Given the huge scale on which it was permitted to Lutyns to work, and given his universal success, it remains admirable that his work is never, or hardly ever, dead (I except the British Pavilion at Rome of 1910 and the British Embassy at Washington of 1929), as the contemporary composers and civic centres of the United States so often are. This is no doubt due to two causes which seem at first to exclude each other. Lutyns's clan vishi and his immense care over details. The many pages of detail drawings in the Lutyns Memorial show clearly how meticulous a worker he was and how the naughtiness of so many of his motifs is by no means the outcome of habit in accident. Lutyns admired the Norman Shaw of his later period, and that of Bryam and Chetwyd (17)—Shaw had set an example for Lutyns of how an architect of immense picturesque gifts can in later life find a way to Palladio and Wren—but he objected to the manner in which at Chatsworth all details are 'left go lucky beyond a point' (120). Yet Chatsworth must have impressed him more than any other nineteen century building. Philip Webb he discovered in 1861, and also admired greatly. Voysey, nowhere mentioned in Mr. Hussey's Life, although his influence on, say, Orchards seems to me beyond doubt—the bay window of its unornamented details and transomes (a Shaw motif originally) and the batten of the buttresses. Another influence worth considering is that of the Cours Pavillon on the plan of Palladian Hall with four wings projecting diagonally from a central core. The common source of course again Chatsworth, but Lutyns's solution is nearer Prior's than Shaw's. And Prior also possessed a liking for rather crazy primural details which Lutyns shared.

But Palladian Hall of 1908 has got one feature which neither Voysey nor Prior would have introduced; the circular and oval rooms of the Central Basin Court with its colonnades. This introduction of motifs which seem to have nothing to do with each other, this playing them simple games just to amuse, but sometimes also to jiper le bourgeois, is in my opinion one of the most characteristic features of Lutyns's style. How he enjoyed such bits as the specially low-silled 'crawling window' in the nursery at Midland Park, or the one Victorian window left unaltered when he converted Ashwell Bury, or those disapearing pilasters which annoyed me so much twenty years ago at 48, Pall Mall, and which also occur in the Midland Bank in Poultry, and even in the British Embassy at Washington, those pilasters which start innocently with Doric bases and then fade away in the close pattern of rustication or brick courses, until much higher up they suddenly reappear and end in correct capitals as if nothing had happened. How he enjoyed adding in completely different styles to houses he had built himself—Crockford, the earliest of all his works, was originally in the Carlisle style of picturesque cottages (as Mr. Hussey calls it). The addition of 1896 was Lutyns's first effort in a vast building and hugely battered piers. The entrance side of Homewood at Knebworth of 1901 (not illustrated in the Memorial) has a big classical doorway and weatherboarding gables above. Little Thakeham of 1902 is Tudor, but the hall has broad stone doorways towards the staircase with Gibbsonian surrounds.

What made Lutyns so fond of this Palladian motif of blocks of alternating sizes for doors and window surrounds? It is due no doubt to the same delight in geometry as the circular room and the circular court at Papillon Hall. The square, the rectangle, the circle occur everywhere in his work. The voluptuousness of the long, swaying curves of the Arts and Crafts and Art Nouveau and the single-minded dynamic intensity of the pointed arch of Gothic and Eastern tradition were equally abhorrent to him. When the Viceroy pleased for pointed arches at Delhi instead of round-headed ones, because these would not be in harmony with the Indian past, Lutyns wrote: 'God did not make the Eastern rainbow pointed, to show his wide sympathies' (196). His first conception of the focal monument for gravesyards of the First World War in France was 'a solid ball of bronze' (197), and wherever one looks in the three volumes of plates of the Memorial, one is struck by elementary geometrical patterns—the squares of different materials in the Westminster Housing Scheme, the black and white marbles in the paving of entrance and staircase halls, the trilaminated front of Gray Wall, the exact semispherical domes of Delhi, the Midland Bank in Poultry and the British Pavilion for the 1928 exhibition at Antwerp. This worship of geometry found in some later works lead to most complex and ingeniously thought out ratios of proportions. The memorial arch of Thiepval is as geometrically perfect as any Modulor-designed exercise of Le Corbusier. 'In an architecture Palladio is the game,' wrote Lutyns in 1903 (121).

But where Lutyns's geometry seems to be most basic is where he uses it not for the sake of perfection but for the sake of contrast and surprise. Thiepval and the Poultry facade of the Midland Bank reveal little of the best in Lutyns. For that you have to go to such early houses as Tignourne Court of 1809. The contrast between the perky up-curved front wall carrying two abarantly tall chimney stacks set diagonally, and the facade itself further back with its low Tuscan legs and its sheer wall above with its windows set apart and straight gables on top is irresistible. So is the geometry of the south front of Deanery Garden of 1894, that of the Bank House at Folly Farm of 1912, and also that of the pools and fountains at Delhi, though here and even more, still later, at Liverpool cathedral the play with geometry gets dangerously near the continental jazz idiom of 1925—a curious entirely independent parallelism.

If I look for continental parallel to what is most valuable in Lutyns's work, I find some similarity with Berlage (born 1856) and his Dutch successors, especially de Klerk (born 1884). Here is the same origin in picturesque traditions, the freedom of handling, the faith in elementary cubic forms, the occasional jazziness of detail, and also—and this introduces two more qualities essential to Lutyns's character—the keen interest in a variety of materials and in craftsmanship. But whereas Berlage and de Klerk and then Dudok were led by their theories geometrical to a complete renunciation of period ties,