the embodied knowledge suggested by the objects themselves and the evidence in the archive for their afterlife, in this final section I considered their use and the acts of being shown in the performance of the lecture itself. Continuing from the reading I made in the first ‘Drawing Out’ section – that there may be a new way of approaching these drawings as drawn to perform within the situation of the lecture – the staging of the facsimiles of particular groups and sequences of drawings shown in the R.I. lectures was used explicitly to consider the ways the drawings might have addressed conditions of reception in the architecture of the R.I. lecture theatre.

Linking to the summary and conclusions I make above with respect to the section located at the end of Part I entitled ‘Reading Again’, I also developed the method of re-enacting the R.I. lecture manuscripts through transcribing them. As a ‘practice’, I positioned the process of actually making the copy of the R.I. lecture manuscript to play an active role in reading and revealing
the evidence it transcribes. Here I showed how the method of the practice of the transcription which I adopted – of transcribing the handwriting and layout – led me to engage with Soane’s performance practice of scripting the word and drawing before his lecture occurred. Recording the changes in handwriting also enabled me to notice the hand of a woman named Norah Brickenden and her possible involvement in the immediate preparation for the 1817 lectures. Indeed, the critical value of this process of transcribing the manuscripts for reading their form and content, and the function of the transcriptions as more straightforward copies that operated as invaluable digital tools from which I could search the words of the manuscript and reflect on its form away from the archive, became very evident almost immediately after starting to transcribe.

The status of the transcription objects themselves, however, especially when printed – beyond as described above, of being a subjective record of the process of transcribing and a pragmatic research tool – remained ambiguous for most of the project. As with the initial resistance I felt towards re-enacting the lectures within the R.I. lecture theatre (which I described in ‘Drawing Again’), this ambiguity regarding the transcriptions was also informed by my former practice as an artist, and by a particular attitude which I had developed during this time to the practical artefacts and drawings which I make alongside writing.

Whilst I conceive of the writing of the thesis as both a performance and demonstration of the evidence and process of evidencing the ways the R.I. manuscripts and lectures can be read as evidence (staged for the future live encounter of the audience that is the reader), I do not understand the printed transcriptions as performances or as artworks. Whilst I am happy to show them (as indeed I do in Appendix 1), importantly, I did not produce them for the purpose of being shown or viewed. Indeed, I locate both the practice of transcribing and the transcription artefacts that result explicitly as the preparation, the backstage, the improvisation, and the field or site notes, or even as drawings, for the presentation of the evidence and performative evidencing of history which takes place through writing and image, both on the page and within spoken presentations. Another way of articulating this is to say that whilst I do not understand the transcriptions to be performances, I

---

12 Roms, ‘Mind the Gaps’, 174–175; Peters, Der Vortrag als Performance.
nevertheless locate them as a part of the performance practice of architectural history; indeed, they are where I played out questions in relation to the manuscripts before, during, and after writing.

I labour over this point partly because reaching this conclusion regarding the status of the transcriptions in this way has unlocked for me the bigger question about positioning one element of the ‘practice’ – in this case, the practical artefacts which I have made throughout this enquiry – in my own broader practising of this architectural history (its process and ways of doing). Thinking the transcriptions through a model of performance practice and the temporal issues which this brings up (of before, during and after the performance), following the theories of for example Schneider and Carlson13 which were set out in my 'Conceptual Framing', is for me a more productive way of positioning this work located in Appendix 1, than to consider them as, for example, subservient to, or equal to, the writing. In so doing, it also collapses the theory/practice, or thesis/practice binary which I do not feel to be at stake in my own approach to architectural history, which considers the constellation of activities carried out during the process of research enquiry as different ways of thinking and doing engaged with during the process of reading Soane’s lecturing practice.

The above conclusions regarding my transcriptions as practice, performance and performance practice overlap with my conclusions about this method as a performative practice of architectural history. Indeed, on one perhaps obvious level, following Austin’s theory of the performative, the active role which transcribing plays in the process of reading the history of Soane’s lectures can be understood as actually achieving a performative action, rather than as operating as a mechanical and ‘constative’ method of reproducing a historical or literary text (which indeed, as Bennett notes, is the way that transcription and the act of copying is so often assumed within conventional historical and documentary evidence practice).14

Linking in turn to the summary and conclusions I make above with respect to the final section of the thesis and Part II, entitled ‘Drawing Again’, I also worked with the method of re-enacting the facsimiles of the lecture drawings. As a ‘practice’, similar to my argument about the practice of transcribing, I

13 Schneider, Performing Remains; Carlson, The Haunted Stage.
14 Bennett, ‘The Editor of Letters as Critic’, 112-140.
made the case for a practical history approach of physically working with the facsimiles to itself constitute a way of reading them. As a ‘performance practice’, I considered the value of the seminar as a space for rehearsing the evidence previously encountered in the archive, as well as a collective means for shaping an interpretation of the past with other people. As a ‘performative practice’, I argue that this embodied, collective process of reading the lecture drawings in situ particularly drew attention to Bonnivier’s characterisation of Butler’s performativity as that which offers a critique (in my case of the existing history of John Soane’s lectures and value systems regarding word and drawing) through showing ‘how meaning is crafted in the process of making’.  

