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The French Renaissance Revival in British architecture, 1824-1914, is a history of the revival in secular and domestic architecture of a range of French historical styles (sixteenth- to eighteenth-century), for both interiors and exteriors, beginning with the revived Louis Quatorze of the 1820s and ending with the Néo-Grec style, which was associated in the Edwardian era with the Beaux-Arts influence in architectural planning and composition, as well as in education and civic design. Between these extremes lay such revivals as the decorative François Premier and the Loire chateau styles; most widespread of all was the influence of the Louvre and the Hôtel de Ville of Paris. This broad scope is partly determined by the fact that architects tended to combine motifs from different periods in a single building, making the isolation of any one revived French style unrealistic, and partly by the continuity possessed by the movement as a whole which paralleled that of Victorian and Edwardian architecture generally. Within a basically chronological framework, the revival is described in its evolution away from a superficial concern for motifs unrelated to the building plan, towards the absorption of Beaux-Arts principles of homogeneous composition. At the same time an investigation of the reasons for the popularity of these particular styles suggests for them a more important role in Victorian architecture than is usually recognised. The sheer volume of output in itself demands attention; but it is argued that in another sense the French styles were literally central to
Victorian architecture. Like the Queen Anne movement, with which they were closely allied, they were seen as a compromise between Gothic and Classic and therefore as a possible solution to the problem of a style truly appropriate to the nineteenth century. In addition to such theory, the thesis investigates the relationship (aesthetic and associational) between style and environment, including the reasons for the earlier appearance of the Loire style in Scotland than in England. Matters of patronage, politics, economics and materials are dealt with, while special attention is paid to the literature of the movement. The importance which many Victorians, themselves, attached to the French styles; the influence of Beaux-Arts principles upon modern architecture; and most of all the spirited excellence of certain individual buildings make reappraisal of this movement overdue.
"But, while the Classicists and Goths
Engage like butterflies and moths,
Another party woke from trance,-
The rich re-nascent Renaissance.
Like Stanley 'twixt the twain at Bosworth,
Still thinking which his favour was worth,
Or Dick, or Harry, - till no longer
He might doubt which should be stronger,-
So stood the bastard, till he rather
Chose the Classic for his father.
"Fighting shy" of the Grotesque,
He'd yet preserve the Picturesque;
And thus declared for Classic, which found,
The favour Stanley showed for Richmond."

"The Battle of the Styles; a Hudibrastic epic", by George Wightwick.
Builder, 18/7/1857, pp 403-5.
"It must be owned that France has given the mode in architectural and fine arts in northern & western Europe," C. R. Cockerell noted in his diary in 1824, on returning to London from a visit to Paris. Cockerell was to become an increasingly isolated figure in British architecture. He had absorbed in his youth a great deal from the Classicism of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris, and persisted with this approach to architecture until his death, well into the reign of Queen Victoria, while the rest of the country was being swept away by the Gothic Revival. By the end of the century and the death of the queen the wheel of taste had turned full circle; Beaux-Arts principles were generally acclaimed; the day of the picturesque and the irregular was done. During the intervening decades French architecture had continued to give the mode, to a considerable degree, in the architecture of Europe, indeed the world; but the mode and its interpretation in Britain were not at all of the type that Cockerell would have approved.

Although French architecture from 1500 onwards had produced many fine churches, firstly in a highly individual blend of Gothic structure and Classic detail, and later of a more homogeneous (though still idiosyncratic) Classical nature, the French Renaissance Revival in Britain was restricted almost entirely to secular and domestic architecture. The Gothic Revival was too well entrenched

by the 1850's when the French taste was beginning its boom to be seriously challenged in the ecclesiastical field by any of the newer historicist revivals of which the Victorian era was witness; and this ascendancy persisted to the end of our period of study, the outbreak of the first great war.

In secular and domestic architecture the history of the French Renaissance Revival is a somewhat diffuse subject; it is the history of the adoption of not one but a number of styles in Britain over a period of nearly one hundred years. These several styles were the styles of France from the first hints of Classical influence upon the native Gothic tradition appearing after the Italian campaign of Charles VIII in the 1490's, right through to the supremely elegant Classicism of Ange Jacques Gabriel, and the brand of Néo-Grec architecture which characterised late eighteenth-century France and the years of the First Empire. Between these extremes lay bounty for Victorian plunder which can here be only briefly sketched.

1. A couple of designs for churches in French Renaissance styles appeared in the press but were not built: a sketch for a village church by Edward Buckton Lamb (who died 1869) which appeared as first of a series on "Classic design adapted to country churches" (BA, 3 Jun. 1881, p. 281) in early sixteenth-century chateau style; also an octagonal church of Beaux-Arts influence by Campbell Douglas and Sellars (BA, 15 Sep. 1882). Less surprising was the use of "modern Renaissance of a French type" by Spiers and Phipps in the competition for Sacré Coeur, Montmartre (see Eldr., 1 May 1875, p. 381; BN, 14 May 1875, p. 536); and the Renaissance detailing to the French Protestant Church, Soho Square (actually built), by Aston Webb (see Archt, 20 Apr. 1894). Also not uncommon was the use of steep, wedge-shaped roofs with cresting and lucarnes in the late mediaeval, secular French manner in lieu of a spire, e.g. Somers Clarke, the younger's church of St. Martin, Lewes Road, Brighton (see BN, 7 Mar. 1873, & 15 May 1874).

2. See Appendix A for time chart of French monarchs, architects and buildings.
First there was the rich age of Francis I, characterised on the one hand by the Loire chateaux of unsurpassed picturesqueness, as well as a group of more formal but still picturesque palaces in and around Paris; and on the other hand, a number of small houses in towns like Caen, Rouen and Orleans, whose highly decorative facades and irregular compositions had a very strong impact upon Victorian architecture. To avoid confusion these latter will henceforth be regarded as paradigms of the François Premier style as opposed to the more famous models of the Loire-chateau mode. The more fully developed Classicism of the late sixteenth century, not untinged with Mannerist eccentricity, was less widely imitated; but the purer (yet still picturesque) Classicism of François Mansart in the first half of the ensuing century, and the palatial Louvre schemes of Louis XIV's reign (as well as the sumptuous Baroque and Rococo interiors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) were to find much favour in Victorian Britain.

This may appear a perversely wide interpretation of the Renaissance, but it is one which Sir Reginald Blomfield, writing in 1911 at the end of our period of study, adopted in his important History of French architecture. It was, in his opinion, unhistorical to limit the Renaissance in France to the first half of the sixteenth century. The development of Classicism in France needed to

1. Most influential of these were Chambord, Azay-le-Rideau, Chenonceaux, Chaumont, and the Francis I wing of Blois.
2. The Châteaux of Fontainebleau and Madrid; the Paris Hôtel de Ville; and Lescot's wing at the Louvre. To this group may be added the Hôtel d'Écoville at Caen.
be regarded, he argued, as an "unbroken series of efforts in one direction", with pinnacles of achievement in the work first of Mansart and then of Gabriel. It is certainly true that French architecture was unusual in Europe for the way in which it preserved right into the eighteenth century features which were mediaeval in origin. So academic a view as Blomfield's is unlikely to have been shared or even comprehended by the majority of architects involved in the reviving of the French styles in question. To some extent it was ignorance - more often the deliberate eclecticism of the day - which induced them to combine in one building elements derived from widely differing periods in French architectural history. That they did make so free with all the French styles in unprecedented combinations is a further reason why it is difficult and counter-productive to try to extract from nineteenth- and early twentieth-century British architecture, and deal in isolation with, any one type of revived French architecture. There were different phases, true, beginning with the Louis Quatorze style of interior decoration and ephemeral architecture in the 1820's and '30s and ending with the eighteenth-century French Classicism and the Louis Seize interior which were cut off by the First World War - with the decorative Francois Premier, the Louvre, Hotel de Ville and Loire chateau fashions in between - but they overlap, intermingle and recur. Certainly one searches in vain for a logical progression from Gothic to pure Classicism such as Blomfield saw

over the centuries in France; the succession of one French style upon another during the ninety years between the Elizabeth Saloon at Belvoir (begun 1824) and the *Beaux-Arts* exercises which characterised the output of 1914 had its own logic, however, which was intimately related, as might be expected, with the progress of Victorian and Edwardian architecture generally. The choice of one French style or another was regulated by the same factors which brought about the characteristics which we recognise today as Edwardian, or Early, High and Late Victorian; and the movement played more than one important role in the quest for direction which obsessed the architectural profession at the time. The French Renaissance Revival (a blanket term to cover all the phases) was therefore a good deal more important in the history of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century British architecture than is generally allowed. It is not enough to see it as a sequence of dilettante exercises in the gratification of individual (and often dubious) taste.

In more than one sense the French Renaissance Revival, particularly from 1857 onwards, can be said to have been central to British architecture. First there is the question of sheer volume. If at times the present work takes on something of the semblance of a catalogue, this is the point: despite extensive demolition, the streets of our cities still boast an incredible quantity of rather Gallic architecture, erected in the Victorian and Edwardian eras — much of it certainly indifferent in quality; most of it ignored by architectural historians. The journals of the relevant period tell the same story, not only of buildings which were built, but of
endless designs which were not. In due course it will be seen how
during a fifty-year period the architecture associated with the laying
down of new streets in Westminster and the City was time and again
overwhelmingly French of one sort or another 1.

Much more interesting is the reason for this popularity. In
Scotland, the historic links between the native Baronial style and
the chateaux of the Loire induced an interest in sixteenth-century
French architecture earlier than in England. Furthermore, John
Claudius Loudon’s theory of association between landscape and archi-
tecture encouraged the chateau style in Scotland earlier than in
England, (ironically forgetting the flatness of the plains of the
Loire) 2. In the north, therefore, this phase of the revival had
its roots in a combination of nationalistic self-analysis and a taste
for the Picturesque. In England, on the other hand, there was
another important theoretical issue involved which invites us to
see the Loire style in particular, and also the Louvre and the Hôtel
de Ville types, as quite literally central to one of the major
problems of Victorian architecture. This was the question of the
style of the future which was thrashed out to begin with in the
mid-century against the background of the ‘Battle of the Styles’. An
increasing number of theorists saw that the answer might lie in some
sort of compromise between the warring protagonists, Gothic and
Classic. That Victorian invention, the so-called Queen Anne movement,

1. Victoria Street, the Victoria Embankment, the Holborn Viaduct,
Northumberland Avenue, Aldwych.
2. J. C. Loudon, A treatise on country residences, London, 1806, I,
pp 157-70.
was one suggestion; the Loire chateau style was another. It was easier because ready-made. The two styles emerged in England at the same time (about 1870) and contemporaries could see the link.

E. M. Barry remarked upon the problem and these two solutions in his second Lecture on Architecture to the Royal Academy in 1874, giving a little boost to his favourite, the latter. But, as far back as 1843, observers of current trends in French architecture had noted the role of compromise which the early French Renaissance was then playing in that country. As yet little mediaeval work was being done there, but taste was less exclusively Classical than formerly: "in adopting the middle style of the days of Francis I., a field is opened both for fancy and for innovation." It was to be felt, especially during the 1870s, that the situation of the Victorians in relation to the two opposed major styles was analogous with that of the early Renaissance architects themselves. By going back to that moment in history when a freedom of invention and response to a combination of Gothic and Classic details prevailed, unfettered by the strictures of purer Classicism, a new start might be made and a new style developed which was truly of the nineteenth century.

The style of the Louvre and the more Classical seventeenth-century French architecture was seen in the same light. In 1862, James Fergusson, when discussing the New Louvre of Visconti and Lefuel (just completed to the orders of Napoleon III in an ebullient

2. Eladr, 8 Apr. 1843, p. 104.
amalgam of the features of the older building), contrasted it to advantage with the British Museum and the Houses of Parliament:

"We see how happily it takes a medium course between the frigid classicality of the one and the florid mediaevalism of the other; while it is in every respect suited to the wants of the age and expressive of its feelings, to which neither of the others can make any pretension."

