

Predella journal of visual arts, n°41-42, 2017 www.predella.it - Monografia / Monograph ■

www.predella.it/www.predella.cfs.unipi

Direzione scientifica e proprietà / *Scholarly Editors-in-Chief and owners:*
Gerardo de Simone, Emanuele Pellegrini - predella@predella.it

Predella pubblica ogni anno due numeri online e due numeri monografici a stampa /
Predella publishes two online issues and two monographic print issues each year

Tutti gli articoli sono sottoposti alla peer-review anonima / All articles are subject to anonymous peer-review

Comitato scientifico / *Editorial Advisory Board:* Diane Bodart, Maria Luisa Catoni, Michele Dantini, Annamaria Ducci, Fabio Marcelli, Linda Pisani, Francesco Solinas

Coordinamento editoriale / *Editorial Assistants:* Paolo di Simone, Silvia Massa, Michela Morelli

Impaginazione / *Layout:* Nikhil Das, Giulia Del Francia, Vittorio Proietti

Predella journal of visual arts - ISSN 1827-8655

Another piece of the mosaic. Trecento influences on the Albert Memorial

The Albert Memorial was constructed as a monument to Prince Albert, the consort of Queen Victoria, following his death in 1861. Completed in 1876, it is a major example of the Gothic Revival yet one that references both Classicism and the Italian Trecento. The latter's influence can clearly be seen in the Memorial's mosaics that decorate its pediments, spandrels and vaulting. This paper explores the reasoning and background for the inclusion of Italian trecento styles on the Memorial. It examines the roles played by the architect, George Gilbert Scott, the designer Richard Clayton, the mosaic entrepreneur Antonio Salviati, and the artistic advisers Charles Lock Eastlake and Austen Henry Layard.

The Albert Memorial is an intriguing piece of Victorian architecture that stands at the southern edge of Kensington Gardens facing the Royal Albert Hall (fig. 1). Although it is ostensibly a product of the Gothic Revival, closer inspection reveals that it is in fact a very eclectic mix of influences and designs. Hidden amidst the grandeur of the Gothic shrine and the surrounding classical statuary, the Italian Trecento has a quiet presence high up in the mosaics that decorate the gables. It remains there as evidence of a certain moment in time when a new vogue for mosaic decoration intersected with a growing interest in early Italian art.

The Memorial commemorates Queen Victoria's consort, Prince Albert, who died of typhoid at Windsor Castle on 14 December 1861. Although there were varying attitudes among the British towards the Prince during his lifetime, from sycophancy to outright hostility, his death caused a certain outpouring of grief and emotion that led to calls for memorials to him across the country. One month after his death, on 14 January 1862, a public meeting was held at the Mansion House to discuss the construction of a national memorial to be sited in London. The idea found favour with the Queen who, in February 1862, appointed a four man committee to find a design for the memorial. The committee considered proposals from seven architects and, after a lengthy process, in May 1863 the Queen announced her approval of the design by George Gilbert Scott¹. Work on the Memorial started on 6 May 1864 and it was revealed to the public in 1872, albeit without the gilded statue of Prince Albert. That was placed *in situ* in November 1875 and was finally unveiled in March 1876².

Artistic scrutiny of the design existed from the outset, initially in the shape of Charles Lock Eastlake. He served on both the original selection committee and the Executive Committee appointed to oversee the construction of the Memorial. Eastlake's status in the Victorian art world and his standing with the royal family made his involvement in the project something of a *fait accompli* and is recorded in the *Handbook to the Prince Consort National Memorial*:

Sir Charles Eastlake, as President of the Royal Academy, Director of the National Gallery, and Secretary of the Fine Arts Commission during the whole period of its existence, represented the head of the artistic profession, and the Queen and the Prince constantly consulted with him upon artistic matters. His services, in making the preliminary arrangements with the different sculptors and other artists, were most invaluable to the Executive Committee³.

When Eastlake died in Pisa on Christmas Eve 1865, the Executive Committee turned to Austen Henry Layard to fulfil the role of artistic adviser. Layard was an author, connoisseur, collector, archaeologist, politician and diplomat and although he himself felt that he was «unworthy to succeed» Eastlake⁴, the Executive Committee invited Layard to join them on 15 January 1866, partly for his range of artistic knowledge but also for his government connections⁵. There is an interesting parallel here with the National Gallery. In seeking to fill Eastlake's position as the Director of the National Gallery, Layard had also been considered as a candidate but had had to refuse the position due to existing political commitments and instead he became a lifelong and active Gallery Trustee.

