Horace Walpole (1717–97) is well known for two important Gothic projects: his villa, Strawberry Hill, Twickenham (1747/8–80), and his novel, The Castle of Otranto (1764). These two manifestations of Walpole’s ‘Gothic imagination’ are frequently linked in critical literature on the Gothic Revival and medievalism more broadly; the relationship between Strawberry Hill, Otranto and manuscript illustrations visualising Otranto’s narrative has, on the other hand, received far less attention. This paper brings together a number of important and hitherto overlooked sources that help address this imbalance. In particular, it examines two large-scale watercolours by John Carter (1748–1817) that narrate some of Otranto’s pivotal scenes, allowing critically overlooked subtleties in their iconographies to emerge. The work establishes how Carter’s pre-existing interests – in particular, in Gothic architectural forms and heraldry – are harnessed to govern his representations of Otranto. These paintings, together with Carter’s other illustrations, demonstrate Walpole’s authorship of Otranto, expressed through codes hidden in plain sight. Unlike the frequently touted link between Strawberry Hill and Otranto in secondary criticism, Carter’s illustrations, the argument reveals, do not explicitly make this connection.

Horace Walpole’s novel, The Castle of Otranto: a story, published on Christmas Eve 1764, is typically presented as the first ‘Gothic’ novel. It was not until the second edition of Otranto (1765), however, that the work acquired the subtitle A Gothic Story: only then was it explicitly framed as a piece of ‘Gothic’ fiction. Walpole initially distanced himself from Otranto, instead presenting the narrative as a translation by William Marshall, Gent., from

---

the ‘original Italian of Onuphrio Muralto, Canon of the Church of St Nicolas at Otranto’. 2

The novel’s source, the Preface to the first edition tells us, was a work ‘printed in Naples, in
the black letter, in the year 1529’, which was ‘found in the library of an ancient Catholic
family in the north of England’. 3 Although apparently of sixteenth-century provenance, the
work is dated by Walpole, in the guise of the translator, to the Crusades – to the ‘darkest ages
of Christianity; but the language and conduct have nothing that favours of barbarism’. 4 As if
to obscure his authorship even further, Walpole did not have The Castle of Otranto produced
at his private printing press at Strawberry Hill, a facility that he had set up in 1757. 5 It was,
instead, published by Thomas Lowndes in London.

Walpole disclosed his deception, however, and acknowledged his authorship of
Otranto in the Preface to the second edition published on 11 April 1765:

The favourable manner in which this little piece has been received by the public, calls
upon the author to explain the grounds on which he composed it. But before he opens
those motives, it is fit that he should ask pardon of his readers for having offered his
work to them under the borrowed personage of a translator. 6

Thereafter the novel has been connected frequently, and understandably, with Walpole’s
other notable Gothic ‘output’, his villa, or the ‘little Gothic castle’ of his ancestors,
Strawberry Hill, Twickenham (constructed and furnished 1747/8–80). 7 Indeed, Walpole
himself seemed to have prompted this identification when, in the guise of the translator of the
first edition of Otranto, he writes that ‘the scene is undoubtedly laid in some real castle’. 8

Accordingly, like many other visitors to the house after 1765, once Walpole’s authorship of
Otranto was disclosed, Frances Burney (1752–1840) found that the villa’s ‘unusually shaped
apartments’ offered ‘striking recollections … of his Gothic Story of the Castle of Otranto’. 9

W S Lewis, the great collector of Walpoliana in Farmington, CT, and executive editor of the
extensive forty-eight-volume Yale edition of Horace Walpole’s Correspondence (1937–83),
similarly repeats Walpole’s suggestion that Otranto was based upon a tangible structure:

---

2 Walpole 1764, title page.
3 Ibid, iii.
4 Ibid.
5 See Clarke 2011.
6 Walpole 1765b, xiii.
7 The house is dealt with extensively in Snodin 2009, 15–105; Harney 2013; Chalcraft and Viscardi 2007;
8 Walpole 1764, viii.
9 Barrett 1904, ii, 483.
the castle [of Otranto] itself, however, was Strawberry Hill, as Walpole repeatedly points out. In the first Preface to *The Castle of Otranto*… he says, ‘The scene is undoubtedly laid in some real castle. The author seems frequently, without design, to describe particular parts. *The chamber*, says he, *on the right hand; the door on the left hand; the distance from the chapel to Conrad’s apartment*: these and other passages are strong presumptions that the author had some certain building in his eye.’ Are these italics in the original, or is this an authorial intervention?

Lewis continues by suggesting that it is possible to identify some of the rooms in *Otranto* as those at Strawberry Hill:

The Gallery at Otranto is the Gallery at Strawberry Hill. The ‘chamber on the right hand’ into which the spectator disappeared at the end of the Gallery and in which he lay down so disconcertingly was the Tribune. This is also the ‘gallery-chamber’ and ‘the great chamber’. Isabella’s chamber, ‘the watchet-coloured chamber’, is the Blue Bedchamber. The Armoury is the same in both castles and so is the ‘principal staircase’.

Sean R Silver also connects the building and novel, but suggests that *Otranto* reciprocally influenced Walpole’s villa. He writes that ‘Otranto was an experiment in the organisation and display of Gothic artefacts that extends, and in some ways anticipates, ongoing work at Strawberry Hill’.