In so far as Fergusson described his History of the modern styles of architecture as "a critical essay on the history of the aberrations of the art during the last four centuries"\(^2\), one cannot hope to find him a whole-hearted champion of any of the styles with which he dealt. His abhorrence of blind copyism which he saw as the bane of all western architecture since the Renaissance (and more especially of his own day) did, however, endear the more independent spirit of the French Renaissance to him to some extent; and one can observe system striving with fancy in his conclusions about the style:

"It is true," he writes, "that the French architects were never so completely enslaved to the orders as the Italians became after Palladio, or the English after Inigo Jones; but they felt the chain nevertheless ... The absurdity they committed was in fancying that the best way to ornament modern buildings on the banks of the Seine was to cover them all over with shreds of ornament borrowed from the Temples of Antiquity on the banks of the Tiber. Although, therefore the Renaissance Civil Architecture of France belongs intrinsically to a lower class of Art than the Ecclesiastical Mediaeval Styles, and is further vitiated by the imitative being introduced to replace the constructive element, which is so essential in all true Art, it is still a style so elegant, so gay and so characteristic, that its study will well repay any attention that may be bestowed upon it, provided it be entered upon without adopting the narrow class prejudices which are the bane of modern Art criticism."\(^3\)

2. Ibid., p.v.
3. Ibid., p. 185.
Fergusson was not prepared to say where the future of nineteenth-century architecture lay. He was sufficiently aware of current trends, however, to realise that his favourite mediaeval styles could not provide the whole answer. He also believed, with the rest of his age, that history could not be escaped entirely. Clearly he saw the significance of a style which combined "in many instances the picturesque of the Gothic with the elegance of the Classic styles, to an extent not found elsewhere."2

What this attitude to the French Renaissance styles amounted to was a refinement of the eclecticism which was being vigorously promoted by such influential figures as John Ruskin and Robert Kerr, but which went back as far as Thomas Hope and his *Historical essay on architecture* (1835)3. The French styles were eclecticism ready-made, and they had something nice for everyone. For the Goths, plundering the fertile transitional years of the early Renaissance, there was an enrichment of vocabulary - new roof types and spiky dormers, pretty oriel windows and exposed staircases; for the Classicists there was first and foremost skyline - a means for them to compete with the Goths in the all-important vogue for the Picturesque. The Louvre or the architecture of François Mansart employed the orders with grace and symmetry, yet at the same time cast a dramatic silhouette against the sky. Furthermore, the pavilion composition typical of

---

1. "To give a distinct and categorical answer to such a question is, of course, impossible" ([Ibid.](#), p. 488).
French Classicism (usually with two or three pavilions projecting both in front of and above the principal wall plane and capped with separate roofs) allowed for a richly plastic effect which, as Henry-Russell Hitchcock points out\(^1\), appealed to the mid-century's desire to break sharply with the flat-suraced and flat-topped cubic blocks of Romantic Classicism, while at the same time avoiding the straggling irregularity of Gothic and late Georgian Picturesque design.

These theoretical issues prevailed over considerations of nationalism. After all, one casts about in vain for an equivalent to the Louvre and Tuileries complex in English Renaissance architecture. Hampton Court was too heterogeneous; Jones's Whitehall too little known. For the palatial opulence suitable to a building of civic importance one could hardly do better than the Louvre. Besides, its expansion in the 1850s, associated as it was with the Second Empire at its most prestigious, was not only the most impressive single building enterprise of nineteenth-century Europe, but also the most widely publicised and watched. On the other hand, Tudor and 'Jacobethan' architecture were certainly attracting much attention too in nineteenth-century Britain, and the frequency with which elements from the Renaissance architecture of both countries were blended in the same building does lead one to suspect that in this area at least the promotion of the French style might paradoxically have been because of nationalism. It seems likely that, seeing certain similarities

\(^1\) *Architecture: nineteenth and twentieth centuries*, Harmondsworth, 1971, pp 192-3.
(particularly of decoration) between the sixteenth-century architecture of the two countries, and recalling instances of French influence in Tudor England, the Victorians sought to create the English style which might have evolved had Inigo Jones never visited Italy. But for the most part, if nationalism played a role at all in the many grand imitation Louvre schemes devised by architects for public buildings of the later Victorian years it was of the competitive variety - a desire not to seem deficient and provincial. So they took up what was being done in contemporary France. Actually, the whole French Renaissance Revival had its counterpart in France, each stage always a few years ahead. The results were never quite the same however, because of the different architectural moods which existed in the two countries in the nineteenth century; and the French reason for reviving the styles was simply the more straightforward brand of nationalism which was causing most countries of Europe to look at their own historic architecture.

Nationalism apart, political relations throughout the century between France and Britain were on the whole better than they had ever been before. A certain distrust persisted between the citizens of the two countries, but their sovereigns during the 1850s in particular were exchanging the most cordial of visits, while the end of the century basked in the harmony of the Entente Cordiale. Edward VII's francophilia is legendary. The hectic history of France during the earlier nineteenth century held a captive audience across the Channel; and the succession of revolutions which overtook that country did nothing to shake an interest in French art and architecture. Indeed, the reverse was the case. Wave upon wave of
fleeing aristocrats found refuge in England. They brought with them their furniture, their paintings, their objets d'art. By the time of the last of the French revolutions, that which brought down Napoleon III in 1870 during the Franco-Prussian War, deteriorated political relations between Britain and France did nothing to discourage in this country the use of French styles of architecture. The Louvresque mode was unquestionably associated with civic grandeur; and the Loire chateau was a supremely picturesque model for a country house - adaptable if rendered more regular even to an urban setting. No wars and diplomacy could alter these facts.

Not that these styles found universal favour. Some criticism that was voiced did betray a degree of blimpish chauvinism. More often there was informed dismay at the lack of invention to be found in the churned-out formulae, the "general harmony of mediocrity" which characterised the new architecture such as arose in Northumberland Avenue ¹. There were some outspoken critics. For one the verb, to 'Frenchify', was a term of abuse ², while Edmund Beckett found it difficult to believe "that anybody really thinks there is either beauty or convenience" in mansard roofs:

"I believe that these, like most of the monstrosities of modern architecture, are designed not with any serious belief in their beauty, but simply on two principles: one, to be in the fashion generally, and the other, to add to it some little queerness of detail or arrangement in order to give an impression of originality... To these designers one shape is as beautiful as another..." ³

¹. See below, pp 109-10.
Where the country house in particular was concerned the French styles became tainted with the slur of vulgarity. Heathcote Statham dubbed one specimen of pavilion roof and cone-topped tourelle as "the turrets of the *nouveau riche*" in his book on *Modern Architecture*. But in his bid to damn the new rich, Statham nearly destroyed his case:

"... of late the *nouveaux riches* have grown so knowing," he maintained, "that they will sometimes consciously adopt the quiet and unassuming style of domestic architecture they have discovered represents the taste of an older class of society, just as they will desire to rent a small house in Mayfair rather than a big one in Portland Place."

Mark Girouard has pointed out, however, that once the Louvresque roofs were adopted with enthusiasm by the new railway hotels the old families did tend to avoid them. This does seem to be the case, though again it is not quite fair to the middle classes who were also more likely than the aristocracy to patronise the avant garde.

And there was the Duke of Westminster who seemed to fancy French chateaux almost as much as he did the Queen Anne taste, being responsible for one of the prettiest and last of all Loire-style mansions - the house of his agent at Eccleston, Cheshire - as well as additions to Cliveden for his horses and the heavy French Gothic

---

1. *Modern architecture*, London, 1897, p. 201, and fig. 95. The house used as model for the abused turrets turns out to be Galtee Castle, Co. Cork, by Darbyshire and Smith of Manchester. Statham had reduced the interest of the original by placing the arch axially beneath the windows of the tower rather than off-centre in characteristic *François Premier* fashion. The house was illus. *Bldr*, 14 Sep. 1895, p. 188. Its plan was used also by Statham (fig. 98, p. 204) as an example of bad house-planning. The *nouveau riche* owner was Abel Buckley, J.P.
2. *The Victorian country house*, Oxford, 1971, p. 133. I am much indebted to Dr Girouard, particularly for his chapter on "The *Nouveau-riche* style".
of Eaton Hall for himself (not to mention what went up on his London estates). But the greatest concentration of chateau-style houses from the mid-1860s onwards was certainly around the big industrial centres - commuter distance from London, Glasgow or Manchester. As for the choice of the French eighteenth-century styles for interior decoration, the old aristocracy was by no means above such indulgence. Here the associations were so clearly with luxury and prestige that anyone who set store by the London season and high society knew the value of so much gilding. One is tempted, therefore, to posit a different, or simply wider, social grouping where the French interior was concerned - based rather on intellect and cultural awareness (or the lack of it) than on origins of wealth. It was the intelligentsia, usually middle class, who favoured Aesthetics.

If the associations of the French interiors were with royal splendour so also were those of the Louvre-like exterior. But this was also felt to be very much an urban type, largely limited to public building or the grandiose town mansion. Louvre roofs were often enough popped (with some bizarre results) on to old country houses as much for the cheap extra space they provided as for reasons of fashion, but full-scale Louvre compositions in the countryside were rare. The Loire style, by contrast, was appropriate in this field, especially if the countryside were hilly. But, if architects indulged in theoretical notions concerning the stylistic compromise offered by the chateau style, the actual patrons were more likely to be indulging in unbridled romance and self-dramatisation - in flight from the ugly industrialism in which so many had made their fortunes. It is interesting to note how even in the architectural
press the frequent illustrations of French chateaux were supported by very little technical information and a great deal of anecdotal history. The public who favoured the paintings of Mary, Queen of Scots, and Anne Boleyn which filled the Royal Academy summer exhibitions, and read the verse of Tennyson, fancied also to live in a chateau.

It was not a sector of the public which was particularly pioneering in its artistic tastes; yet conversely, these patrons were by no means backward in espousing the technological inventions of the day which might increase their comfort and convenience. They had, after all, probably manufactured such innovations in their own Midlands factories. Antique though the mock chateau might strive to appear on the outside, the latest in fire-proof construction was likely to have been used, and the inside would be well up to the mark, with newly-installed electricity, central heating, lifts, electrical bells, hot water and the rest. High roofs supplied plenty of cheap extra space and might do nicely for the water tanks. The Victorians were far too practical a people to allow the external eccentricities of their houses to interfere with their actual style of life. Though expressive architecture was much favoured for its honest reflection on the outside of the inward plan, too serious a concern for a stylistic correspondence inside and out would have been held eccentric. An imitation sixteenth-century chateau was likely to have French eighteenth-century interiors or even frankly English decor; and the influence of French planning (which took no account of the niceties of English social life) was slight. It was a superficial attitude to style which the Edwardians with their Beaux-Arts concern for over-all composition rejected with vigour. To the Victorians style
was no more than a veil with which to prettify a building whose form had been established by more practical means. With Ruskin behind them they knew that a building was nothing without ornament; with Pugin behind them they knew that the form of a building must first be settled by a number of empirical considerations such as situation, climate and function. If historic precedent in any way threatened to restrict the freedom or comforts required by the modern way of life, then modification was taken for granted. Until the influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts was being felt towards the end of the period under consideration, French Renaissance details almost invariably concealed an essentially English building underneath. This was even stressed as a desideratum by Robert Kerr, professor at Kings College, London, and author of the influential book, The Gentleman's house. When writing about the French Renaissance styles for modern use he said,

"All the while the style need not certainly be French - it need have nothing in common with the French manner except certain features of form, not of expression. The treatment throughout is preferably English, - massive and bold, picturesque even when required, simple, substantial and unaffected."

The differences, therefore, between British essays in the French Renaissance styles and their equivalents in Second Empire France are traceable to the loose approach to planning and the greater concern for the Picturesque which prevailed in British as opposed

to modern French architecture. The early sixteenth-century chateau style in particular was very adaptable to this empirical approach and, indeed, certain English chateaux came closer to recapturing the spirit of the sixteenth-century originals than did the more formalised versions produced by Second Empire France. The adaptability of the Loire style made it, amongst the many stylisms that the Victorians played with, one of the most suitable for the modern way of life. When the architect, Laurence Harvey, designed a villa in that style in Kensington, about 1885, he declared that

"Of all the styles of French architecture this is the most adaptable to English dwellings. The very laxity of the style which is neither Classic nor Gothic but a mixture of both, allows of the greatest freedom in meeting all the requirements and even caprices of private persons." ¹

In 1872 a similar scheme had elicited another eulogy:

"This is the stuff of which our mansions should be designed. Neither the emasculated Italian of the Palladian or Vitruvius on the one hand, nor the ascetic and ecclesiastic aspect of the Early Mediaeval on the other, it becomes sufficiently Renaissance in the best sense, with the freedom of Gothic in every use of detail to be in our estimation the best of all styles for the expression which one naturally expects in nineteenth-century secular and domestic architecture." ²

While not demanding perfect symmetry which situation, function, or taste might not permit, the imitation Loire chateau could be spacious, light and airy. The original chateaux had themselves been modernised

1. Archit, 25 Apr. 1885, p. 253. The villa was in Campden Hill.
2. Archit, 25 May 1872, p. 269, concerning a seemingly unexecuted scheme by T. Roger Smith for Stanslie Hall, Derbyshire (see below, p. 311n ). J. J. Stevenson, too, was to find the "Union of the two styles" in sixteenth-century French architecture "admirably suited for modern domestic requirements" (House architecture, London, 1880, I, p. 239).
mediaeval fortresses, their massive and picturesque bastions rendered more suitable for a peaceful life-style by the insertion of broad window strips. The Victorians felt quite at liberty to make them broader still. French Classicism was also convenient:

"It certainly is in their hands the style most perfectly adapted to modern wants and refinements", was a typical view.

