after his death. Is Lutyens here being put into the same danger? Certainly not, if Mr. Butler is right and Lutyens is indeed 'the bad architect in building whom Britain has produced.' But Mr. Butler, in his remarkably close and penetrating analyses of Lutyens's buildings, is so enthusiastic that he sometimes provokes more than he convinces. Mr. Hussey, on the other hand, as his Life never indeed does, thinks he has also evidently been deeply impressed by Lutyens the man and the artist. His volume is a masterpiece, and one does not know what to admire most in it—where the consummate tact with which he manages what had to be said about his hero's private life, the wisdom with which he has treated the building and the site, or the period, or the sustained fervour which glows through all his pages and flashes up brightly where peaks are reached in the architect's career.

Only Mr. Hussey's peaks are not as a rule mine, and even after a careful study of his book I found myself left with many an embarrassing doubt. How great was Lutyens? And how important in the history of architecture? Speculating as an historian, his importance in the development of European architecture seems to me without any doubt less than, amongst his British contemporaries, Voysey's, and his originality less than Mackintosh's. Yet there is so far no more than a small preliminary book in existence on Mackintosh (and that not in English), and no more than a small booklet in preparation on Voysey.

Leaving aside for the moment all questions of aesthetic achievement, one can say that the Lutyens Memorial has a right to be so much bigger, because Lutyens was so much bigger in total volume and in individual buildings, and because his success was so much bigger and maintained over so much longer a period.

So the question arises: Why was Lutyens so immensely successful? He was not the type necessarily fast for professional success, as Sir Herbert Baker was, 'tall, manly, athletic, outwardly calm' (in Mr. Hussey's words), captain at cricket and football at his public school, and in later life outstandingly good on committees. Lutyens was the son of a retired army captain and an Irish girl. His father devoted his time to hunting. His mother was busy trying to bring up fourteen children on little money. Edwin Landseer Lutyens was born in 1869 (Voysey 1857, Baker 1862, Mackintosh 1868). His education was 'irregular and scrappy.' At sixteen he was up at Glencorse, as it was then, to study architecture. He did not complete the course, and was articled in 1887 to Ernest George & Petö. Senior assistant at the time was Baker. Lutyens was lazy, disliking sketching, but had a knack of 'quickly absorbing all that was of most worth learning' (Baker). He left the office after six months and set in practice on his own. He was twenty years old then.

The credit of having discovered him belongs to Gertrude Jekyll, the formidable gardener-maker, 'frightening but kind and wise,' says Mr. Hussey from experience. She commissioned Lutyens to design Munnstead Wood, a house for herself. It was built in 1890, not his first building—he had done cottages, lodges and additions to houses before, and in 1890 he planned earnings of about £1,000 a year—but it was

Orchids, 1880, an example which shows the influence of Voysey on Lutyens.

The Gothic Revival was still very strong early in the 1890s, and Lutyens must have been influenced by it. The great influence of Voysey on Lutyens shows clearly in his first building of consequence. In 1897, moreover, he married Lady Emily Lytton, daughter of the First Viscount, and with her began a new chapter in the life of his friend George Lytton, the author of 'The Vicerecy.' He brought Lutyens the influence of the Vicerecy, and his first building of consequence. In 1897, moreover, he married Lady Emily Lytton, daughter of the First Viscount, and with her began a new chapter in the life of his friend George Lytton, the author of 'The Vicerecy.' He brought Lutyens the influence of the Vicerecy.