The materiality and prevailing atmosphere of ‘gloomth’ at Strawberry Hill, together with its ‘active’ architecture that imposes upon visitors a range of transitory and contradictory experiences designed and ‘curated’ by Walpole and the ‘Strawberry Committee’, certainly had a hand in *Otranto*’s narrative. The house and novel are, after all, both concerned with the Gothic past. Walpole had been working on Strawberry Hill for sixteen years before

---

10 Lewis 1934, 89.
11 Ibid. The analysis continues to p 90.
12 Silver 2009, 543.
13 Walpole invented the word ‘gloomth’ to refer to the feeling and environment of medieval Gothic architecture: ‘one has a satisfaction of imprinting the gloomth of abbeys and cathedrals on one’s house’. Lewis 1937–83, XX, 372; to Mann, 27 Apr 1753. For the Strawberry Committee, see Snodin 2009, 80–1. In terms of active architecture, the claustrophobic and dark Trunk Ceiled Passage opens out into the large and light Gallery.
Otranto took shape and, given their shared interest in, and references to, medieval architecture and culture, it is perfectly reasonable to see the novel and house as symbiotic, though discrete, manifestations of Walpole’s broad fascination with the Gothic past. Indeed, their connection is suggested numerous times by Walpole himself. In a letter from 19 June 1774, for instance, he states that ‘I am going to hang them [a pair of shields] by the beautiful armour of Francis I and they will certainly make me dream of another Castle of Otranto’. Strawberry Hill’s interior, he implies, could spawn another Gothic narrative.

Walpole also anchors Otranto’s genesis firmly at Strawberry Hill in a well-known letter to William Cole (1714–82) from 9 March 1765, in which he recalls the moment in early June 1764 that the novel was born:"

I had time to write but a short note with The Castle of Otranto, as your messenger called on me at four o’clock as I was going to dine abroad. Your partiality to me and Strawberry have I hope included you to excuse the wildness of the story. You will even have found some traits to put you in mind of this place … Shall I even confess to you what was the origin of this romance? I waked one morning in the beginning of last June from a dream, of which all I could recover was, that I had thought myself in an ancient castle (a very natural dream for a head filled like mine with Gothic story) and that on the upper-most bannister of a great staircase I saw a gigantic hand in armour.

The staircase mentioned in this letter to Cole is surely that at Strawberry Hill: the Arlington Street townhouse could hardly be considered an ancient castle, nor was its Classical style likely to have inspired Otranto by association. It may seem contradictory, however, to see in Strawberry Hill the ‘foundation’ of an ancient Gothic castle given that Walpole’s house was, after all, a modern, suburban villa. Walpole, nevertheless, considered and frequently referred to it in his correspondence as a castle – and an ancient one at that. Writing to George Montagu (1713–80) on 11 June 1753, for example, Walpole makes mention of the ‘castle I
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14 See Reeve 2014, 189–91. See also Snodin 2009, 80–1.
15 Lewis 1937–83, XXXV, 421. The armour did not actually belong to Francis I: dating from the reign of Henry IV (1590–1610), it is a rare parade version of cuirassier armour: see Snodin 2009, 226–8.
16 Walpole’s letter to Francis Seymour Conway, 1st Earl of Hertford, dated 8 June 1764, places Walpole at Strawberry Hill: it could be around this date that Otranto was born from Walpole’s dream: Lewis 1937–83, XXXVIII, 399.
17 Ibid, i, 88. ‘This place’ is Strawberry Hill, from where Walpole wrote this letter.
am building of my ancestors’; its newly built nature notwithstanding. The house’s historical nature and faux antiquity is developed further in an undated holograph addition to one of Walpole’s personal copies of A Description of the Villa of Mr. Horace Walpole (1774):

The year before the Gallery was built, a Stranger passing asked an old Farmer belonging to Mr Walpole, if Strawberryhill was not an old House! He replied, ‘yes, but my master designs to build one much older next year’. Thus, although Strawberry Hill was effectively a new and modern structure, it is not unreasonable and unprecedented for Walpole to consider and refer to it as an ancient castle.

In his Description Walpole also emphasises Strawberry Hill’s influence over Otranto’s narrative: ‘at least the prospect would recall the good humour of those who might be disposed to condemn the fantastic fabric, and to think it a very proper habitation of, as it was the scene that inspired, the author of the Castle of Otranto’. This is what Nick Groom terms the ‘Strawberry factor’ in his Introduction to the most recent edition of The Castle of Otranto (2014). This ‘Strawberry factor’ was sufficiently powerful for Walpole, on occasion, to refer to Strawberry Hill as ‘Otranto’, of which he was the ‘Master’, while Thomas Chatterton (1752–70), the author of the Rowley Poems (1777) whom Walpole later maligned, termed Walpole the ‘Baron of Otranto’. In addition, a drawing by Lavinia Spencer (née Bingham), Countess Spencer (1762–1831), depicting ‘A young lady reading the Castle of Otranto to her companion; a graceful and expressive drawing, done for a present to Mr. W.’, was hanging in the villa’s Red Bedchamber by 1784. Spencer’s drawing not only reinforces the perceived relationship between Strawberry Hill and Otranto in the Georgian period, but also the predominantly female readership of Gothic novels that is equally recorded by James Gillray’s engraving, Tales of Wonder from 1802.
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18 Walpole 1840, iii, 1.
19 LWL, 49 2522, endpapers.
20 Walpole 1784, iv.
21 Groom 2014, xxxvi.
22 LWL, 33 30 copy 6 Folio, fol 97. The printed notice reads: ‘The Master of Otranto being in the Durance and not able to receive the Fairy BLANDINA in the Manner he wishes, has nevertheless ordered his Seneschal to deliver up the Keys of the Castle to her Hautesse; and all his Vassals will with pleasure obey her sovereign Commands’. For interpretation, see Reeve 2014, 189, for Chatterton, see Lewis 1937–83, ii, 110.
The link between Strawberry Hill and *Otranto*, based upon evidence from Walpole and his contemporaries, appears irrefutable. This article does not attempt to challenge the connection and postulated direction(s) of influence between the house and the novel. Instead, it explores a small collection of remarkable and apparently unsolicited watercolours that depict scenes from *Otranto*. These paintings are mostly by John Carter (1748–1817), the well-known Georgian architectural draughtsman and vocal supporter of medieval architecture. Paying close attention to these images yields a nuanced reading of the relationship between Walpole, *Otranto*, medieval architecture and heraldry.