The French styles were considered less adaptable where materials were concerned.

"It is not easy to adapt a style of this kind to a crude or rough surface, or a mean substance", wrote Robert Kerr. There was a natural tendency to employ the same sorts of materials in the British imitations as were typical of the French originals. The palatial associations of the Louvre formula made good stone essential, just as it demanded an urban environment:

"a miniature Louvre built of Kentish rag or brick, for a house in a picturesque Sussex village would be as much out of harmony with its surroundings as would be the Louvre in Paris if built of half-timber and weather tile."

The Loire chateaux too had, typically, been of stone, though the Louis XII wing at Blois provided a famous example of the early, transitional Renaissance style in brick. The brilliant brick-work of

---

1. EN, 30 Jun. 1871, p. 507.
2. Kerr, Op. cit., p. 366. The disappointment attendant upon such an attempt may be gauged by a look at David Bryce's Meikleour, Perthshire, as built: a sad let-down after the pretty schemes devised on paper. See below, p. 212.
small and obscure buildings like the Manoir d'Ango attracted much attention too by late Victorian sketchers; and brick was certainly used in a number of country houses of the Louis XII - François Premier variety, as well as in the many decorative François Premier edifices which shared Mayfair with the Queen Anne vogue. More surprisingly, Holloway College, Surrey, a massive imitation of Chambord (with touches of Hampton Court - here was the answer) was built of bright red brick with terra-cotta decoration. The importance of ornament in the sixteenth-century French styles was another reason why stone was deemed essential; but terra-cotta in fact soon proved an ideal substitute, and it was recalled with satisfaction that Francis I's Château de Madrid in the Bois de Boulogne had employed faience for its ornamentation. The cheapness of this material somewhat offset the expense of building in the early French styles. The profusion of decoration and the irregularities of plan, plus the attitude that stone was essential, had made it by no means a cheap mode of expression. In 1882 J. C. Edwards, proprietor of the Pen-y-bont terra-cotta works near Ruabon, sponsored a competition for the design of a villa to be done entirely in terra-cotta. The results showed a distinct tendency to adopt features derived from the Loire chateaux. In actual practice houses used this material only on a small scale for their detail; but by the 1880s terra-cotta

1. See BA, 21 Jan. 1881, p. 34 (design by D. Brade of Kendal); also BA, 19 Aug. 1881, pp 419-420 (a terra-cotta house by T. Raffles Davison, editor of the journal, with details by W. W. Baldwin; there is an open spiral stair as at Blois, with cone roof, French dormers, roof cresting, etc., all in terra-cotta).
was being employed quite extensively for lavishly decorative public buildings in the François Premier style, such as the Birmingham Assize by Aston Webb and Ingress Bell. By the Edwardian era, some very prominent French-style buildings were amongst the earliest in this country to employ a concealed steel framework; and it is interesting to note also that when in 1907 the design was published in *The Building News* of experimental concrete houses being newly manufactured in America by Thomas Edison, the style employed was a simplified François Premier. For constructing a thousand such houses in close proximity the material was pronounced very satisfactory. It was clearly a case of showing how a new material could suit an old style rather than of suiting style to material.

1907 was a very late date for such an exercise. From the 1870s onwards a revival of Classical sympathies in Britain saw an increasing tendency towards symmetry in the use of the Loire chateau style, and by about 1890, the rejection of the chateau style altogether. After a last flutter in public buildings in the 1880s the Louvre and the Hôtel de Ville waned in popularity too, succumbing to the new taste for the discreet and elegant Néo-Grec in the wake of the Paris Exhibition palaces of 1900. By the Edwardian era the espousal of Beaux-Arts educational principles had brought about a total reaction against the superficial, motif-mongering approach to architecture which had underlain the whole historicist phase of

---


The house design was by Manning and Macneille.
nineteenth-century British architecture. Throughout these final years before the war architects were certainly still employing historical motifs in their designs (now from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France) but this had become a secondary consideration to matters of composition and planning. For these, too, France was the major source. C. R. Cockerell, ignored in his own lifetime, had become at last a hero.

The historicist approach to architecture, the over-riding interest in styles, had failed. Neither Classic nor Gothic was any longer felt to be relevant to modern life with its new techniques and materials. Nor had the marriage of the two found in the French Renaissance styles an offspring capable of evolution and renewal in constant response to the requirements of the day. Even the more original Queen Anne style had petered out in an over-preoccupation with decoration. The Ritz and the Waldorf might employ steel framework beneath their French facades; Edison might manufacture concrete Francois Premier villas; but in neither case did the use of a French historical style in any way express the potential of these new materials. Yet the French Renaissance was not without some influence upon the development of twentieth-century British architecture. A certain subtle handling of the relationship between masses and voids which characterised both early Queen Anne architecture and a few of the better Loire-style buildings (as it had the original chateaux of the early sixteenth century) remained as a legacy in the "free style" architecture around 1900 for which Britain became world-famous, and lingers on to this day in garden suburbs. More widespread and more easily overlooked was the legacy left to
modern architecture by the Beaux-Arts principles of Classical planning and composition (with their roots in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France) which were absorbed in the new schools of architecture in the first two decades of this century. Quite apart, however, from any long-lasting influences the movement might have had, it also produced (along with thousands of uninspired edifices) a surprising number of buildings during Victoria's reign which brim with ebullient vigour, and many of considerable elegance in the reign of her successor. This alone would vindicate its study.
CHAPTER TWO: Louis Quatorze and François Premier to 1863

Right from the sixteenth century British architects were being influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the architecture of France. Even before artists of the Fontainebleau school were being employed upon Henry VIII's fabulous palace of Nonsuch, James V of Scotland had been employing Frenchmen at Stirling and Falkland. During the seventeenth century this became more general. Sir Christopher Wren himself owed a good deal to the architecture of that country, and certain individual mansions by others built in the late seventeenth century, such as Petworth and the houses of the first Duke of Montagu, were overtly, even deliberately, French. The French Rococo interior as well as furniture and the decorative arts during the ensuing century had some impact on English decor; and by 1773 Robert Adam was lavishing praise upon the French house plan. By this stage certain French features, particularly the mansard roof with concomitant dormers, had been absorbed into urban architecture, at least, with no longer any self-conscious awareness of their origins. Persisting as they did into our period of study, this fact calls for caution when deciding what in the 1830s and '40s constituted a deliberate revival of a French historical motif, and what was simply a survival of a fairly traditional form.

In grander architecture, too, there is a survival-revival

1. The French influence upon Scottish Renaissance architecture was not forgotten by nineteenth-century revivers of that style. See ch. 5.
2. See below, p. 257n.
problem; or, more accurately, a need to distinguish between what sought to borrow from the latest innovations of contemporary France (the sort of interchange of ideas from nation to nation which exists in all ages) and what sought consciously to revive long-dead styles from French architectural history. It needs to be stressed, however, that the whole revival of the French Renaissance styles over the ninety-year period from 1824 to 1914 was simultaneously a response to contemporary France. A combination of nationalism and a new sense of history was inducing all Europe to look to its several Renaissance styles in which individual national traits had begun to differentiate more clearly the architecture of one country from that of another after the relative uniformity of the age of international Gothic. France herself, therefore, was hard at work throughout the nineteenth century reviving her Renaissance styles. British reasons for adopting these French historic styles (usually a good deal later than they had first appeared in France) were more complex, however, than a simple case of copying a neighbour. In the meantime the influence of developments in French architecture during the Louis XVI and Empire periods continued to be felt in Britain into the 1820s. In the person of Charles Robert Cockerell there existed an architect who was concerned with current French attitudes towards planning, composition and draughtsmanship. Where styles are concerned there was a pair of patrons who can be seen to some extent to form a link between this sort of contemporary interest and the revival architecture and decoration with which we are more concerned. One of these was the Duke of Hamilton; the other, King George IV himself. The king's was naturally the greater influence;
besides his interest was of longer standing. The duke is more quickly
dealt with. When he was contemplating the renovation of the interiors
of Hamilton Palace in the late 1820s it was none other than the great
French architect, Charles Percier, that he called in to draw up a
sumptuous scheme for the "grande salle d'introduction" in character-
istic imperial Roman style\(^1\). This was not executed. By 1833 the
Louis Quatorze Revival had caught up with the duke. His architect,
David Hamilton of Glasgow, was concocting lavish designs for ceilings
in the French Rococo taste\(^2\).

George IV had been a life-long francophile. In the 1780s
while Prince of Wales, he had employed Henry Holland to build him
his town residence at Carlton House. With the prevailing Whig
enthusiasm for France and the prince's own penchant as background,
Holland produced a building with much of the grace and elegance of
contemporary Parisian fashion. This end was aided by his employ-
ment of a Frenchman, J. P. T. Trécourt, as his chief assistant, a
French foreman, and a number of French furniture-makers and decor-
ative painters\(^3\). By the 1820s, the king's favourite architect,
John Nash, was transmitting a similar feeling to his ill-starred
Buckingham Palace decorated with motifs drawn directly from

---

1. Hamilton Drawings (Lennoxlove) Inventory 154-62.
2. Hamilton Drawings (Lennoxlove) Inventory 170-1. One was dated
November 1833. Then followed Rococo grates by Robert Hume of London,
and others, 1841 (Inventory 173-7) and pelmets (179-81). See also
Inventory 87 for an elaborate Rococo entrance hall suggestion. The
duchess's boudoir, it should be pointed out, had been in a fairly
extreme type of French Rococo dating from 1746-52.
3. See Sir John Summerson, Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830,
prominent Louis Seize prototypes. Nash was close enough to the originals for this to be no revival. It is interesting to see the same features appearing, by then very much a revival, in the Classical French architecture of Edwardian England. By 1825 when Nash drew up his first plans for the palace it was permissible for the king to admit his love of France again. For some time past, however, it had not been so. He confessed to Lady Bessborough that during the years of the French Empire and the hostilities of the Napoléonic Wars he had been obliged to settle on the Oriental taste for the Royal Pavilion at Brighton

"because at the time there was such a cry against French things, &c., that he was afraid of his furniture being accus'd of jacobinism."

The restoration of the Bourbons made all the difference. In September 1816 Ackermann's Repository of Arts contained a satiric letter by one Harry Homebred, disgruntled husband. It was entitled "The advantages of a trip to Paris exemplified":

1. A frieze of loose scrolls in the Louis Seize fashion encircled the entire building, while small oval medallions draped with a thin wreath, such as appear at the Petit Trianon and elsewhere, adorned the pavilions of both the garden and main facades. For this feature's usage in the 1890s and later see below, p. 508. Summerson, Op. cit., p. 487, points out that in fact Nash constantly imitated the public buildings of Paris: "Gabriel's twin palaces are reflected in Carlton House Terrace and his interiors sometimes pay tribute to Percier." Nash's Buckingham Palace was illustrated in W. H. Leeds, Illustrations of the public buildings of London, London, 1838, pp 103-23.
"As it has lately become, I am sorry to say in great measure, the fashion to take a peep at the great nation, my wife and daughters determined to be as tonish as their neighbours, and opened upon me a grand battery of prayers, caresses, persuasions, and finally complaints of ill health," recounted the peevish squire. Inevitably he must capitulate with a Parisian vacation for the family. Once there, his daughters lost no time in equipping themselves "à la Parisienne" and depleting the exchequer in the process. They lost no time because, not only had the same good Repository commenced its long-lasting series on Paris fashions the minute it was politically acceptable to do so¹, but the Misses Homebred would undoubtedly have been equipped with their volumes of Paris chit-chat, an indispensable publication which preceded even Waterloo and which was calculated to "perform the office of an intelligent cicerone to such English as are visiting the most interesting metropolis of Europe"².