Eastlake's and Layard's role as artistic adviser was to assist Scott in bringing his design to fruition. In his original proposal for Queen Victoria and the Executive Committee, Scott described his plans for the Memorial:

The idea which I have worked out may be described as a colossal statue of the Prince, placed beneath a vast and magnificent shrine or tabernacle, and surrounded by works of sculpture illustrating those arts and sciences which he fostered, and the great undertakings he originated. I have in the first place, elevated the Monument upon a lofty and wide-spreading pyramid of steps. From the upper platform rises a Podium or continuous pedestal, surrounded by sculptures in alto-relievo, representing historical groups or series of the most eminent artists of all ages of the world: the four sides being devoted severally to Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, Poetry and Music⁶.

The selection of artists is extensive and ranges from Homer to Turner but it is interesting to note that the growing interest in earlier Italian art is reflected by the inclusion among the painters of Cimabue, Giotto, and Orcagna. The themes of the sculptures on the podium are continued in the mosaics: «Each side is terminated by a gable, the tympanum of which contains a large picture in mosaic»⁷ and «in the pediment of the gable, above each of these groups [of the arts] is a mosaic picture idealizing the art of which the great professors are portrayed below; while in the spandrels of the arches are (also in mosaic) groups illustrative of the practice of the art in question. [...] Thus the sculptural and pictorial enrichments of the Monument from its base to its roof are illustrative of art and science in all their branches»⁸. In its entirety Scott's design has echoes of the fourteenth century as well as a resonance with other nineteenth-century memorials. Although the Eleanor Crosses were a source of inspiration for Scott⁹, he made it clear that «though adopting [...] the style of a Gothic Cross, I have not followed any existing type, but have struck out one suited to the best of my judgement, especially to this individual object»¹⁰. Mediaeval shrines were another influence that Scott would have encountered in his travels in Europe¹¹ and, although Scott doesn't allude to it, the Memorial also calls to mind George Meikle Kemp's Sir Walter Scott Memorial in Edinburgh and Thomas Worthington's Albert Memorial in Manchester¹².

Whatever the inspiration, Scott's idea of a Gothic Cross had appealed to Queen Victoria, possibly for religious reasons as well as for its grandeur and the centrality of the monument to Albert. Her secretary Charles Grey explained to Eastlake that «many reasons have influenced HM to think that Mr Scott's design, or at least the principle of that design should be adopted» and that «beautiful as some of the other designs are they are for the most part too much in the character of mausoleums»¹³. One of the many reasons that met with the Queen's approval may have been Scott's holistic approach to the Memorial. It was not only that the imagery existed to celebrate Prince Albert's encouragement of art, science, architecture and sculpture but also the design itself would reflect the Prince's wide-ranging tastes and the variety of arts that he had fostered. Scott argued:

By thus introducing all the arts subsidiary to architecture we should not only be rendering the Memorial replete with beauty, and giving it that air of preciousness so essential to its object, but should be at once displaying and calling into exercise arts which the Prince Consort so earnestly desired to encourage; and should be rendering his Memorial not only an illustration of, but a means of practically realising many of the objects to which he devoted his energies¹⁴.