Instead of promoting *Otranto*’s commonly held source as Strawberry Hill, he repeatedly, and occasionally *ad nauseam*, emphasises Walpole’s role as the novel’s creator: there is no trace of Strawberry Hill – beyond, of course, the broad aesthetic theme. Carter capitalises upon his and Walpole’s congruent interests in the form and visual language of Gothic architecture and heraldry to create bold artworks articulating the associationist powers of the medieval form. Importantly, and until now overlooked, these watercolours also demonstrate an understanding and sympathetic use of the coded language of heraldry, and Carter embraces this visual language to add extra layers of sophisticated meaning to his depictions of *Otranto*.

Upon publication, *Otranto* lacked illustrations, and the first engravings were not included until the sixth edition (1791), which was set and printed by Bodoni in Parma. The six plates after drawings by Anne Millicent Clarke included in this edition are not particularly sophisticated, and offer only a basic, stage-like, two-dimensional rendering of the scenes’ architectural contexts; instead, it was figures and their clothing and equipage that drew her attention (*fig.*). Critical of such illustrations, Walpole wrote to Bertie Greathead (1759–1826) praising four manuscript designs depicting scenes from *Otranto* by his son, Bertie Greathead Jr (c. 1781–1804). In the letter of 22 February 1796, Walpole recounts that:

I have seen many drawings and prints made from my idle – I don’t know what to call it, novel or romance – not one of them approached to any one of your son’s four – a clear proof of which is, that none one of the rest satisfied the author’s ideas – It is as strictly, and upon my honour, true, that your son’s conception of some of the passions has improved them, and added more expression than I
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25 For Carter see Nurse 2011; Crook 1995; Frew 1982.
26 The plates, based upon drawings by Anne Millicent Clarke, depict: Isabell and Manfred (opp p 22); Theodore and Isabella (opp p 33); Theodore and Matilda (opp p 142); Theodore and Isabella (opp p 146); Frederick, Theodore and Isabella (opp p 155); and Jerome and Hippolita (opp p 197). All page references relate to Walpole 1791.
myself had formed in my own mind; for example, in the figure of the ghost in the chapel, to whose hollow sockets your son has given an air of reproachful anger, and to the whole turn of his person, dignity.27

As Walpole here concedes, illustration had the power to supplement and enrich scenes that had only been loosely sketched out in his literary imagination. In comparison with Clarke’s illustrations, those by Bertie Grethead Jr are complex, and the architectural contexts are convincingly three-dimensional (fig 2).28 Significantly, the settings are clearly influenced by eighteenth-century domestic Gothic Revival architecture, though they do not reference specific spaces at Strawberry Hill.29 Consequently, Grethead Jr’s drawings are more modest and relatable in comparison with those created by Carter, who produced by far the largest, most important and most ambitious illustrations to The Castle of Otranto.

Under Richard Gough (1735–1809), Director of the Society of Antiquaries of London (1771–97), Carter was employed from 1780 to record medieval architecture and its fragments, and he contributed significantly to Gough’s Sepulchral Monuments in Great Britain (1786–96), which the Preface to the first volume acknowledges.30 Carter had also been introduced to Walpole at this time, and in 1788 he was employed to record Strawberry Hill (fig 3), including its interiors and a number of objects within Walpole’s collection, such as the model of the shrine of St Thomas Becket (fig 4).31 Describing his relationship with Walpole in his unpublished Occurrences in the Life, and Memorandums Relating to the Professional Pursuits of J C F.A.S. Architect, Carter records that:

Horace Walpole, late Lord Orford, I must likewise number among my Patrons, and as far back as this year made a drawing for him, which occasionally I continued to do until his decease. About the year I was introduced by the late R Bull Esq at Strawberry Hill to make for him a series of
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27 Lewis 1937–83, XLII, 430.
28 They are bound into LWL, 49 3729.
29 The domesticity of these illustrations will be considered in a larger essay considering Otranto’s extra-illustrations, which is currently in preparation by the author.
30 See Nurse 2011, 218.
31 Carter’s misspelling of ‘F.A.S. instead of F.S.A. was quite common in Carter’s time, as a Google Books search under ‘F.A.S. Society of Antiquaries’ will reveal. Note best omitted.’ Are you happy to do that—or amend text if retained?
32 Commented [LP(6): correct: of, not to.
views, both external and internal, with … the decorations belonging thereto, with … curiosities, &c. &c. To accelerate this undertaking, Mr. Walpole afforded me every assistance and accommodation. Thus engaged I became acquainted with his right hand man, his chief help in all his purchases of every description, and also familiar intercourse between him and Amateurs of the day.