In light of this happy turn of events George IV, at the time still Prince Regent, himself lost no time in augmenting his already considerable collection of French furniture and objets d'art. He was aided by his pastry-cook³, by his good friend Lord Yarmouth (from

1. The Illustrated London News from its inception in 1842 on into the 1860s ran a similar feature.
2. ARA, 1st series, XIII, Jan. - Jun. 1815, p. 224. The book, Paris chit-chat, or, "A view of the society, manners, customs, literature and amusements of the Parisians", was a translation of Guillaume le Franc Parleur by "that acute and lively writer, M. Jouy" and marked, so it was claimed, "the most important and interesting era of French history, the restoration of the legitimate family to the throne of France".
3. François Benoist. Also another confidential servant, Louis Weltje, whose connections with the family of the famous André Charles Boulle proved invaluable.
1822 3rd Marquess of Hertford), and by the diaspora of the déclassé Empire nobility after Waterloo. The 1789 Revolution and the Terror had already brought to England a flood of refugee aristocrats; the events of 1830 were to bring another wave. With each came enough furniture, silver and porcelain to glut the market. The British nobility, identifying with the ancien régime, rejoiced at the Bourbon restoration, lavished aid upon the stricken émigrés, and relieved them of their possessions for very reasonable sums. As well as this availability of pre-Revolution furniture en masse, there was also an understandable desire amongst the upper classes to forget recent French history like some bad dream and to pick up the threads where they had been broken. They had had a fright and as Winslow Ames puts it, "they saw their safety and comfort so much in terms of the status quo that they froze the liveries of their servants at the breeches- and-hair-powder stage." They had done little building during the Napoleonic Wars and when thereafter they decided to build they wanted a setting for their Dubois and Riesener commodes.

Accordingly, Elizabeth, Duchess of Rutland, decided in 1824 that the new saloon in Thoroton's Tower at Belvoir Castle, Leics., which was to bear her name, was to be in the Louis XIV style; and

---

1. He lived a great deal in France and was one of the originators of the Wallace Collection which was to become the greatest single collection of French painting and objets d'art in this country (see below, pp L70-L72).
2. Greville's diary reports that the Countess de Grey (whose nephew was to build Wrest Park, a total exercise in the French Rococo taste - see ch. 4) gave support to the destitute Duchesses de Berri and d'Angoulême after the 1830 revolution, according to Simon Houfe, CL, 25 Jun. 1970, p. 1251.
thereupon the deliberate revival of old French styles took off. In her case the taste for French eighteenth-century *objets d'art* might have owed something to George IV: he had visited Belvoir in 1813 only three years before the fire which precipitated the redecoration of the interiors. The fire had destroyed much of the work which had recently been done by James Wyatt. It was his sons, Matthew and Benjamin Deane Wyatt who were responsible for effecting the *Louis Quatorze* decor of the Elizabeth Saloon. R. Stanley-Morgan has shown that Benjamin Wyatt in the years between Waterloo and the Elizabeth Saloon had been in a very good position to develop a taste, himself, for the French eighteenth-century styles of decoration. Involved as he was in the question of the abortive Waterloo Palace which was to be the nation's gift to the Duke of Wellington, equivalent to Marlborough's Blenheim Palace, he had reason to visit Wellington in Paris and Cambrai several times in the months immediately following Waterloo, thereby renewing an acquaintance with modern and pre-Revolutionary French styles in advance of most British architects. Furthermore, when it was decided that the duke would settle for the old house, Stratfield Saye, near Reading, Wyatt was in a good position to see the excellent *Louis Quinze* drawing room of ca. 1750, probably the work of a Frenchman. Be that as it may, though Benjamin's is the name chiefly associated with the new style owing to his later commissions, the Elizabeth Saloon at Belvoir was more the work of

---

Matthew Cotes Wyatt, the brother. It was Matthew who personally painted the panels of the ceiling and also no doubt designed the gilt frames in which they are set and the ornate ceiling cove employing the device of the peacock, emblem of the Manners family. He would also have been responsible for arranging the genuine eighteenth-century door and wall panelling whose importation from France he had personally supervised\(^1\). Belvoir is the first instance of the recurrent habit of the bodily importation of genuine eighteenth-century French boiseries for incorporation into British houses. The Reverend Irwin Eller in his History of Belvoir (1871) maintained that these had come from a chateau of Mme. de Maintenon. They have more the look of the age of Louis XV, however, and are rather more delicate than Wyatt's own work, especially his ceiling. Not that the term "Louis Quatorze" needs to be taken literally. That monarch being associated more than his successors with splendour and prestige was naturally the one who sprang first to mind, and certainly it was with him that George IV rather liked to identify\(^2\). But the so-called Louis Quatorze fashion shortly became a vehicle for the most unbridled Rococo extravagances which the Grand Monarque would not have recognised.

---

1. There is a letter from Matthew Wyatt, dated 28 Sep. 1824, in the Muniment Room at Belvoir (ref. no. 2.20.5) in which he reports on cases of French panelling inspected for use in the Elizabeth Saloon. (Thanks to Alistair Rowan for this information).

Nor would he have recognised much of the work of B. D. Wyatt which followed the Belvoir exercise, even though it often did on the side of a heavy Baroque. If any one French period springs to mind in relation to B. D. Wyatt's work it is that of the *Regence*, the first quarter of the eighteenth century, a period of transition between the Baroque of the seventeenth century and the Rococo of the *Louis Quinze*. But, as often as not, the Wyatt style was a mixture of this type of French decoration with heavy Palladian coffering, lighter Rococo touches and a fair amount of *Louis Seize* detailing as well, notably the same loose scroll frieze already seen on the exterior of Buckingham Palace. The Wyatt style was a highly individual concoction and in its lax attitude to history prefigured the eclectic freedom of the coming era. Wyatt's clients belonged to the very highest circles. A series of these sumptuous pseudo-*Louis Quatorze* interiors appeared in the palatial residences of London during the 1820s and '30s, Wyatt usually working in conjunction with another of his brothers, Philip Wyatt. Holdernesse (later Londonderry) House for the 3rd Marquess of Londonderry was the first. Then followed the Waterloo Gallery at Apsley House for the Duke of Wellington, Lord Tavistock's house in Carlton Gardens, and Crockford's Club in St. James's Street. Finally there was Stafford (now Lancaster) House for the 2nd Duke of Sutherland, though begun for the Duke of York.

Crockford's (1827), considerably remodelled in the mid-Victorian period, had a drawing room in a reasonably convincing *Regence* style.

---

Its panelling was of a lightish if controlled Rococo while the ceiling, which more closely approximated to those typical of Louis XIV's reign than was usual with Wyatt's work, was broken up into a series of rounded panels in high relief. More frequently Wyatt, if not succumbing to his most un-French penchant for skylights, favoured heavy, coffered, geometric ceilings which had their source at least as much in English Palladian architecture as in anything French. Thus it was in the drawing room suite at Stafford House. The walls are panelled in a Regence manner but the ceiling, very heavy indeed, consists of a rectangle of Palladian coffering rimmed by Louis Seize scrolls, a shallow ribbed cove, and a frieze of swags. Even less like the ceiling of a Louis XIV salon is that employed at the Waterloo Gallery at Apsley House (1828-30) with its curious grid of coffered sections. The dado panels are of a reticent Regence type, on the other hand, while the mirror pelmets and over-doors are quite lavishly Rococo. The frieze is Louis Seize. At Londonderry House (1825-8, now demolished) the prior existence of interiors by Athenian Stuart, including a boudoir with coffered and deeply coved ceiling, puts in doubt the French origin of the similar coves incorporated by Wyatt in the new ball room of that house, and more sumptuously in the gallery at Stafford House. Yet he must also have been aware of similar French coved ceilings like that in the Salon de l'Oeil de Bœuf at Versailles by J.-H. Mansart (1701).

2. For Londonderry House see CL, 10 Jly. 1937, pp 38-44. W.G. Coleman, a former assistant of Wyatt's, said of Wyatt's style in law case of
Stafford House marked the pinnacle and also the conclusion of Wyatt's achievement. To some extent it is difficult to be entirely certain how much was really his work and how much Robert Smirke (or more probably Charles Barry) altered Wyatt's designs, given that the execution of them had been summarily and humilitatingly given by the Duke of Sutherland into the hands of first one, and then the other, of these two men. There are, however, strong family likenesses between the Stafford House interiors and those of other Wyatt commissions. The banqueting hall ceiling, for instance, virtually duplicates, just a little more lavishly, the Crockford's drawing-room one already mentioned; and the vast double-return stair with open gallery encircling it on the first floor is very close to the one at Londonderry House. The Duchess of Sutherland is said to have been closely connected with the choice of the French taste at Stafford House, but it is probably not so simple. Wyatt's group of patrons was a close-knit one: this duchess was the niece of Lady Rutland; and besides, there had been an intention that Wyatt do French interiors like the one at Belvoir Castle before the Sutherlands acquired the house. It had come into their possession by way of payment to the Duke of Sutherland's father, the then

Footnote continued from p. 32
Wyatt v. the Duke of Sutherland, 1838, "It is design that is principally invention, because there is very little rule to go by" (J. Cornforth, "Stafford House revisited", CL, 14 Nov. 1968, p. 1257).
Marquess of Stafford, of huge debts owed by the Duke of York. The debt had been still outstanding at his death in 1827. The Duke of York, who was the King’s brother, had employed Wyatt to build the house at the instigation of the Duchess of Rutland. This influential lady’s role perhaps went even further: one contemporary source maintained that the plans and elevations of the house “were executed from suggestions and under the immediate inspection of the late Duchess of Rutland”. Only the ground floor rooms were completed at the time of the Duke of York’s death, but the Sutherlands undoubtedly inherited some of his schemes for the state apartments when they inherited Wyatt himself, for apparently the Crown had agreed that as part of the settlement of the house upon him

“Lord Stafford should be repaid whatever was expended by him in finishing the house according to the original plan as should be fixed on by you (i.e. Wyatt)”.

1. Colonel Frederick William Trench, A collection of papers relating to the Thames Quay: with hints for some further improvements in the metropolis, London, 1827, p. 141. The duchess died in November 1825, her own Elizabeth Saloon at Belvoir barely finished. Plates X-XV in Trench are of York House, including plans and (pi. XII) a longitudinal section which indicates the Rococo panelling of the central hall and the State dining room. Wyatt wrote to the Duke of Sutherland, Aug. 1833, that the idea of his plans for the Duke of York derived from “that of the best parts of the Palace of Versailles, and of the date of Louis XIV. The whole was intended to be finished with white and gold; and I am certain that a more splendid suite of Rooms than these would never have existed in France” (Cornforth, op. cit., p. 1257). Cornforth gives a full account of the 2nd Duke of Sutherland’s decoration of the State rooms, and his relations with Wyatt, from letters in the Trentham Collection. The stair was illus. ILN, 9 Mar. 1850, p. 161. For further views of the interior and the garden front, see Archt, 19 & 26 Mar., 2,9 & 16 Apr. 1897.

2. The Marquess of Stafford (1st Duke of Sutherland)’s auditor, James Loch, to Wyatt, 10 Jan. 1832, apud Stanley-Morgan, op. cit., p. 104.
If the Duke of York planned to set the royal seal of approval upon the new-fashion French interiors, his brother, the King, did so in fact. As a natural extension of his earlier interest in the arts of contemporary France, George IV embarked on most splendid historicist exercises in the French taste at both Buckingham Palace and Windsor. As in the case of Stafford House for Wyatt, Buckingham Palace was to prove an embarrassing termination to John Nash’s career. But whatever the problems posed by the exterior, the interiors were undoubtedly gorgeous. As with Wyatt there were debts to Palladianism; there were also debts to the taste of the recently past Empire in France and to the work of Percier. The grand staircase, made by Samuel Parker (1828-30) to Nash’s designs, with its metal rail and undulating return, is a lush bit of Louis Seize. The White drawing room, however, (completed 1831) combined an amazingly sumptuous coved ceiling with an order of pilasters of distinctly Regence type. The colour scheme, incidentally was not the present white and gold, but included yellow scagliola for the pilasters. This use of strong colours is one of the features which tends to differentiate the French interiors of this period from those of the Edwardian era which preferred delicate pastels and much white and gold.