In practice this meant that Scott included a variety of historical styles in his design for the Memorial and settled upon the Trecento as the inspiration for the mosaic work that he envisaged in the upper part of the structure¹⁵. Mosaic had been intended for the Memorial from the outset and it was certainly in vogue at this time, partly because it seemed to offer a solution for large scale wall decoration that could withstand the vagaries of the damp British climate (the debates about the suitability of fresco painting at the Houses of Parliament were fresh in people's minds)¹⁶. For Scott, it was not simply practical considerations that attracted him to the medium but he also felt that the large pictures in mosaic would help effect the characteristics of a shrine, i.e. they were precious and expensive enough to be fitting for the Memorial. Mosaics were also increasing in popularity due to the marketing efforts of Antonio Salviati, who had given up a career in the law to devote himself to re-establishing Venice's pre-eminence in the glass-making industry and re-inventing its mediaeval craft techniques¹⁷. In 1859 Salviati had founded a company for the manufacture of mosaics and during the 1860s oversaw a renaissance of Venetian glass-making. He was well-known in England, exhibiting at the International Exhibition of 1862, executing numerous commissions and ultimately opening up a London showroom in Oxford Street in 1866. Scott had decided that Salviati would have a role in the Memorial's mosaics from the start, stating in his explanatory remarks on the design that «the vaulted roof of the interior would be decorated with the enamel mosaic-work introduced from Venice by Dr Salviati»¹⁸. This is not surprising because Scott already had an existing relationship with Salviati and was working on a similar proposal at the same time as his submission regarding the Albert Memorial. In 1862 Scott had also been involved in the reconstruction and decoration of the Albert Memorial Chapel (formerly the Wolsey Chapel) at Windsor Castle. This included mosaic-work provided by Salviati based on designs by Richard Clayton who would also go on to reprise this role for the Albert Memorial. It was Scott who had suggested mosaics and Salviati for the chapel after seeing his work at the 1862 International Exhibition, writing on 12 September 1862: «I am so struck by its suitability to this situation and the magnificent effect it would give to the Chapel that, though the cost is considerable, I cannot refrain from suggesting it for consideration»¹⁹. The next day he reported to the Dean of Windsor that Salviati had been to the chapel and was «in a state of extasy [*sic*] at the idea of executing such a work»²⁰. Scott would superintend the cartoons designed by Clayton for execution by Salviati, an exact forerunner of their future collaboration on the Memorial.

Early work on the Memorial and indeed much of Eastlake's perceived involvement focused on the sculptures. It was only in August 1864 that Scott once

again started to consider the mosaics and he remained convinced that Venice should serve as the inspiration, writing that «Venice is the very land and home of mosaic-work, and it seems hopeless as yet to equal the works of those who have been brought up among the ancient productions of this noble art»²¹. In embracing this romantic notion about the Venetian workmen, Scott was following Ruskin²² who had prepared the ground in *The Stones of Venice* of 1853 with his appreciation of the city's history of artisanship in the glass-making industry²³. Ruskin was echoed by later writers, including Eastlake's nephew and namesake, Charles Locke Eastlake, who wrote in his popular *Hints on Household taste in furniture, upholstery and other details* of 1872 that «at Murano these poor glass-blowers appear to inherit as a kind of birthright the technical skill in a trade which made their forefathers famous», adding that «Dr Salviati has done his best to produce good designs, and old examples for the men to copy»²⁴. Salviati would indeed go on to secure the contract for the mosaics on the Albert Memorial, albeit only after providing a guarantee that his work would survive in the British climate following a debate about the durability of mosaics that arose in early 1866²⁵. Salviati assured Scott that the mosaics would be of the highest quality and «answerable in thickness to that of the ancient enamels and of the enamels which the said mosaicist has supplied to the Chapter of the Cathedral Church of St Mark in the city of Venice»²⁶.

The designs for the mosaics also took time to be settled. Initially Scott had left the design of the mosaics relatively open: «The mosaic pictures in the tympana of the gables may either represent, in an ideal manner, the patronage of Art and Science by Royalty, or might illustrate important incidents from the life of the Prince Consort»²⁷. By the autumn of 1864 Scott had developed this idea into a proposal for two historical and two allegorical subjects, the historical depicting key moments from Prince Albert's life and the allegories relating to his encouragement of the arts and sciences²⁸. However, uncertainty about the effect of modern costumes in mosaics depicting recent events from the Prince's life led Scott to question his own ideas. He appears to have consulted Eastlake on this matter²⁹ and, possibly as a result, by June 1865, he came to the conclusion that a simple portrayal of four allegorical subjects would be preferable and that these would correspond with the reliefs below relating to the arts fostered by the Prince: music and poetry; painting; sculpture; and architecture³⁰. Eastlake appears to have played no further part in the design process and following his death in December 1865, Layard enthusiastically took up Eastlake's liaison work with the sculptors. Meanwhile it was Scott who decided that the contract for designing the mosaics should go to the firm of Clayton and Bell, with whom he had colla-