In 1790, Carter produced *The Entry of Frederick into the Castle of Otranto*, a large-scale watercolour (602 x 503mm) of a scene taken directly out of Walpole’s narrative (fig. 5). There is no evidence to suggest Walpole commissioned it specifically, though it is a natural extension of his commission to delineate Strawberry Hill: the novel was, after all, Walpole’s other significant ‘Gothic monument’. Walpole hung the watercolour in the Little Parlour at Strawberry Hill, and in his personal copy of the *Description* (1784) bequeathed to him by Walpole, Carter records that he ‘(Was paid for it 20 Guineas.)’. This watercolour is unique among the known corpus of *Otranto* illustrations as no other traced work tackles this part of the novel. Unlike Strawberry Hill’s modest scale and, indeed, that of the real castle of Otranto in Italy – Carter copied a watercolour of the ‘real’ Castle of Otranto in Italy from a drawing made by Mr Reveley (fig. 6) – the architectural setting of *The Entry of Frederick* is vast. Nine distinct structures ranging in style from Romanesque through to Perpendicular Gothic form three sides of Otranto’s courtyard. These buildings are clearly informed by Walpole and Carter’s shared understanding of, and interest in, the forms and details of medieval architecture. For Carter, this was manifest in the preservation and delineation of buildings and their details, whereas Walpole reproduced medieval architecture and ornament for domestic purposes, including modelling chimney-pieces upon tomb canopies: the gabled-canopy (now removed) over the effigy of John of Eltham, Earl of Cornwall, in Westminster Abbey, was the model for the chimney-piece in Strawberry Hill’s library, and the screen of Prince Arthur’s tomb at Worcester Cathedral informed the wallpaper of the staircase and hall.
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33 KCL, Leathes 7/4, vol t, fols 20r–20v.
34 LWL, 790.00.00.138dr+. It is signed ‘John Carter in' del. 1790’. A note on the back of the painting, in Carter’s hand, repeats this and gives the painting’s title.
35 For a record of *The Entry of Frederick into the Castle of Otranto*, see Walpole 1784, 95. For Carter’s note about payment for *The Entry of Frederick* see LWL, 33 30 copy 20, fol 95. Carter records that the *Description* was ‘Bequeathed to me (J Carter) by the late Earl of Orford (Mr. Horace Walpole) (1815)’: ibid, front fly-leaf. To what does this refer? LWL, 33 30 copy 20, fol 95?
36 The watercolour of the ‘real’ Castle of Otranto is pasted into LWL, 33 30 copy 11 Folio.
37 See Walpole 1784, which identifies the sources for the architectural ornament at Strawberry Hill when derived from Gothic monuments. See also Lindfield 2012, ii, 339–417.
The sophisticated rendition of architecture in *The Entry of Frederick* clearly resonated with Walpole’s passionate belief that Gothic architecture inspires awe and imagination:

> It is difficult for the noblest Grecian temple to convey half so many impressions to the mind, as a cathedral does to the best Gothic taste – a proof of skill in the architects and of address in the priests who erected them. The latter exhausted their knowledge of the passions in composing edifices whose pomp, mechanism, vaults, tombs, painted windows, gloom and perspectives infused such sensations of romantic devotion; and they were happy in finding artists capable of executing such machinery. One must have taste to be sensible of the beauties of Grecian architecture; one only wants passions to feel Gothic.38

Indeed, one of the reasons for Walpole’s profound embrace of Gothic architecture and historic relics was their ability to call to mind associations. As I have shown elsewhere, the medieval arts were intimately associated with the idea of chivalry, but the associative principles of Gothic architecture covered other facets of the Middle Ages.39 Walpole, in his *Books of Materials*, writes that:

> I believe this approbation [of classical architecture] would in some measure flow from the Impossibility of not connecting with Grecian & Roman Architecture, the ideals of the Greeks & Romans, who invented & inhabited that kind of building. If (which but few have) one has any partiality to old Knights, Crusades, the Wars of York & Lancaster &c the prejudice in favour of Grecian buildings, will be balanced.40

The power of association, cultivated in the eighteenth century by Walpole – and, amongst others, by Joseph Addison (1672–1719) in his *Spectator* letters (1710–11) – meant that architectural styles were laden with meaning and associated ideas.41 Gothic, as Alexander Gerard (1728–95) sternly criticised it in his *Essay on Taste* (1759), argued that it only satisfies those unfortunate enough not to possess ‘enlargement of the mind’: though it
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38 Walpole 1765a, 114–15.
39 Lindfield 2016.
40 LWL, 49 2615, fol 52. This idea was also propagated by Walpole in his *Anecdotes of Painting* (1762–80); see Harney 2013, 46–53.
41 See ibid, 4–5.
offered, for others, a fantastic repertoire of architectural form and ornament—quite separate to
everyday Georgian life and taste that resonated with ‘old Knights, Crusades, the Wars of
York & Lancaster’. Carter embraces the associative power of Gothic, and *The Entry of
Frederick* is an elaborate response to Walpole’s novel: nowhere in the novel is the castle of
Otranto referred to as a Gothic fabric (beyond in the first edition’s preface where the
‘translator’ dates the narrative to between 1095 and 1243), and it is never presented
(explicitly or implicitly) as a vast complex. These features, instead, arise from the novel’s
plot, its subtitle (used from the second edition on) and the regard for Britain’s Gothic heritage
that Carter and Walpole shared.