At Windsor the King’s architect was not Nash but another member of the Wyatt family, Sir Jeffry Wyatville. Here, the State Reception Room (1830) left the heavy pseudo-Louis XIV behind and launched into Rococo of the most delicate and decorative kind. A new phase in the taste for revived French interiors was inaugurated. Apparently Wyatville’s role was restricted fairly much to responsibility for the plasterwork and gilding. The rest fell upon the
decorators, Morel and Seddons, who had been involved years before at Carlton House. Windsor Castle therefore inaugurated also the tendency, rife in Victorian years, for interiors to be taken out of the hands of the architectural profession and placed into those of the upholsterer-decorator. Wyatville disapproved of the introduction of old French boiseries at Windsor, it was reported at the time: they "would never have appeared in the Castle had the architect been solely guided by his own judgement." Here was the reason for the rise of the professional decorator: informed taste was beginning to react vigorously against the new French vogue: many architects disapproved. The interiors of Windsor Castle itself

1. As is pointed out by Derek Linstrum, Op. cit., p. 187. For the State Reception Room see pl. 157. The White Drawing Room in a less volatile Regence style was illus., ILN, 6 Apr. 1850, p. 240. This and the other private apartments were earlier than the State Reception Room, some pre-dating the King's accession. They continued the King's taste for France already indulged at Carlton House and, following the demolition of that building in 1826, re-used some of its fittings. By this stage it was ceasing to be a love of contemporary French taste and taking on the note of a revival. W.H. Pyne, The history of the royal residences, London, 1819, III, p. 48, describes "the large coved and enriched cornice and the walls formed into compartments by gilt mouldings, stiles and carved angles of shells and foliage in burnished gold".

2. Jeffry Wyatville, Illustrations of Windsor Castle by the late Sir Jeffry Wyatville, R.A., edited by Henry Ashton, London, 1841, p.i. T. L. Donaldson probably referred to Wyatville at Windsor when he told the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures, 10 Mar. 1836, that "the introduction of the style of Louis XIV decorations was against the sense of the profession and has been forced upon them. I know an eminent artist who complained to me that he was obliged to adopt that style in the finest monument which, within these few years, has been erected in Europe, in spite of his better judgement and his earnest remonstrance. In France under the Empire, there was not any trinket, jewel or piece of furniture that was prepared for the court that had not been either designed or approved by Percier and Fontaine ..." (House of Commons, Reports from committees (3) 1836, IX, Question 362).
came in for criticism - "too gaudy," thought Greville; "enormously over-loaded in parts," said Prince Puckler-Muskau. John Britton learnt with regret that the Rococo style which he considered "the most uncouth and tasteless that was ever devised" had been adopted at "a modern palace": "Let us hope that even princely authority will not become an example for such a style," he frothed.

Crockford's had been likewise denounced for its licence by George Smith, the King's own upholsterer, in his Cabinet Maker and Upholsterer's Guide (1828):

"As this mansion is solely appropriated to nightly purposes of pleasure, perhaps such a taste may be in unison with the wasteful transfer made of property in such establishments."  

Censure followed thick and fast. Thomas Hope called it "the inane or frippery style". John Claudius Loudon thought it "unsuitable to the present advancing state of the public taste". Nonetheless, he

---

3. George Smith, The Cabinet maker and upholsterer's guide, London, 1826 (i.e.1828), p. 174. At Crockford's, in step with this libertine decor, piquet, whist and cribbage were being eclipsed by French hazard, according to H. T. Waddy, The Devonshire Club - and "Crockford's", London, 1919, p. 123. Smith, writing of a Louis XIV type of chair (p. 187 & pl.CXLVI) said, "Here we have magnificence, but no taste: an elaborate display of ornament, but no beauty in general outline - those who possess a strength of fancy for this species of furnishing may have ... their taste amply gratified by a visit to Crockford's Gambling-house ... which is wholly furnished after this manner." Despite this censure Smith acknowledged the style's "richness and splendour of effect" and chose to include several illustrations of French Rococo fittings, including some sumptuous window cornices (pl. XXXVII, no. 6, & CXI, pp 176, 179), one of which he declared "would be suitable for many parts of such a palace as Windsor Castle."
was obliged to note that there was a very considerable number of upholsteryers who had given themselves over to dealing entirely in such "curious and ancient furniture". Indeed by the mid-1830s there existed a thriving industry in the manufacture of replicas - even forgeries - and less faithful imitations of the furniture and fittings of the French eighteenth-century interior. Thomas Johnson's French Rococo designs were reprinted by Weale. Other pattern-books for furnishings appearing at the time included French designs as a matter of course. What was regrettable was that the work on much of the imported antiques was "nothing like so good as the best English workmanship, but the charm of their really being French is all-powerful", as Loudon pointed out when reviewing a collection of "Louis Quatorze" chimney pieces at Mr Nixon's showrooms in John Street: "such is the effect of this charm that many articles of Louis XIV's time are purchased, admired and imitated, for no other reason than their antiquity". What was even more regrettable was that in the opinion of a number of eminent gentlemen interviewed by the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures, 1835-6, the standard of British workmanship had itself declined drastically in recent years and the meretricious style of Louis Quatorze had much to do with it. On the whole it was recognised with regret

3. AM, I, 1834, p. 244.
that the quality of modern British art manufactures was sinking well below that of France.

Cockerell felt the root of the problem was \textit{papier mâché}. Since quick, easy and inexpensive methods of moulding such as this French invention had supplanted traditional methods of carving, there had been a pronounced decline in standards\textsuperscript{1}. Concurring with this, J. B. Papworth had stated that

"our want of good designers and sufficient workmen capable of executing the several ornamental works at a moderate expense, are true causes why we get a great deal of that very old matter of furniture from abroad, which arrives in ship-loads, and which is adopted instead of new furniture much to the disadvantage of our designers and our workmen."

Papworth also pointed out, however, that the prevalence of piracy of art designs was discouraging manufacturers from seeking out quality work from well-trained artists. The lack of some sort of protective law and the general poverty of standard amongst craftsmen were together conspiring to promote the taste for the so-called Louis Quatorze:

"The absence of protection has induced manufacturers to seek a style of ornament capable of being executed with facility by workmen unpossessed of theoretical knowledge, and without practical accuracy. This style has been fostered to a great

\textsuperscript{1} House of Commons, Reports of committees (1) 1835, V, Question 1431 (28 Aug. 1835). George Smith, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 174, referred to papier mâché saying that "We now excel our inventive neighbours in the execution of (it); the English manufacture being more durable as well as more imitative of real carved work from its sharpness of edge and depth in cast. But with respect to the elegance and phantasy of design in paper decoration, the French offer patterns very far superior to all others; this may be accounted for from the great inventive faculties of some of their first rate artists."

\textsuperscript{2} Reports of committees (1) 1835, V, Question 1247 (21 Aug. 1835).
extent, and erroneously termed that of Louis XIV., but which, in fact, is the debased manner of the reign of his successor, in which grotesque varieties are substituted for classic design; and it is admitted that designers and workmen of very mediocre talents are preferred to better artists in this kind of work, for it is little amenable to the criticism of the judicious, and the workmen are usually free from the trammels of artist-like education."

Papworth expressed the hope that the newly established Institute of Architects would prove a force for the betterment of standards in art manufacturers and the design of architectural fittings. Perhaps he was not aware that the first president of that body, the Earl de Grey, was currently involved in the erection and fitting out of an entire house in the Rococo taste.

Special committees and censorious pundits have less control over developments of taste than they could wish. In spite of the critics, the Rococo suited the taste of the 1830s for the delicate and decorative. Where heavy velvets were the choice of the mid-Victorian years, light silks and muslins were the rage of the '30s. Festoon draperies labelled "Louis Quatorze" in the pattern-books of Thomas King had a natural affinity with the curves and scrolls of elaborately carved Rococo cornices and the frothy convolutions

1. Ibid., Question 1264 (21 Aug. 1835). The early style of Louis XIV he admitted had much grandeur (Questions 1267-8). Papworth rated the special facility of manufacturing the Louis Quatorze: "It is easier manufactured; it is often manufactured by putting bit and bit together of heterogeneous matter to form a new whole" (Question 1272).

2. Ibid., Question 1277.
of papier mâché chairs. Its lightness of touch made it a natural contemporary of the frilly Gothic at the Houses of Parliament. Significantly, at much the same time as the youthful A. W. N. Pugin had been employed on fussy "Gothick" furniture for Windsor Castle (1828) he had concocted designs for a room in the Louis Quatorze taste for Gillespie Graham's Murthly Castle, Perthshire. They were not executed, for which the later fire-brand of the Gothic Revival was no doubt very thankful. Charles Eastlake in the High Victorian period was to jeer at the Rococo as "flimsy and fragile" and "effeminate in form"; and it is interesting to notice that even in the late Georgian - early Victorian period there was a tendency to regard the Rococo as a style most suitable for such female domains as the boudoir and the drawing room. Conversely the greater simplicity of the English Neo-Classical or Palladian modes better equipped them for areas of general congregation. This dichotomy can be illustrated nicely with reference to the furniture designed by the architect, Philip Hardwick, the elder, in 1834 for the Goldsmiths'

1. E.g. Thomas King's Upholsterer's sketchbook of original designs for fashionable draperies, London, 1839. Also his Fashionable window cornices and hangings ... as manufactured by Messrs Haselden & Co., London, ca. 1840, which is almost entirely devoted to pelmets and mirror frames in the Rococo taste. Elsewhere, King, writing as "an upholsterer of forty-five years", stated that during those years "has occurred the entire introduction of French draperies and curtains" (The upholsterer's accelerator, London, 1833). Another pattern-book devoted to French ornament was Henry Shaw's Ornamental works in Louis XIV's style, London, 1833.


Hall and made under his supervision by W. and C. Wilkinson. All the furniture designs have survived. They indicate a dainty, much gilded Rococo as the chosen style for the drawing room to which ladies would be admitted, while solid, carved mahogany pieces in the Greek style were deemed appropriate for the Court Room and the Court Dining Room. Even at a house like Wrest Park, Beds., where French styles were employed throughout the principal apartments, the dining room verges on the Palladian while the boudoir must rank amongst the most delicate of Rococo creations with tiny cherubs gambolling amongst the rocaille of the bookshelves and hanging from niches in the ceiling. But the fact is that the days of the unified and harmonious interior were done. The foible of the Georgians to include the odd room in the Indian or Chinese taste had become by the 1830s out of hand. One could no longer expect neighbouring rooms to be in harmony - a situation to which Loudon referred snidely in 1833. While stressing that the costly gilding made the

2. On this room, referred to as "My Lady's Sitting Room", Lord de Grey, who designed the decor himself, wrote, "Though I say it as shouldn't, I think this is the very prettiest, chastest, most uncommon, most rich and yet quiet and gentle without garishness, of any room I ever saw. I don't mean to say but what a great part of its present value is attributable to the multitude and disposition of the pretty things brought there and arranged by the taste of My Lady. But still the room! The room has its merits, and I am sure no lady set foot in it without thinking that the man who invented such a jewel of a place must be 'a sweet man'." (MS History of Wrest House, April 1846, Transcript, p. 14 - original in possession of Lady Lucas of Sutton Scotney, transcript at Beds. County Record Office.) For more on Wrest Park, see below, pp 138-49. Lord Grey was the Institute's first president, just mentioned.
Louis XIV style "unsuitable for persons in moderate circumstances," he continued,

"yet, could we indulge in it, we would display (it) in one room, as we would all the other distinctive styles in so many different apartments."

Certainly it was an expensive style. George Smith noted that

"It is alike suitable to the kingly palace as it is to the mansion of the nobleman; but is no ways answerable to dwellings of persons of small fortune."

Undoubtedly none but the very rich could indulge, particularly if genuine panelling was employed; and as the century wore on the expense of antique furniture was becoming prohibitive. In 1851 the Duke of Devonshire wrote to Paxton, "The prices of the French tables are tremendous & I no longer want them." But the expense did not mean that Wyatt's ducal patrons retained the Louis Quatorze style as their very own. Aristocrats of the most impeccable pedigrees continued to favour French eighteenth-century decor for another hundred years, but from the beginning of Queen Victoria's reign they were being joined by the richer gentry and by industrialist plutocrats too. For the less affluent but still modish sector of society there developed a less lavish version of the French style, a confusion of Louis Quinze and Empire motifs. This is best distinguished by the term, "Style Louis Philippe", and corresponded to the "Biedermayer" of the less cultivated salons of Europe, and the characteristic middle-class decor of Paris which Balzac

immortalised in his *Comédie Humaine*. The Yellow Drawing Room at Grimston Park, Yorks., done in the 1840s for the 2nd Lord Howden, is a relatively good example.