borated on several previous projects³¹. Throughout July 1866 Scott, Clayton and Layard discussed the design of the mosaics. However, problems between Salviati and Clayton soon began to surface and in September 1866 Layard, now in Venice, wrote: «I have seen Salviati here. He tells me that Clayton is rather troublesome about cartoons and that it is very difficult to get them within the time he promises»³². Layard's sense of urgency in this matter appears unreasonable given that, in effect, only a few months had elapsed since Clayton had been awarded the job. Layard's position might be explained by his relationship with Salviati, which dated back to 1862, and the fact that Salviati was facing financial difficulties. It was these circumstances that would propel Layard into a much closer relationship with the Venetian when in late 1866 he organised a British consortium to invest in Salviati's company, leaving the founder with only a small stake in the firm. From this point forward Layard became both client and supplier, a fact that offers some explanation for his ongoing criticism of perceived delays by Clayton in delivering the designs. Although it can be argued that Layard's relationship with Salviati helped the latter to gain access to commissions in England, this does not appear to be true in the case of the Albert Memorial³³. Scott had an existing relationship with Salviati prior to Layard's involvement in the project or his provision of financial support to the Venetian firm. Moreover, Scott, in line with Ruskin, was clearly interested in the whole aesthetic of art and craft and this prompted his own enthusiasm for the use of Venetian mosaics. Utilising this craft served the shrine-like purposes of the Memorial and honoured the memory of the Prince Consort in both a practical and intellectual manner.

Although much of Layard's time was taken up with ensuring that Clayton fulfilled his contractual obligations, he was of course also responsible for advising on the artistic merits of the designs. Layard first met with Clayton to discuss the designs in July 1866 and it is now that it becomes clear that the fourteenth century would serve as their inspiration. Layard directed Clayton towards an illustration reproduced in Rosini's *Storia della pittura italiana*, namely the fresco in Santa Maria Novella depicting the arts and sciences and then believed to be by Taddeo Gaddi, now attributed to Andrea di Bonaiuto da Firenze³⁴ (fig. 2). Scott approved of Layard's advice, adding that «I almost wish he [Clayton] could go to Florence before he draws the cartoons. He has been there a couple of years ago but a recent familiarity with Florentine works of the 14th century seems to me the best possible means of inducing the tone of feeling needed for such a work»³⁵. At this time Clayton, Layard and Scott were considering group compositions for each allegory but by the time Clayton's initial sketches were completed in December 1866, they had become single figures. Layard and Scott approved of the idea and Queen

Victoria gave her blessing to the proposed designs in January 1867. However, as Clayton began work on the full-size cartoons, he started to introduce changes to the general concept derived from the example of fourteenth-century Florence. In April 1867 Clayton informed Layard that «the throne had to be re-designed and the fact that all the sculptors are perhaps necessarily avoiding all gothicisms of character in their work, rendered it prudent to depart more from the style of the architecture of the building than my small sketches indicated»³⁶. While the figures remained enthroned, the thrones were not canopied and a drift towards a classical model is evident. When the cartoons were finally tried out during the summer, Scott differed markedly from Clayton on this point. Scott believed that the designs were «very gay, pronounced and prominent whereas I think it should have a quiet, rich and sombre tone rather like an old painting: rather giving the idea of retiring as the quietest part of the composition than of thrusting itself forward»³⁷. A further redesign by Clayton clearly took place to reintroduce the tone of «an old painting», i.e. a painting of the Trecento, although, as Teresa Sladen has observed, the figures themselves retained certain classical qualities³⁸.

The first redesigned cartoon, produced by Clayton in England, was finally ready to be sent off to Salviati in Venice at the end of October 1867. By September the following year the mosaics had been completed and were almost all in place on the Memorial (figs 3-6). They are described in the *Handbook to the Prince Consort National Memorial* thus:

On the South front the figure of Poetry holds a lyre in her right hand, and in her left hand a scroll, on which is inscribed the names of Homer, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare, and Molière; the figures of King David and Homer are inserted in the niches of the throne. In the spandrels are shown the poet and the musician. On the East side the figure of Painting holds a palette and brushes in the left hand; the right hand resting on a strained canvas. The figures of Apelles and Raphael are shown in the niches of the throne. The painter and his model fill the spandrels.

On the North side, the figure of Architecture holds a pair of compasses, and a sketch of the Memorial itself; the niches of the throne being occupied by the figures of Solomon and Ictinus; the former holds a model of the Jewish Temple, and the latter a model of the Parthenon. In the spandrels appear the designer and the builder.