Carter’s complex rendering of architecture responds to his occupation as an antiquary
and architectural draughtsman. It reproduces, for example, the clutter and omnipresent
architectural surroundings of the frontispieces to his *Specimens of Ancient Sculpture and
Painting* (1780–94), the first volume of which was dedicated to Walpole: ‘Your kind
Encouragement gives wings to my Ambition to continue their Publication, and under your
Auspices, I have been able to bring to a Conclusion the first Volume’. The *Entry of
Frederick*, whilst a bespoke artwork, is consistent with, and based upon, Carter’s pre-existing
canon of *faux*-historical, associational illustrations that are imaginative, yet shrewdly
archaeological and architecturally elaborate. In essence, Carter is using Walpole’s narrative
to create more of his extraordinary and highly personal representations of the past: *The Entry
of Frederick* is indebted to Walpole, but what Carter achieves is certainly very different to
Walpole’s villa and the objects accreted within it.

Carter’s decision to illustrate Frederick’s entry into Otranto offered him a unique
opportunity—one not taken up by other artists—to define and delineate the most complete
and complex display of chivalry and pomp in the whole of Walpole’s novel. The themes
presented in the illustration—medieval architecture, chivalry, inheritance and usurpation
of title and station—are at the heart of Otranto’s plot. Carter realised a scene that Walpole had
imbued with abundant descriptive detail, although the architecture, as typical throughout
Otranto, is not defined. The passage in Otranto, of which Carter was clearly aware, identifies
suggests around 523 least 474 characters in Frederick’s retinue, and it is worth quoting the
text in full to contextualise Carter’s vivid rendition of the scene:
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42 Gerard 1759, 122.
43 Carter 1780–94, 1, i.
The prince, in the mean time, had passed into the court, and ordered the gates of the castle to be flung open for the reception of the stranger knight and his train. In a few minutes the cavalcade arrived. First came two harbingers with wands. Next a herald, followed by two pages and two trumpets. Then an hundred foot-guards. They were attended by as many horse. After them fifty guards. Footmen, clothed in scarlet and black, the colours of the knight. Then a led horse. Two heralds on each side of a gentleman on horseback bearing a banner with the arms of Vicenza and Otranto quarterly – a circumstance that much offended Manfred – but he stifled his resentment. Two more pages. The knight’s confessor telling his beads. Fifty more footmen, clad as before. Two knights habited in complete armour, their beavers down, comrades to the principal knight. The ‘squires of the two knights, carrying their shields and devices. The knight’s own ‘squire. An hundred gentlemen bearing an enormous sword, and seeming to faint under the weight of it. The knight himself on a chestnut steed, in complete armour, his lance in the rest, his face entirely concealed by his visor, which was surmounted by a large plume of scarlet and black feathers. Fifty foot-guards with drums and trumpets closed the procession, which wheeled off to the right and left to make room for the principal knight.

As soon as he approached the gate, he stopped; and the herald advancing, read again the words of the challenge. Manfred’s eyes were fixed on the gigantic sword, and he scarce seemed to attend to the cartel: but his attention was soon diverted by a tempest of wind that rose behind him. He turned, and beheld the plumes of the enchanted helmet agitated in the same extraordinary manner as before.  

44 The gigantic sword with its bearers (though far short of Walpole’s one hundred) – along with the heralds, knights, horses and attendant parts of the train – are admirably illustrated by Carter. *En masse*, they convey fully the pomp and circumstance of the scene. And Manfred’s affront to the scene – the usurpation of his station and title, Prince of Otranto – is equally captured. In particular, in the prospect behind Manfred’s left shoulder, we see the arms of Vicenza and Otranto quartered – indicating Frederick’s apparently legitimate dominion over Manfred’s castle and land (fig 8). Vicenza’s arms, that of a golden Lion of St Mark (for

44 Groom 2014, 60.
Venice), is a natural choice on Carter’s behalf, and Otranto’s arms is a subtle modification of those of Naples under the Angevins. This corresponds with Otranto’s setting and conceivably demonstrates Carter’s researches into, and awareness of, the novel’s purported age (the time of the Crusades) and of heraldry more broadly.

Subverting this historical awareness and his attention to detail, the architectural setting is not real: instead, at best, Carter loosely paraphrases building types and styles. The Perpendicular structure to the rear right of the courtyard responds loosely to the western facades of Bath Abbey and Winchester Cathedral, whilst not being either in the fine detail. The cross towering over the scene is loosely based upon that at Winchester, though, once again, modified: none of these architectural models have anything to do with the novel. Besides, Perpendicular Gothic architecture post-dates the supposed age of Otranto by a century, and is therefore surprisingly anachronistic given Carter’s heraldic research and otherwise robust attention to detail. This anachronism does not, however, disrupt Otranto’s narrative; instead, it creates a striking High Gothic context that is consistent with his other elaborate works discussed here.