Less discriminating interiors of this type would appear to be the architectural background to the aberrations of taste which swamped the furnishing section of the Great Exhibition of 1851. What seemed particularly objectionable to discerning critics about the néo-Rococo *objets d'art*, such as were seen in abundance at the exhibition and as early as the 1830s, was their unstructural nature. Essentially decorative scrolls and *rocaille* were, with the help of concealed metal frames, all too often the only visible support of any heavy item from a wheelbarrow to a grand piano. The Rococo taste offended against the Gothic Revival's demand for structural honesty.

2. See Hussey, *English country houses: late Georgian*, pp 234, 238 & pl. 449. Lord Howden subsequently took up residence in France and built for himself near Bayonne the *Château de Caradoc* in the 1860s.
3. See the "very handsome mahogany navigator's wheelbarrow" involved in the digging of the first turf for the Trent Valley Railway by Sir Robert Peel (ILN, 22 Nov. 1845, p. 327). The worst Rococo pianos at the Great Exhibition came from America. Collard and Collard of London produced some monsters, however (see Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue: The industry of all nations, 1851, London, 1851, p. 52; and The Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue: The exhibition of art industry in Dublin, Dublin, 1853, p. 50. Even the lavatories at the Crystal Palace were Rococo: Kirkwood’s *Tubular Registered Water-Closet* (no. 524) "complete in itself and trap annexed" and "extensively in use at the exhibition building since the opening" was illus. CEAJ, 9 Aug. 1851, p. 430, fig. 1. For more on the reaction to the 1851 Exhibition see below, p. 468. The *Louis Quatorze* style occupied the attention of the art world and the architectural press from time to time: A Mr Fildes addressed the Decorative Art Society Conversazione, 11 Nov. 1845, on "The style of Louis 14th" (Bldr, 22 Nov. 1845, p. 558); Bldr, 31 Mar. 1855, ran a leading article on "The Louis Quatorze style"; comparisons between the
Blasted by the critics in 1851 and succumbing also to the pendulum of taste, the Louis Quatorze declined somewhat in popularity during the High Victorian years. That it did not disappear altogether but emerged triumphant again in the fin de siècle interior will be the subject of a later chapter.

As well as for interiors the so-called Louis Quatorze style was becoming popular during the early Victorian years in a quite different field. This was the fashionable West End shop. Nathaniel Whittock's book, The shop fronts of London, published in 1840, contained, amongst a preponderance of Grecian, Gothic and even Oriental facades, two in the Louis XIV style. One was for Messrs Sangster, umbrella and stick merchants of Regent Street; the other for Saunders and Woodley, upholsterers of the same locality. Sangster's had an entablature which undulated sensuously; Saunders and Woodley's was simpler in form but richer in general appearance, with palm tree capitals of burnished gold and a cornice also bronzed and gilt:

"This front has certainly the most superb effect," wrote Whittock, "and though it is no doubt a costly erection this style of front can be executed at a much less expense than persons unacquainted with the means used to produce this splendid appearance would imagine, the ornaments being executed in compo or papier mâché; the iron-work is bought by weight; the pattern adds but little to the expense."

Sangster's was in white and bronze, tipped with gold.

Footnote continued from page 44
English and French seventeenth centuries (Bldr, 10 & 24 Feb. 1855, pp 61-2, 85-6); View of Versailles, ILN, 8 Sep. 1855.
1. N. Whittock, On the construction and decoration of the shop fronts of London, London, 1840, p. 10. Saunders and Woodley was illus. as pl. XIII.
2. Ibid., p. 7 and pl. VI.
Both shops had richly wrought Rococo iron grills in front of their plate-glass windows. The *Louis Quatorze* was acknowledged to be novel for shops at this time,

"but from its elegance and easy adaptation for the most contracted or extended fronts is likely to become fashionable. The large squares of plate glass make this shop appear very light."

Loudon had noted the first appearance of such shop-fronts when surveying the architectural progress of the year 1838. In this context he gave his approval:

"The employment in Regent Street and Bond Street of the Louis XIV style in shop fronts is one of the latest improvements ... and in combination with the immense panes of plate glass now used for shop windows, and accompanied by rich gilding on a pure white ground, it has a striking and most magnificent appearance."

The superficially decorative nature of the Rococo style was ideal for shop-fronts which characteristically were built out in front of pre-existing house facades, extended no higher than the ground floor or mezzanine, and bore no relation to the building they were part of. A view of Nash's Regent Street Quadrant as altered by Sir James Pennethorne, published in the *Illustrated London News* in 1848, showed in the left foreground a lavish shop-front which would no doubt have been labelled "*Louis Quatorze*" and which was totally at odds with the simple Georgian elevations above it. Smothered with ornament executed in plaster or some other synthetic material they were probably regarded even in their own day as fairly

---

1. Ibid.
temporary structures responding to the latest foible of fashion. Virtually none has survived to this day.

Although there are indisputably Rococo panels on the Regent Street Quadrant example referred to above, much of the decoration has a look of the sixteenth century to it, of François Premier or Henri II France. This was in fact a common combination in the 1840s and '50s. The François Premier taste was enjoying something of a revival too, beginning in the 1830s not for reasons related to the flood of aristocratic French émigrés but, like the Rococo style nonetheless, because it was seen as a system of ornamentation which satisfied the contemporary taste for fussy, ornate surfaces. Besides, it was the new fashion in Paris. One critic, calling himself "Philomusaeus", wrote in 1839 that

"one of the first things which strikes the visitor to Paris is the rapid change in style which has taken place within the last two years. The Louis Quatorze and Louis Quinze have gone to the tombs of their fathers and left scarcely a trace behind, and the restoration reigns in paramount splendour".

By "restoration" (and elsewhere "Raphael style") one deduces (at length) that the sixteenth-century Renaissance styles of France are being alluded to. A year later the same critic noted a similar trend in Britain - a trend towards the adoption of the native Renaissance style in preference to the despised Rococo. Philomusaeus

2. Article headed "Elizabethan shop front", CEAJ, Aug. 1840, p.257, remarking with pleasure the advance of the new "revival" style in England: "Already to a certain extent is this realized; the Louis Quatorze, after a long and widely extended rule, has already gone to the tomb of its predecessors, and will leave scarcely a wreck behind. Known to us only in one of its very worst forms, that of its decline during the reign of Louis the Fifteenth, it became here the most unmeaning and unintellectual mass of patching and gilding by which the public taste has ever been perverted."
perhaps hardly expected that the French sixteenth-century styles would achieve at least as much patronage in Britain in ensuing years as the Jacobethan style which he was heralding. Yet, the fact that he spoke of the François Premier Revival in France and the Elizabethan in England in such closely similar terms is not without significance, for there seems to be enough evidence to support the idea that, just as architects in Scotland were to appreciate and build upon the links which had existed in the sixteenth century between French Renaissance architecture and the native Baronial style, so also were the early Victorians to see certain links between the Renaissance styles of France and England. Their cautious adoption of the French version in the 1830s and '40s was partly spurred by a notion that, if blended with the native Renaissance, a new and original Victorian, even "national", style might evolve, that was in a sense only picking up the threads which Inigo Jones had broken and which had been very much there in certain buildings like Nonsuch and some of the Elizabethan prodigy houses. William Cecil, it was known, had called for French books when planning Burghley; Longleat had actually been built with the assistance of a French mason. Dawson Turner, back in 1820, had compared Longleat with Fontaine-Henri in Normandy and the Amboise tomb at Rouen for its medallion and scroll work. All these buildings, he deduced, had their roots in the work of Raphael.

1. John Sell Cotman and Dawson Turner, Architectural antiquities of Normandy, London, 1822, II, p. 69. Cockerell, in evidence before the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures, seemed also to link the two styles when denouncing the "spurious and bastard" one which modern terminology knew as "Elizabethan": "The French term is Renaissance", he said (House of Commons, Reports from Committees (3) 1836, IX, Questions 2244-5 (2 Aug. 1836).
Clearly the emergence of the Jacobethan Revival as seen at Harlaxton was related to the François Premier taste, and it is notable that many buildings of the 1830s and '40s which were early to use François Premier decorative motifs did so within a context which was undisguisedly Tudor or Jacobean. Lord Stuart de Rothesay's Highcliffe Castle was a striking example, while Sir Charles Barry, architect of the very Elizabethan Highclere, did also a curious little design for an unidentified house which blends a busy set of details from the Renaissances of both countries. Several architects worked in both styles, the Scot, David Bryce, achieving an interesting synthesis of the two at Panmure, not so much in the house itself (though this confounded the critics) as in the splendid hall chimney-piece which partakes both of Rosso and Primaticcio's Fontainebleau and the gravestones of Greyfriars Churchyard in Edinburgh. By the 1850s and '60s, features such as the squared or octagonal ogee domes of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England were being found to blend harmoniously into compositions which were predominantly French. In the early Victorian years, however, England was not ready to receive from France more than a handful of decorative

1. RIBAD 34/32. There are Jacobean gables and English bowed windows at each end; an entrance like Kirby Hall's but with more strapwork; and an ambiguous French-English lantern. Detailing of the parapet and the facade with its pilasters seem rather François Premier. For Barry's Dunrobin see below, pp 203-6. For Highcliffe see below pp 129-36. 2. The house seems fairly much a revival of Anglo-Scottish Renaissance features but Bryce's obituary (Archit, 13 May 1876, p. 308) said it was in his "best French style", while the squared ogee domes "tend to give the building the appearance of something of the old French chateau," said ILN, 21 Nov. 1857, p. 508. The chimney-piece is closely related to drawings of tombstones in a book of Sketches of Scotch & Old English Ornament by Bryce, held in the Bryce Collection at Washington University, St Louis, Missouri. Alistair Rowan points
motifs. Pavilion roofs and picturesque tourelles had no role to play as yet. It was the François Premier brand of superficial decoration, divorced from considerations of the Picturesque which appealed, partly for the reasons suggested above and partly just as an alternative vocabulary to that of the Louis Quatorze style. It was this sort of thing which the earnest phase of the Gothic Revival, led by Pugin, reacted against with vigour. Ironically Pugin himself in his younger days found the decorative style of François Premier architecture attractive, as he had the Louis Quatorze. Several of the old houses of northern France which constituted the subject matter of his 1836 book,*Details of antient timber houses of the 15th and 16th centuries,* present facades thickly covered with non-structural decoration – arabesques, medallions, pilasters, candelabra. In *Contrasts* (also 1836) just such a house in the rue de l'Horloge, Rouen, was compared with Sir John Soane's house in Lincoln's Inn Fields to the latter's disadvantage. This contrast was omitted.

Footnote continued from p. 49

out that the tombstones themselves were probably influenced by the designs of Serlio who was active in France; but Bryce has greatly played up the similarities with the cartouches of the Galerie François Premier at Fontainebleau when designing the chimney-piece.

1. A. W. N. Pugin, *Details of antient timber houses of the 15th and 16th centuries* selected from those existing at Rouen, Caen, Beauvais, etc., London, 1836. See especially pl. 5 (house, rue des Poêtes, Caen); pl. 12 (house near Châteaudun); pl. 13 (house at Gisors).

2. Phoebe Stanton has illustrated in "Some comments on the life and work of Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin", *RIBAJ*, Dec. 1952, p. 48, an early idea for this "contrast" – a sketchbook of 1832 contains three houses contrasted, dating from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and from 1832. The early examples are French Gothic and François Premier; the 1832 one is a case of a house with a mansard roof, a survival of the Georgian tradition rather than a revival. It, of course, was the example to be despised.
however, from the second edition, published 1841. By 1843 and the
Apology his stance had shifted: the elaborate François Premier gate-
way to the Château de Gaillon and the west front of the church of
Gisors were included as "examples of the introduction of pagan details
with the antient masses in the 16th cent." Yet there was still a
note of tolerance:

"Although the builders of the so-called Renaissance opened the
flood-gates of innovation, they had not lost natural composition;
they only decorated what they required in an inconsistent
manner." 2

The implication was, of course, that later architects had gone on to
decorate what they did not require.

The Arc de Gaillon had attracted attention because of its
removal, on demolition of the chateau itself, to the forecourt of
the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris during the rearrangement of that
institution by Felix Duban in 1832. Philbert Delorme's frontispiece

1. Drawings by Pugin of the church at Gisors are held by RIBAD (Y8/
27 (1-2)); also in the RIBAD Pugin sketchbook 105 (France I, 1837),
f. 47 along with a few other sketches of early French Renaissance
secular work. See also sketchbook 106 (France II, ca. 1847) for
sketches of French secular subject matter of a more picturesque
chateau type. Phoebe Stanton claims that the 1837 trip to France
produced also sketches of such decorative François Premier subjects
as the Tomb of the Cardinal d'Amboise, Rouen Cathedral, the organ
case at Evreux, and the church of St Pierre, Caen (Stanton, Pugin,
p. 29) and that these are held at RIBAD - not, however, found by
me. On his use of a chateau-like style at St Marie's Grange, see
below, pp 136-8.