On the West side, the figure of Sculpture holds in one hand a small model, and in the other a sculptor's mallet: the niches of the throne being occupied by figures of Phidias and Michael Angelo. In the spandrels are figures of the

modeller and the carver³⁹.

The final designs clearly show the influence of trecento art in their design and execution but to what extent did Layard's role as artistic adviser play a part in this? Layard was sympathetic towards early Italian art and it is tempting to make the links between the mosaics, Layard and Salviati. However, Layard came to the project when it was already at an advanced stage and indeed after Eastlake had already started to advise Scott on the direction of the design of the mosaics. This is not to say that Layard didn't have any impact but it is reasonable to assert that Layard's role was advisory and that generally he was responsive and reactive either to Scott's vision or to Clayton's actual designs formed in response to that vision. It was of course Scott who had had the original concept. He was the great master of the Gothic Revival yet he was also appreciative of Venetian Gothic and Byzantine art. Furthermore, both he and Clayton were admirers of Florentine fourteenth-century painting. Teresa Sladen points out the resonance between the final designs for the Memorial mosaics and Giotto's *Ognissanti Madonna* (fig. 7), a noteworthy example from the early Italian art repertory, although the resemblance between the designs and other early Italian altarpieces is also striking, for example Duccio's Siena Duomo *Maestà*⁴⁰. Scott would never have said that his was an absolute historicism; it was more about seeking inspiration from the past and then improving upon it. He stated that:

My theory is, that if there is real merit in early christian art – of which I am perfectly convinced – its merit must of necessity be independent of, and separate from, its defects and its quaintness; and that if we believe in our own great revival, we are bound to show our faith by discriminating the faults from the merits of our originals, and by endeavouring to produce an art which avoids the one while it retains the other, and adds to this whatever of better instruction and skill our own eye can afford⁴¹.

Therefore, although Scott, like many contemporaries, regarded early Italian art as imperfect, he also believed that it was inspiring and that it had the right tone for the characteristics of a Christian shrine. In seeking to represent a variety of styles on the Memorial, the Italian Trecento was a good option as a source of inspiration for the design of the mosaics. In choosing this path, Scott was not copying the craft or art of the fourteenth century but adapting it for his own very specific purposes in the creation of a recognisably Victorian structure.

When the Memorial was unveiled in 1872, initial reaction to it was generally positive although there was some criticism of the incongruities between the different styles represented on the monument. The *Illustrated London News* pronounced it as a «great success» in general terms but found fault with some of the artistic work upon it, adding that «instead of borrowing features from Italian Gothic, we think some pure native style would have been more appropriate»⁴². *The Times* also offered a mixed review when the statue of Prince Albert was unveiled in 1876, stating that the overall effect was a fitting tribute to the Prince while acknowledging that there were «differences of opinion with regard to the congruity of its component parts»⁴³. As time passed, changes in taste and the advent of Modernism resulted in increasing criticism of the Monument. In 1928 Kenneth Clark referred to it in *The Gothic Revival* as «the expression of pure philistinism» although he later revoked the statement in a 1950 edition of the book⁴⁴. It was only in the latter decades of the twentieth century that a revival of interest in Victorian art and architecture resulted in a certain reappraisal of the monument. Concerns about the condition of the Memorial led to a major restoration project that was completed in 1998 and, together with subsequent works, returned the Memorial to its original splendour. It is perhaps the case that the initial press commentary when it was first unveiled remains true, that the High Victorian opulence of the monument as a whole dominates the visitor's response to it, obscuring the individual component parts that sought to represent a Victorian idea of the universality of art in all its forms. However, if the different elements of the monument, such as the Trecento inspired mosaics, exist to create an «air of preciousness» around the central object of the Memorial, the statue of Prince Albert, Scott has achieved his aim. In that sense the Trecento is just one part of an eclectic mixture of styles that serve the purpose of creating a single Victorian monument.