Carter exploited the language of heraldry to great effect. He dots the arms of Otranto (Naples) across the painting, including on the entrance tower, the shield, banners and flags in the foreground, and the heralds’ tabards and flags in the middle-ground. This gesture, however, was not without error – the quartered arms of Vicenza and Otranto that enraged Manfred so much in the novel, depicted behind him and Isabella, shows the flag’s reverse side; here, the arms face as they would on the obverse, meaning that the Lion of St Mark is mirrored the wrong way. There is no firm explanation for this oversight: Carter may have simply made a mistake, though this is unlikely given the effort expended planning and executing the watercolour’s minute details. Perhaps it is a subtle indication of the invalidity of Frederick’s claim to the title of Otranto, which is an important element in the Otranto narrative. Despite the uncertainty surrounding this heraldic component, the scene in general celebrates the forms, motifs and styles of medieval architecture that the ‘heretical part’ of Walpole’s heart adored.45 It also weaves in the heraldic details pertinent to Otranto’s narrative, by which Walpole was fascinated, harnessing it at Strawberry Hill, as he did, to

45 Walpole suggested his appreciation of medieval architecture came from the heretical part of his heart in a letter to John Chute on 4 Aug 1753: ‘in the heretical corner of my heart I adore Gothic buildings, which by some unusual inspiration Gibbs has made pure and beautiful and venerable. The style has a propensity to the Venetian or mosque-Gothic, and the great pillar near it makes the whole put one in mind the Place of St Mark. The windows are throughout consecrated with painted glass; most of it from the priory of Warwick, a present from that foolish [Mr Wise], who quarrelled with me for asking him if Lord Brook had planted much’: Lewis 1937–83, XXXV, 77.
create a visual representation of his pedigree, particularly in the Armoury on the Staircase,
and on the Library’s ceiling. Moreover, as indicated in the passage quoted above, heraldry
certainly guided Frederick’s reception by Manfred, the then apparent Prince of Otranto.

Aside from the style of the architecture, the deployment of heraldry and the fact that
Walpole purchased it and hung it in his Gothic villa, *The Entry of Frederick* has little to do
with Strawberry Hill. And yet, two figures in the lower right-hand corner of this watercolour
are particularly unusual, and serve to link the scene with the eighteenth century. The person
directly behind Manfred and Isabella looks out confrontationally at the viewer. This is almost
certainly a self-portrait of Carter: the face correlates with the self-portrait (c 1817) produced
with Sylvester Harding, now in the British Museum, and with another included in the
frontispiece to his *Occurrences*; his attributes – the beret and roll of paper – support his
identity as architect, draughtsman and artist. The second figure, in the bottom right-hand
corner talking to a page, is almost certainly Walpole himself. The face and hair, quite distinct,
like Carter’s, from the remainder of the watercolour’s caricature-like representations,
matches Walpole’s appearance as recorded by Carter in his *Three sketches of Horace
Walpole in 1788* and the portrait (1796) by Sir Thomas Lawrence (1769–1830).

The Carter self-portrait was previously thought by W S Lewis to depict Walpole. This
in part governed the price he was willing to pay to acquire the work from General Sir Henry
Cholmondeley Jackson in 1962. ‘Because of its ‘Strawberry Hill provenance plus the HW
portrait,’ he wrote, ‘I do not think £500 is excessive’. His letter does not identify where
Walpole is within the crowd; however, correspondence between Lewis and Sir Owen
Morshead written ten days earlier furnishes the essential information, including the portrait’s
‘discovery’: Morshead recounts that the General ‘loathe[s] the whole notion of taking money
for the drawing at all – which has acquired all the more value to me through the Mr. Lewis’s
discovery that the figure is H.W. himself’. Importantly, Morshead found the General ‘aglow
at having just discovered [within the watercolour] a quite unmistakable Devil (with 2 horns)
at the left right-hand margin, apparently glaring towards H.W.’.
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46 LWL, SH Views W218, no. 1; LWL, SH Views Ed25; Snodin 2016; Snodin 2009, 38–9. [non-chronological order of refs intentional here? — thought more recent first, though happy to go with your preference.]
47 BM, 1886,1012.534; KCL, Leathes 7/4 1.
48 LWL, 33.3; NPG, 3631.
49 LWL, Morshead, Sir Owen and Lady – File 2, Evening 19 May 1762. General Jackson was the grandson of the Revd Horace George Cholmondeley (1797–1851), who purchased the drawing at the Strawberry Hill sale: day 22, lot 100, for £8 18s 6d.
50 LWL, Morshead, Sir Owen and Lady – File 2, Evening 9 May 1762.
51 Ibid.
Lewis later published this identification in his co-authored ‘Portraits of Horace Walpole’ (1968–70). Walpole is almost certainly in the picture; however, the figure to the left of the ‘Devil’ is more likely to be Carter, whose confrontational gaze announces, in line with an established tradition in European art, the importance of his architectural genius and skill as a draughtsman. Carter is more prominent because he converted Walpole’s words to line, colour and shade. Walpole, if this reading is correct, is below, and to the right of, Carter. His importance to the form and appearance of The Entry of Frederick is subsidiary to Carter’s architectural vision. Walpole is nevertheless intimately associated with the narrative – as indicated already, this scene is one of the most prominent expressions of medieval spectacle in Otranto. Carter demonstrates Walpole’s authorial responsibility for the novel but takes for himself the credit of interpreting and visualising the literary work. These portraits are, effectively, signatures that would have been instantly recognisable to Walpole, Carter and their circle of antiquarian friends.