2. A. W. N. Pugin, An apology for the revival of Christian archi-
("Cisors") and Gaillon, see pl. 2.

3. It was illus. in its new position in Paris in Bldr, 1 Dec. 1849,
p. 570; also as in Paris, divorced from the original chateau,
but with a posse of sixteenth-century horsement debouching from
it in William James Müller's Sketches of the age of Francis 1st,
to the Château of Anet suffered a similar fate but significantly, being a more vigorously plastic and structural piece of architecture, it was ignored during these years of concern for the purely decorative. On the other hand, another sixteenth-century edifice to be removed in part to Paris for reconstruction enjoyed a considerable popularity. This was a villa from Moret, the decorative court front of which was incorporated in 1825 as the main facade of what was to be known as the "Maison de François Premier" by L.-M.-D. Biet, a pupil of Percier. It was situated in the Cours-la-Reine, off the Champs Elysées. Its formula of triple-arched ground floor, mullioned upper windows and a quantity of medallions, arabesqued panels and candelabra-columns was more directly copied when this sort of architecture enjoyed another vogue in the 1880s; but to the 1830s and '40s it was just another example (a readily accessible one) of this busy, ornamental style. It proved popular with sketchers. More so was the extraordinary Hôtel de Bourgtheroulde in Rouen. This was in fact the most frequently discussed and illustrated of all French Renaissance buildings during the 1820s and '30s. John Sell Cotman and John Britton (with the elder Pugin) included pictures of it in their early post-Waterloo books on Norman antiquities.


There was a rough sketch of it, complete with Joan of Arc being led off to the stake, in John Coney's *Engravings of ancient cathedrals, etc.* and a rather better picture by Charles Wild, the only example of French secular architecture in a collection devoted to the architecture of Belgium, Germany and France. It was called there a "splendid mansion". Full descriptions were given by the itinerants, Dawson Turner and the Reverend T. F. Dibdin, both choosing to illustrate and extol details of the house's pièce de résistance, a remarkable set of bas-relief sculptures representing the meeting of Henry VIII and Francis I at the Field of the Cloth of Gold. Virtually the whole house is in fact coated in busy, deep-cut sculpture prophetic of Victorian taste. It was the less figurative arabesque and medallion work which appealed in the first

---

1. J. Coney, *Engravings of ancient cathedrals, hôtels de ville and other public buildings of celebrity in France, Holland, Germany and Italy*, London, 1832. The Rouen Palais de Justice is the only other example of French secular architecture.

2. C. Wild, *Twelve etched outlines selected from the architectural sketches made in Belgium and France, Second series*, London, 1836, pl. 5. The first series ("... made in Belgium, Germany and France") had appeared in 1833. The two were combined and reprinted as a consecutive series under the new title, *Select examples of architectural grandeur in Belgium, Germany and France: a series of twenty-four sketches drawn on the spot*, London, 1838; reprinted 1843. Here Bourgtheroulde appears as pl. 17.


instance to late Georgian and early Victorian imitators, however, and also the depressed or elliptical arches of the Cloth of Gold range. These, Coney's drawing inaccurately converted into pointed, four-centred arches as in English Perpendicular Gothic which was enjoying much popularity in the years before Puginian proselytism promoted Middle-Pointed. But others did not hesitate to draw them as they were, along with the round-angled window and door openings with which they were so often associated in the early sixteenth-century architecture of France. Nor did architects hesitate to adopt these motifs in British buildings from the 1830s shop window onwards. Indeed they remained amongst the most consistent French-derived features of British architecture throughout the rest of the century, often quite in isolation from any other French motifs. The elliptical arch provided an ideal frame for the large plate-glass windows popular in West End boutiques. It also provided an ideal framework for decorative covers and title-pages to books, particularly on architectural subject matter: Hitchcock has suggested that the decorative and ephemeral nature of shop facade architecture in these years found its closest links with book design and furniture.

Again in the early work of A. W. N. Pugin illustrations of this point are to be found. The elliptical arch or round-angled opening he employed frequently in furniture designs and in interior decoration, as in a chimney-piece at Scarisbrick. The title-pages of

---

1. Joined for this purpose in the 1870s and '80s by the big, semi-circular arch also found in Francois Premier buildings (see below, p 338).
2. Hitchcock, EVA, p. 396. Hitchcock gives a good account of early Victorian shop architecture here, to which I am considerably indebted.
3. Illus. in Stanton, Pugin, pl. 8; and in Girouard, VCH, pl. 75. Original drawing at RIBAD (Pugin catalogue (64) Scarisbrick, 23 & figs 53–4).
such early books as *Contrasts* and *Antient timber houses* display also this device with other motifs of almost Plateresque ornateness. Another book, published in 1841, which was important to the revival of the *Francois Premier* style in Britain (and to the Loire style as well) and which employed the depressed arch as a frame to its title-page was the Bristol painter William James Müller's *Sketches of the age of Francis I*. Here a view of the ramparts of Chambord is seen through a realistic arch of this shape.  

The elliptical arch was not the only contribution of the *Francois Premier* style to the typical shop front of the early Victorian period. One unusual case, the shop and house of Mr Fair, Princes Street, Hanover Square, was almost entirely in a bastard version of this early sixteenth-century type. Unlike most other shop fronts there was a homogeneous facade from ground level to roof, albeit sandwiched between quite alien buildings in typical British way. There is the depressed arch at street level (or more accurately a segment-headed arch here), arabesque-adorned pilasters, and segmental pediment at the top flanked by medallions. Spanning the upper two floors like some giant order is (capriciously) a pair of outsized panels with circle motif in the centre (bearing medallion portraits of the queen and the prince consort it appears). This motif (minus the portraits), though used in Italian Renaissance

---

1. Along with the villa at Moret and the Arc de Gaillon already mentioned, this book included (with, also, views of various Loire chateaux) an illus. of the Amboise tomb at Rouen (pl. 20).
2. Illus. Bldr, 15 Apr. 1843, p. 118. See also Hitchcock, EVA, pl. XII.22.
architecture, was best known to nineteenth-century Britain (along with the even more common panels with diamond or lozenge shapes in the centre) as adornments to the prodigious chimney stacks at

Chambord. Müller's title-page provided probably the best illustration of these chimneys available to the Victorians until French publications of the 1860s supplied the growing need for meticulously detailed drawings of the Loire chateaux.

Along with all this François Premier detailing, Mr. Fair's house displayed motifs from another century. The urns, incredible emblem, and obelisks on the skyline suggest the era of Versailles; so do the corbelled heads with trailing garlands beneath the cornice; so do the iron balcony grills. The one at first floor level is virtually identical to that in front of L. T. Piver's perfumery and glove shop at No. 160 Regent Street, which appeared in the Illustrated London News about the same time. Both grills, no doubt, had their origin in some eighteenth-century pattern-book of metal work designs. The circle panels seen at Fair's shop flank also the large windows of Piver's, with their rounded angles. The rest

---

1. Claimed to be by "a distinguished French architect" but executed under the superintendence of M. Cambon, "the celebrated Parisian decorator". It was illus. ILN, 22 Aug. 1846, p. 128; reproduced in Hitchcock, EVA, pl. XII.26. Another slightly ambiguous shop (though rather more definitely sixteenth-century in feeling) was a perfumery in Piccadilly (Bldr, 12 Apr. 1851, p. 227; Hitchcock, EVA, pl. XII.24) heralded as "one of the first of a class" and therefore as "noticeable and praiseworthy". Its precursors were recognised to be in Regent Street, no doubt those already discussed, or similar. Even George Smith's illus. of "Interior decoration, age of Louis XIV" (Op. cit., pl. CLII) seems a trifle confused, giving as it does prominence to panels decorated with the rather sixteenth-century circle device.
of the detail has a sixteenth-century look, though the shop was described as being "in the style of the age of Louis XIV". As has been mentioned, the shop in Regent Street Quadrant, too, combined Rococo panels at its street corner with French sixteenth-century detailing. It was, it seems, quite acceptable to combine motifs from the two periods. They served the same purpose of supplying a veil of decorative motifs easily mocked up in compo or papier mâché; neither had anything to do with the basic structure. One is even led to suspect that in these early days architects were none too clear on the differences between these widely divergent modes. Certainly Loudon considered it unimportant to differentiate much between the Louis Quatorze and the François Premier styles when discussing chimney-pieces in his Encyclopaedia. Having described a "Louis XIV" one by Mr Lamb (Edward Buckton Lamb?) he added that some hundreds of marble chimney pieces in this style and in that of Francis I had lately been imported by Nixon's of Great Portland Street and that the latter differed chiefly from the Louis Quatorze "in giving greater elevation to the chimney openings". In an engraving of a François Premier house at Tours, published in The Builder in 1847, the tight sixteenth-century arabesque work has been treated like the loose scrolls and floral twirls of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Mr Fair, it seems, was a house decorator and his house has the air of having been designed by a decorator more used to

1. Encyclopaedia, p. 1035.
2. Builder, 4 Sep. 1847, pp 422-3.
working indoors in the Rococo style. On the other hand, it is not very different from a number of contemporary buildings in Paris which were illustrated in Victor Calliat's Parallèle des maisons de Paris, the first volume of which came out in 1850. Unlike the Louis Quatorze shops praised by Loudon, Fair's was not much liked: the critics railed against "this species of cheap picture- or model-making, this experimenting in style and ornament", and took consolation only in the fact of its having been perpetrated in materials no more permanent than cement and compo. Times were changing. Pugin's disapproval of unstructural ornament was being felt.

Despite its odd hint of the Louis Quatorze style, Fair's shop was predominantly François Premier in inspiration. As the 1840s gave way to the 1850s this latter style was to become the commoner of the two, though ambiguous amalgamations of them continued throughout the decade. Most eighteenth-century in flavour were John Shaw's offices for the London and Provincial Law Life Assurance Company at 21 Fleet Street (ca. 1855). Though described as "Italian of the Palladian school" this building was in a brand of Classicism received very definitely by way of France. Built well back on a narrow site, it was squeezed up ridiculously high between its stunted neighbours,

1. Victor Calliat, Parallèle des maisons de Paris construites depuis 1830 jusqu'à nos jours, Paris, 1850-64. Volume II (1864) has subtitle "... construites depuis 1850". Vol. I, pl. 55, shows a house in rue des Saussaies by Alphonse Lejeune which is very like Fair's in feeling. Cf. also the bizarre "Maison de ville, style renaissance, pour deux artistes, peintre et sculpteur", MDA, III, 1848?, pl. 30.
but gained some extra width by the extension of its facade onto the return flanks of the party walls. There were four floors plus attic, only three bays wide; the central bay in each case carried Rococo iron-work balconies in front and were flanked by columns or pilasters in correct Palladian sequence. The lateral bays of the second floor have oval, wreath-covered windows. Oeil-de-boeuf dormers punctuate the mansard roof. Yet François Premier France was not entirely forgotten: there are small horizontal panels with the circle motif beneath the central windows of the first and third floors\(^1\). Rather similar were the premises of Messrs Attenborough, the jewelers, also in Fleet Street, on the corner of Bell Yard (ca. 1858). These were by Frederick Herring. While employing devices drawn as much from the sixteenth century as from later centuries the feeling achieved is of a rather elegant \textit{dix-huitième} type\(^2\). Horace Jones also contrived a \textit{dix-huitième} effect, but with more vigorous detailing, in the Sovereign Life Assurance Office, St James's Street, Piccadilly (1856–7)\(^3\). Other work by Jones appears

\textbf{14B}  
\textit{Bldr}, 6 Oct. 1855, pp 474-5. This obviously French exercise is significant in relation to the too often ignored Frenchness of the same architect's Wellington College, a much vaunted proto-Queen Anne edifice. See below, p. 324. The Fleet Street offices have in more recent years been called Universe House.

\textbf{23A}  
\textit{EN}, 8 Jan. 1858, p. 38. There is an off-centre, elliptical-arched carriage entrance. Giant-order pilasters with circle motif span the two upper floors. There is a mansard roof with round-headed dormers, the rest of the windows being segment-headed, except for the round-angled shop windows. Between the windows of the first floor is a blank panel with Rococo frame. The first floor is banded in the French way. No string course separates second and third floors. Attenborough's got further French treatment in the 1880s (see below, p. 376n ).