- 1 The seven architects consulted on a design proposal and asked to submit proposals in July 1862 were: Thomas Leverton Donaldson (1795-1885); William Tite (1798-1873); Sydney Smirke (1798-1877); James Pennethorne (1801-71); Matthew Digby Wyatt (1820-77); Philip Charles Hardwick (1820-90); and George Gilbert Scott (1811-78). Smirke and Tite ultimately declined to participate and were replaced by brothers Charles Barry Jnr (1823-1900) and Edward Middleton Barry (1830-80).
- 2 The complete history of the Albert Memorial is recorded in S. BAYLEY, *The Albert Memorial*, London 1981 and C. Brooks ed., *The Albert Memorial. The Prince Consort National Memorial: its History, Contexts, and Conservation*, London 2000.
- 3 *Handbook to the Prince Consort National Memorial*, London 1874, p. 8.
- 4 Layard Papers, British Library. Layard to the Queen's secretary, Charles Grey, 16 January 1866. Add MS 38992 f.168.
- 5 Royal Archives. Charles Phipps, Keeper of the Privy Purse, to Alexander Spearman, 11 January 1866. Phipps suggested Layard as a successor to the «irreplaceable» Eastlake partly due to his knowledge of art and to his role in the government. VIC/ADDH/02/1333
- 6 *Handbook to the Prince Consort National Memorial*, p. 9.
- 7 *ibid.*, p. 10.
- 8 *ibid.*, p. 17.
- 9 Erected by Edward I in memory of his wife Queen Eleanor who had died in 1290. One of the architects of the Crosses, William of Ireland, may be found among the sculptors portrayed on the Albert Memorial. All three remaining Eleanor crosses had been sketched by Gilbert Scott by the time he was nineteen and are certainly reflected in his Martyrs' Memorial in Oxford.
- 10 Royal Archives. George Gilbert Scott, *Explanatory Remarks on the Designs submitted for the Memorial to His Royal Highness the Prince Consort and the Proposed Hall of Science*. VIC/ADDH/02/491-495.
- 11 Richard Redgrave of the School of Art and Design compared Scott's model to Orcagna's Shrine of the Madonna in Or San Michele from c.1340. See G. STAMP, *George Gilbert Scott, the Memorial Competition and the Critics* in C. Brooks ed., *The Albert Memorial. The Prince Consort National Memorial: its History, Contexts, and Conservation*, London 2000, p. 120.
- 12 The Edinburgh monument was constructed between 1840 and 1846; the memorial in Manchester between 1862 and 1867.
- 13 Royal Archives. Grey to Eastlake, 27 February 1863. VIC/ADDH/02/351.
- 14 Royal Archives. George Gilbert Scott, *Explanatory Remarks on the Designs submitted for the Memorial to His Royal Highness the Prince Consort and the Proposed Hall of Science*. VIC/ADDH/02/491-495.
- 15 The mosaics are covered in depth by T. SLADEN, *The Mosaics* in C. Brooks ed., *The Albert Memorial*, pp. 286-307.
- 16 However, questions about the durability of mosaics in the British climate would surface at a later date, see note 25.
- 17 See R. LIEFKES, *Antonio Salviati and the Nineteenth-Century Renaissance of Venetian Glass*, «The Burlington Magazine», Vol. 136, No. 1094, May 1994, pp. 283-290.
- 18 Royal Archives. George Gilbert Scott, *Explanatory Remarks on the Designs submitted for the*