Of course, this identification may appear hopeful and speculative – the hair, for example, is, after all, of a generically eighteenth-century style and form. However, Carter’s second illustration of Otranto depicting the death of Matilda (fig 9), and the related frontispiece to Specimens of Ancient Sculpture (1780) (see fig 7), suggest otherwise. Walpole’s personal coat of arms was differentiated from that of the Earl of Orford (Or on a Fess between two Chevrons Sable three Crosses Crosslet of the Field) by the addition of a sable mullet under the upper chevron’s apex. He used it as the centrepiece to the heraldic scheme applied to the library ceiling at Strawberry Hill; it was stamped on the boards of books in his collection and also used on his bookplate (fig 10). John Chute (1701–76), one of the members of Walpole’s Strawberry Committee whom he termed ‘my Oracle of taste’, also applied elements from the differentiated arms onto a proposed facade for the cottage in the grounds of Strawberry Hill. Carter similarly harnessed Walpole’s personal arms, including them, together with the Saracen’s head – the Walpole family crest – at the foot of the tomb-chest in the frontispiece to the first volume of Specimens of Ancient Sculpture (1780) (fig 11). Carter’s initial watercolour proposal for the frontispiece did not include Walpole’s arms, but instead another, though visually related, coat mostly hidden behind figures. By removing the figures obscuring the arms in the engraving, and by changing the armorial to Walpole’s personal, differentiated form, Carter visually reiterated the volume’s dedication to Walpole,

---

52 Adams and Lewis 1968–70, 25, pls 26b–27.
53 RIBA, SB52/5.
54 Chute’s design for the Cottage entranceway is in LWL, 49 3582.
albeit simultaneously by suggesting that Walpole lived and died in the Middle Ages.\footnote{RIBA, SB52/6.} Including a portrait of Walpole in The Entry of Frederik is, therefore, consistent with this earlier engraving as a dedicatory signpost to the man himself.

The second monumental watercolour by Carter illustrating Otranto depicts the death of Matilda (see fig 9), and builds upon the imagery already considered, including The Entry of Frederick and the frontispiece to the first volume of Specimens of Ancient Sculpture.\footnote{RIBA, SB52/5.} Like the frontispiece, it includes Walpole’s personally distinguished arms. But instead of incorporating it once, Carter inserts it, on this occasion, in seven places: above the high altar, at the end of the tomb and on its pri\textsuperscript{e} dieu in the foreground, on the front board of the Bible, on a side altar, and on another two tombs in the background. Walpole, and anyone familiar with Walpole’s personal coat of arms, would have understood this reference immediately: Walpole’s hand cannot be separated from the form, context and appearance of Otranto.

Carter, as with The Entry of Frederick, does not indicate Strawberry Hill’s role in the narrative – none of the tombs illustrated here, for example, were appropriated by Walpole to create Strawberry Hill’s interior, a fact of which Carter, having delineated the house’s interior, would no doubt have been aware. Instead, the very fabric of Otranto’s physical manifestation celebrates and dilates Walpoleian architectural associations writ large. Matilda’s murder in the church of St Nicholas, adjacent to the castle of Otranto, consequently takes place in what is effectively Carter’s reinterpretation of Walpole’s private Gothic chapel-cum-cathedral, realised on a scale grander than anything that Walpole ever achieved in reality: at Strawberry Hill, with The Castle of Otranto, or, indeed, at any other house, such as Lee Priory, Kent (1785), that emerged from Walpole’s circle.\footnote{See Reeve and Lindfield 2015 for a new revision of Lee Priory and its homage to Walpole and Strawberry Hill. For a more substantial genealogy of Strawberry Hill’s architectural ‘offspring’, see McCarthy 1978, 92–117, 171–9. See also Reeve 2013.} Walpole’s arms is the most frequently displayed in the scene: Otranto’s arms, for example, appears only five times in the illustration, and therefore is secondary to Walpole’s own. It is, perhaps, a little ironic, however, that Carter decided to place Walpole’s personal variation of his family arms on three separate tombs; the idea, nevertheless, is direct. Despite this intriguing decision, Carter’s drawings of Otranto and the related frontispiece for Specimens of Ancient Sculpture
are the most compelling and extraordinarily complex historicist essays in late Georgian Britain equal to and excelling the engravings circulated by the Boydell Gallery, such as John Ogborne’s engraving after Josiah Boydell depicting *Henry VI, Part 1*, Act ii, Scene iv (1790–5), and *King Richard the Second*, Act v. Scene ii, *The Entrance of King Richard & Bolingbroke into London*, by Robert Thew after James Northcote (1801) (fig. 12).59

It is clear from these three illustrations that Carter was, simultaneously, informed, imaginative and visually articulate. His use of heraldry, much like Walpole’s interest in the subject matter, was fundamental to his realisation of *Otranto*’s narrative, and through this he established *Otranto*’s relationship with Walpole. Heraldry is a coded language, and the clear and repeated use of Walpole’s personal arms emphasised his status as the true author and inspiration behind these works. Carter’s architectural quotations, such as the near-exact reproduction of the tomb of Aymer de Valance, Earl of Pembroke, Westminster Abbey, in the background of the *Death of Matilda* would have carried favour in Walpole’s circle, and certainly corresponds with Walpole’s own recycling of medieval tombs for domestic design purposes at Strawberry Hill. These representations of *Otranto*’s scenes, much like the frontispieces to *Specimens of Ancient Sculpture*, are hyperbolic and unnecessarily grand: while Walpole never indicates the castle’s dimensions, he never implies that it is on the scale depicted in Carter’s watercolours. St Nicholas, for example, is generally referred to as a church, although, on one occasion, Walpole calls it a cathedral.60 Carter certainly managed to capitalise upon this continuity error, and the setting for *The Death of Matilda* was designed to impress: its form, decoration and atmosphere were clearly indebted to Carter’s love and passionate defence of medieval architecture.61