Method as Not Given But Found

At the end of my Introduction, where I first introduced the methods of this project in detail, I wrote about Roland Barthes’s question – posed first in lecture form, then later documented in the 2011 book, The Preparation of the Novel: Lecture Courses and Seminars at the Collège de France, 1978-1979 and 1979-1980 – which asked: ‘Is it possible to make a Narrative (a Novel) out of the Present?’ Over the course of each of these two lecture series delivered at the end of his life, Barthes had sought to write the ‘present experienced as it happens’, in order to ‘simulate’, but also reflect upon, the processes and methods of constructing a novel. I drew correspondences between this project, and the similar self-reflexive ways in which I was pursuing whether it was possible to write the process of ‘what’s happening’ in one’s own live engagement with the material of the R.I. manuscripts and drawings. In due course, as also outlined in some detail within the Introduction, I sought through Schneider’s cross-temporal theories of re-enactment to develop this live approach to demonstrating the ‘present moment’ qualities of engaging with the evidence as a way of addressing the historian’s performance of simultaneously linking back and also forward to previous live encounters in the archive, and with the future live encounter of the deployment of such evidence for Soane’s lectures as performance practice by the reader.

13 Bonnevier, Behind Straight Curtains, 84, fn. 4.
15 Barthes, The Preparation of the Novel, 171.
16 Barthes, The Preparation of the Novel, 17.
17 Which it should be noted also relate to Barthes’s observations quoted previously about how ‘writing the present as it happens’ involves simultaneous acts of trying to ‘reconcile’ a ‘distance’ and ‘proximity’.

338
The 2013 book, *How to Live Together: Novelistic Simulations of Some Everyday Spaces*, published an earlier series of lecture notes delivered by Barthes, also at the Collège de France in 1977. One of the things which Barthes focused on, both at the beginning and at the end of this lecture course, and which I find particularly relevant to this performative project of architectural history, concerned the issue of ‘method’, which he paradoxically broached through a concept of ‘non-method’. Barthes’s ‘non-method’ can in turn be viewed as the performative principle by which he attempts to practise the lectures or perform his pedagogy in lecture form. Via reference to the philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Friedrich Nietzsche, Barthes writes about ‘method’ in relation to ‘non-method’ as follows:

Method = phallic mindset of attack and defense (‘will,’ ‘decision,’ ‘premeditation,’ ‘going straight ahead,’ etc.) vs. Non-method: mindset of the journey, of extreme mutability (flitting, gleaning). We’re not following a path; we’re presenting our findings as we go along. A ‘hysterical’ structure? Certainly one conducive to stage-fright; not a single one of these lectures without stage-fright > ‘I present {j’expose}’ = ‘I make myself vulnerable’ {je m’expose} + the hysteric’s perpetual question: *What am I worth?*

Barthes’s definition and performance of ‘non-method’ chimes with an oblique position which I have worked through whilst researching this architectural history of Soane’s lectures (and which perhaps applies to all research as practice?). This position regards, far from disregarding ‘method’, the notion that ‘method’ is not given, but found.

Barthes’s concept of ‘non-method’, which in his own words involves acts of ‘not following a path; we’re presenting our findings as we go along’, clearly relates to his later project of ‘writing the present’ and writing the process of ‘what’s happening’, whilst writing. But Barthes also shows in the latter part of the words cited above how practising ‘non-method’ whilst ‘writing the present’ – or, actually studying ‘what’s happening to me’ by writing the self-reflective encounter of reading evidence, as indeed I have done in this performative history of the nineteenth-century architectural lecture – also

---


inevitably results in a ‘stage-fright’ during this performance of the evidence. Here, it is in turning away from the established authority and certainty afforded through the often-disciplinary procedures of pre-given ‘methods’, that I hope to usefully expand our notion of what methods and methodologies are and how they are conceived by researchers. Whilst this involves continually making oneself vulnerable and exposed, it has also activated, and ‘played’ through the present, the evidence in new ways, but also ‘the reality effects such playing has’\(^{22}\) for reading a history of the nineteenth-century architectural lecture.
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