- Memorial to His Royal Highness the Prince Consort and the Proposed Hall of Science*, 1862. VIC/ADDH/02/491-495.
- 19 Royal Archives. Scott to the Dean of Windsor, 12 September 1862. PPTO/PP/WC/MAIN/OS p. 469. I am grateful to Dr Clare Rider of St George's Chapel Archives & Chapter Library for pointing out both this quotation and that in note 20.
 - 20 Royal Archives. Scott to the Dean of Windsor, 13 September 1862. PPTO/PP/WC/MAIN/OS p. 469
 - 21 Royal Archives. Scott to D.C. Bell, 20 August 1864. VIC/ADDH/02/889.
 - 22 Scott had first visited Venice in 1851, meeting with Ruskin while there, and he had grown to like both Venetian Gothic and Byzantine styles, writing of his visit that «no three days of my life afford me such rich archaeological and art collections.» G. GILBERT SCOTT, *Personal and professional recollections*, Stamford 1995, p. 158.
 - 23 J. RUSKIN, *The Stones of Venice*, London 1853, II, p.168.
 - 24 Quoted in R. LIEFKES, *Salviati and the South Kensington Museum in The Colours of Murano in XIX Century*, Venice 1999, p. 18.
 - 25 The ceiling of the porch of the Royal Mausoleum at Frogmore had been decorated with mosaics from Salviati in 1862 but by 1866 they appeared to be changing colour. This incident ignited a debate about the durability of glass mosaics in the British climate.
 - 26 Royal Archives. Thompson (Scott's office) to D.C. Bell, 23 May 1866. VIC/ADDH/02/1449-1450.
 - 27 Royal Archives. George Gilbert Scott, *Explanatory Remarks on the Designs submitted for the Memorial to His Royal Highness the Prince Consort and the Proposed Hall of Science*. VIC/ADDH/02/491-495.
 - 28 Royal Archives. Scott to Doyne C. Bell, 20 August 1864. VIC/ADDH/02/889.
 - 29 Royal Archives. D.C. Bell to Grey, 23 September 1864. In explaining Scott's ideas re the mosaics, Bell tells Grey that Scott «expressed a wish to consult Sir C. Eastlake on the subject». VIC/ADDH/02/890.
 - 30 Royal Archives. Scott to Bell, 28 June 1865. VIC/ADDH/02/1204.
 - 31 The two partners Richard Clayton and Alfred Bell had met through Scott, and it was the former of these, Richard Clayton, who would produce the cartoons for Salviati in Venice. Clayton is known more for his designs for stained glass windows but it's interesting to note that he was also sympathetic to the Pre-Raphaelites and was friends with D.G. Rossetti, that is to say that Clayton too had his Trecento sympathies. See also P. LARKWORTHY, *Clayton and Bell, stained glass artists and decorators*, London 1984.
 - 32 Royal Archives. Layard to D.C. Bell, 28 September 1866. VIC/ADDH/02/1585.
 - 33 Layard's relationship with Salviati would come under scrutiny at a later date when questions were raised in 1869 in the House of Commons about the award of a contract by Layard, then Chief Commissioner of Works, to the Venice and Murano Glass and Mosaic Company (Limited) for the decoration of the Central Hall of the Palace of Westminster. Layard's relations with Salviati himself soured in the late 1860s and the two parted company in the following decade. See Sir A. HENRY LAYARD, *Autobiography and letters*, London 1903, II, p. 261 and Hansard HC Deb 26 July 1869 Vol. 198, cc708-20.
 - 34 Layard called them «Gaddi's Muses». Layard Papers, British Library. Layard to Scott, 18 July 1866. Add MS 38993 f.162. The illustration can be found in ROSINI, *Storia della pittura italia-*

na, Pisa 1845, Plates Vol. I.

- 35 Layard Papers, British Library. Scott to Layard, 25 July 1866. Add MS 38993 f.174.
- 36 Layard Papers, British Library. Clayton to Layard, 27 April 1867. Add MS 38994 f.53.
- 37 Layard Papers, British Library. Scott to Layard, 6 July 1867. Add MS 38994 f.203.
- 38 T. SLADEN, *The Mosaics*, p. 305.
- 39 *Handbook to the Prince Consort National Memorial*, p. 18.
- 40 T. SLADEN, *The Mosaics*, p. 299. I am also grateful to Paul Tucker for his observations about early Italian altarpieces.
- 41 G. GILBERT SCOTT, *Personal and professional recollections*, p. 217.
- 42 *Illustrated London News*, 27 July 1872.
- 43 *The Times*, 13 March 1876.
- 44 K. CLARK, *The Gothic Revival*, London 1928, p. 172, quoted in C. Brooks ed., *The Albert Memorial*, p. 9.



Fig. 1: The Albert Memorial



Fig. 2: ANDREA DI BONAIUTO DA FIRENZE (attr. to), fresco, Florence, Santa Maria Novella.



Fig. 3: South side mosaics, The Albert Memorial, Kensington Gardens, London.



Fig. 4: East side mosaics, The Albert Memorial, Kensington Gardens, London.



Fig. 5: North side mosaics, The Albert Memorial, Kensington Gardens, London.



Fig. 6: West side mosaics, The Albert Memorial, Kensington Gardens, London.



Fig. 7: GIOTTO, *Ognissanti Madonna*, Florence, Uffizi.