Curiously, just over a decade after Carter had completed these watercolours, and following the death of Walpole in 1797, he turned on the late 4th Earl of Orford, his one-time patron. Writing in *The Gentleman’s Magazine* in 1801 under the heading of ‘The pursuits of architectural innovation’, Carter spent the majority of the article critiquing Wren’s work: for example, the great modern monument of classical architecture, St Paul’s Cathedral, London, whose design ‘in the Corinthian taste being then thought to “exceed the splendour and

59 BM, 1868.0822.3480; YCBA, B1977.14.20007. The project, which saw artists paint important scenes from Shakespeare and then have them reproduced as engravings, came to life in 1787: see Dias 2013; Boydell et al 1786.
60 Walpole 1764, 17. <https://digital.nls.uk/1764.html>
magnificence of the old cathedral when in its best state’’. However, in the same piece, Carter considers the contentious topic of ‘Gothic architecture revived’, a tendency, he continues, which has ‘within these few years been banded about the kingdom, and some of its dregs we find foisted on our sight, as the fronts of the courts in Westminster hall’ by William Kent. Carter continues by claiming that:

This half-and-half, this ‘fire-and-water’ mixture, this Gothic and Roman compound of all that is new and strange, may still further be pursued; and we, looking through comparisons perspective, may just take a glimpse at Strawberry-hill. And if a correspondent is to be believed in his account of the abbey at Fonthill … we may also there see this unaccountable combination carried to the utmost pitch of human gratification; where we find ‘a noble Gothic arch’ (if we are to judge from the annexed view) is but a ‘hole in the wall,’ an ‘abbey’ without an abbot.

After Walpole’s death, Carter criticised Walpole’s Gothic villa, a house that he had recorded in such painstaking detail in an extra-illustrated copy of the Description of the Villa of Mr. Horace Walpole (1784) thirteen years before. And yet, during Walpole’s lifetime, Carter was happy to accept the patronage of a fellow admirer of medieval architecture. Indeed, in a previously unknown record he made of Walpole’s Chapel in the Woods in 1787, Very slight View of the Gothic chapel, which contains the Shrine of Sr. in the garden at Strawberry Hill, Carter overtly praises its fidelity to medieval architecture: ‘(This Chapel was Copied and executed with the utmost nicety and truth in Portland stone from part of the Dudley chapel, in the choir of Salisbury Cathedral, by Mr. Gafere Mason, Westminster)’. Like Walpole, who felt that Strawberry Hill was but ‘a sketch by beginners’, whose early parts had been designed and realised by his ‘workmen who had not studied the science [of Gothic design]’, Carter was certainly aware of Strawberry Hill’s flaws as a piece of Gothic architecture. He, nevertheless, appears pragmatic: Walpole was a friend and client who was equally enamoured with the medieval past, and alienating him would have been counterproductive. Despite this later criticism, their shared passion for the
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62 Carter 1801, 415.
63 Ibid. 417.
64 Ibid.
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medieval period precipitated overtly reverential watercolours designed to recognise and flatter Walpole’s role as author of Otranto and as a prominent supporter of the Gothic past.
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Captions

Fig 1. Theodore & Matilda, from Walpole’s *The Castle of Otranto: a Gothic story* (1791). *Photograph*: courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University (pl iii, opp p 142; from LWL, 24 17 791P copy 4)

Fig 2. Bertie Greathead Jr, *Frederick and the Spectre*, 1796, in Walpole’s copy of *The Castle of Otranto: a Gothic story* (1791). *Photograph*: courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University (LWL, 49 3729)


Fig 5. John Carter, *The Entry of Frederick into the Castle of Otranto*, 1790. *Photograph*: courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University (LWL, 790.00.00.138dr+)

Fig 7. John Carter, Specimens of Ancient Sculpture and Painting (1780): frontispiece. Photograph: courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University (LWL, Folio 46 780C)

Fig 8. John Carter, detail of The Entry of Frederick into the Castle of Otranto, 1790, showing the portraits of John Carter and Horace Walpole and the back-to-front quartered arms of Vicenza and Otranto. Photograph: courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University (LWL, 790.00.00.138dr+)

Fig 9. John Carter, The Death of Matilda, c 1780. Photograph: courtesy of the Royal Institute of British Architects, London (RIBA SB52/5)

Fig 10. Walpole’s personally differentiated arms: a bookplate pasted into the title page of the manuscript of ‘The English baronage from William I to James I’, after 1763. Photograph: courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University (LWL, 49 3499)

Fig 11. John Carter, Specimens of Ancient Sculpture and Painting (1780): detail of the frontispiece. Photograph: courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University (LWL, Folio 46 780C)

Fig 12. The Entrance of King Richard & Bolingbroke into London, from Shakespeare’s King Richard the Second, Act V, Scene ii (1801), Robert Thew (engraver), after James Northcote. Photograph: courtesy of the Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, Yale University (YCBA, B1977.14.20007)