\textbf{3}  
\textit{Bldr}, 18 Apr. 1857, pp 218-9. Oval windows surrounded by \textit{rocaille}; round-angled windows; Rococo balcony rails, etc.
to have been of a similar type\(^1\) as was that of John Belcher, the older, his Royal Insurance Company offices in Lombard Street (ca. 1856) being an example\(^2\).

The label *Louis Quatorze* it will be noted was dropping out of fashion by this stage. Everything of a continental seventeenth- or eighteenth-century nature was subsumed under the term "Italian". This shift in terminology was indicative of the fact that by the late 1850s the interest in the eighteenth century was waning. Decorative buildings were more prepared to be frank about their sixteenth-century origins. The facade of some offices by Herbert Williams on the corner of Billiter and Fenchurch Streets (ca. 1858) owed little to the age of Louis XIV but carved itself up into a network of the ubiquitous diamond- and circle-patterned panels\(^3\). Descriptions of the Colonial Insurance Company, Lombard Street, by Edward I'Anson and the premises of Munt Browne and Company, Wood Street, Cheapside, by Somers Clarke\(^5\) suggest very similar buildings. Most highly publicized amongst buildings of this type, and looking rather early Victorian despite its date, was the Inns of Court Hotel, begun in 1864, by Lockwood and Mawson. For a mid-century hotel it was unusual, being much more like these earlier office blocks than the ebullient

\(^1\) E.g. Telegraph Office, Threadneedle Street, described *CEAJ*, Jun. 1859, p. 181; *EN*, 14 July. 1871, p. 24.

\(^2\) *Bldr*, 6 Jun. 1857, p. 319; *ILN*, 23 Dec. 1865, pp 603-4. There is a high mansard with dormer windows surmounting a combination of circle panels, garlanded *œil-de-boeuf* windows, etc.

\(^3\) *EN*, 11 Jun. 1858, p. 501.


hotels of which it was a contemporary. Nonetheless it was received with some praise. One journal called it "one of the handsomest buildings that London can boast of"; another felt it a pity Lockwood had not chosen for his Courts of Justice design a Classic style "such as he has displayed with so much nerve and originality at his new Inns of Court Hotel". For the sort of thing it was it did have a bit more "nerve" than, say, the offices mentioned above in Fenchurch Street by Williams, but originality only a little. They were of a family. Lockwood's facade was just busier, and its French roof higher. But there was also a wider range of sixteenth-century motifs employed. With quantities of the usual circle-motif panels and medallions there were niches taken perhaps from Chambord, while the parapet was punctuated by curious pedimented pinnacles which also suggested Chambord. There was a frieze of fat swags and (despite the new interest in Chambord) a row of dormers of the oeil-de-boeuf variety. The use of fenestration suggestive of the Florentine Renaissance caused the whole building, however, to be described at the time as "Italian".

1. 
2. 
3. It was curiously situated with two important facades, one to Holborn, the other to Lincoln's Inn Fields, and consisted of two distinct blocks separated by Whetstone Lane but joined by under-and over-passes. It began with a great flurry in 1864, expecting to be much patronised by the legal profession and also to supply more central accommodation than the many hotels which had arisen in association with the railway termini; but activity languished owing to financial difficulties, and the part facing Lincoln's Inn remained unfinished between 1866 and 1873 when building was resumed by a new company. For this final stage see Bldr, 30 Mar. 1872, p. 250; 27 Dec. 1873, p. 1022; EN, 19 Dec. 1873, p. 694. Work had begun in
It will be observed that these examples of the decorative approach to the French Renaissance in the late 1850s and the '60s (particularly the Inns of Court Hotel) were beginning to look more towards the Loire chateaux for the source of the motifs they used than to the houses of Normandy. As early as 1847 the prominent decorator, John Gregory Crace, had given an account to the Institute of Architects of the palaces of Blois and Chambord, albeit with special stress on their decorative potential. These chateaux continued throughout the century to augment the range of motifs derived from small-scale urban *François Premier* architecture as a popular method of treating an office or shop facade on a restricted city site. At the same time it would seem that the appearance of the Loire-chateau motifs in the late '50s was part of a growing interest generally at that time in the chateaux of the Loire, an interest which was to lead ultimately to the concern around 1870 in both urban and country-house architecture for these buildings as an inspiration for picturesque composition. Nonetheless they remained inspirations for decorative facades also, throughout the rest of the century. The difference between the early and the late Victorian examples lay in the growth of archaeological accuracy as a result of proliferating literature, the widening range of motifs used, and the tendency to

Footnote continued from p. 61
include if at all possible some touch of the Picturesque, particularly if a corner site were available. The Inns of Court Hotel, therefore, stands mid-way between the two approaches—seeming old-fashioned for its date, with its flat-surfaced block facade, yet looking forward also in its choice of motifs to the François Premier buildings which were to vie with the Queen Anne vogue in the 1880s for pre-eminence in Mayfair.

There was one building in the early Victorian period, however, which displayed a much greater concern for archaeology than was usual, possessing indeed an assurance and sophistication which set it apart from the rest. Yet it presented to the street a facade of sixteenth-century French detailing which was in no way more structural than in the cases mentioned; and with its limited interest in effects of skyline it must be seen as part of the group being discussed.

Built 1848-51, this was the house in Piccadilly of Henry Thomas Hope of the Deepdene, son of the famous collector, Thomas Hope, denouncer of the Rococo taste. The architect was the Parisian, Pierre-Charles Dusillion. Actual execution was supervised by Thomas Leverton Donaldson. Dusillion had been responsible back in 1835

1. It later became the Junior Athenaeum Club and was demolished 1935. It was illus. and described in Bldr, 20 Oct. 1849, pp 493-4, 498-9 (general view and detail of railing); Bldr, 10 Nov. 1849 (chimney-piece with diamond-panelled surround). It was discussed at length in XX, 15 Feb. 1856, p. 77, and CEAJ, Aug. 1856, p. 275. See also Bldr, 7 Oct. 1843; 1 Dec. 1849, p. 572; 29 Jly. 1854, p. 406. I am indebted also to Hitchcock, SVA, pp 208-10, and to his "Second Empire 'avant la lettre'", GBA, XIII, Sep. 1953, pp 115-130.

2. Though, as Hitchcock says (SVA, p. 210), there is no reason to suppose that Donaldson was responsible for anything beyond seeing to the carrying out of Dusillion's plans (unless it be the very British portico), he was himself interested in French architecture and a corresponding member of the French Institute of Architects.

(footnote continued next page)
for a decorative house at No. 14 rue Vanneau, Paris, which Hitchcock suggests was the first in France to employ a high roof and an elaborate set of historical details in conscious emulation of sixteenth-century models\(^1\). There the inspiration had been from an admixture of the decorative Francois Premier type of architecture (elliptical arches and the general block-like nature of the building) with Loire-chateau motifs, notably diamond and circle panels, but also dormer windows of a distinctly Transitional Renaissance type. Though the basic approach is the same at the Hope house and certain motifs echo the Parisian example, the treatment is less fussy - more confidently elegant - and Dusillion seems to have looked for inspiration to the mid-sixteenth century, the period of Henri II, as much as to that of Francis I. This is chiefly suggested by the use of broad segmental pediments (containing cherubs and looking rather like those on Lescot's Louvre) which surmount the ground-floor windows. As with the buildings of Francois Premier type already mentioned, the feature which most struck the critics was the abandonment of the Palladian use of columns and pilasters: instead the windows were separated by vertical panels with inserted decoration in coloured marble. But the overall feeling is strongly Classical if somewhat capricious in the French way. The principal cornice, with

Footnote continued from p. 63
He contributed a series of articles to The Builder in 1848 on French building materials and the buildings themselves, expressing particular approval of early sixteenth-century Renaissance work, including a small house in Caen illus. by Cotman and Turner (Op. cit., II, p. 70): see Bldr, 5 Feb. 1848, p. 64. See also below, pp 1. See Hitchcock, ANTO, pp 80, 92. The house was illus. MDA, LII, Mar. 1859, pl. 622.
its unusual use of pendant brackets, came, it was noted, not at the top of the elevation but above the first floor, giving the second floor something of the appearance of an attic storey (again as Lescot had done) yet with the Classical balustrade and urns above it and the actual attic dormers higher still emerging from the mansard roof. The whole building was capped by massive composite chimneys, equipped with mini pediments in the French way - a feature shortly to be made popular by their use at the New Louvre. Here they were much disliked. The Builder found them an "oppressive pile" which "much injured" the effect of the exterior. The critics also disapproved of the French casement windows on the first and second floors. Casements were a feature which never really caught on in nineteenth-century Britain. In so far as they were used at all they were dubbed by Sir Edmund Beckett "a relapse into barbarism." An earlier critic claimed the two-pane system obscured the view. Sir Gilbert Scott did his best to promote the casement but despairingly conceded that the sash window

"has been registered with Magna Charta, Habeas Corpus, and Trial by Jury as the Englishman's birthright, and it seems hopeless to dream of his relinquishing his privilege."

3. EN, 15 Feb. 1856, p. 77. The Palladian three-light window with widest opening in the centre could not be bettered.
Quite apart from the quibbles about chimneys and windows the reception of the Hope house was mixed. It could not be overlooked, however. The Builder review was generally favourable but The Building News found it "so strikingly remarkable that it seems to challenge criticism with an air of contemptuous defiance". The detailing was "more finical than dignified" and the whole front too "extravagantly bedizened out with Monsieur Dusillion's Frenchified finery". Most of all, the employment of French workmen and the importation of French-made fittings was considered quite unwarranted. That this had been done could suggest either a legacy of the late Georgian years or perhaps the influence of Henry Cole of Great Exhibition fame who frequently expounded on the superior quality of French art manufactures. When the house in Piccadilly was conceived Cole was one of the most influential members of the Society of Arts, of which body Hope was the Vice-President. But Hope was himself also a founding member of the Art Union and had, furthermore, sat on the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures of 1835-6 which had heard the evidence of so many artistic authorities reiterating the message that French manufactures and designs were so much better. Hope was a typical cultivated man of his day with wide artistic connections amongst his acquaintance and his own family. His house is an indication of the extent to which the connoisseur of Classical sympathies was continuing into the mid-century.

1. BN, 15 Feb. 1856, p. 77.
2. Bldr, 20 Oct. 1849, p. 493. The greater part of the ornamental work, including the wainscot doors, stone carving, mahogany casements, and iron railings, was made in France.
to look to France. Following as it did the old-age utterances of his father on the prospects of eclecticism and the merits of the sixteenth-century Renaissance styles of Europe in particular, the Hope house looks like something of a manifesto. As we have seen it was not the first building to look to French sixteenth-century architecture; but it was the first to do so with a combination of scholarship and assured originality. It was also the first to grant the style the honour of execution in durable stone. Built by a Parisian architect it was an echo of the better architecture currently advancing in Paris. In this it was prophetic of things to come. The next decade was to be obsessed with the building activities of Paris.
CHAPTER THREE: The influence of Paris in the 1850s and '60s

"I want to be a second Augustus, because Augustus ... made Rome a city of marble," wrote the future Napoleon III from prison in 1842. He lived to see his ambition fairly well fulfilled. By the fall of the Second Empire in 1870, medieval Paris had been transformed under his aegis, and with the help of his minister, Baron Georges Haussmann, if not into a "city of marble," at least into the city of broad squares and boulevards, carefully calculated vistas, and street architecture with a degree of harmony which can still be appreciated today and which was to have world-wide repercussions in the years up to 1914.

In Britain, a number of factors (chief amongst which was the existence of a more democratic regime) prevented a comparable exercise in town planning from taking place. Suggestions were made but always ignored. The buildings of Paris had their impact, however, both the unpretentious houses of the boulevards and the grander erections of the state.

Building in Paris was very active even before the inauguration of the Second Empire. During the 1840s, the newly founded British journal, The Builder, accorded the progress of the neighbouring capital attention which no other received. Between 1837 and 1857 there were two Parisian enterprises which eclipsed all else. These were the extensions to the Hôtel de Ville and the joining of the

palaces of the Louvre and the Tuileries. The eyes of Europe were upon them; their influence upon world architecture was immense. These works represented the high point of the revival by the French of the architecture of their national Renaissance. In each case the choice of the style was dictated by pre-existing buildings.

By the nineteenth century the Hôtel de Ville was too small. Built during the reign of Francis I (from 1533) by Domenico da Cortona (Il Boccador), it was a symmetrical little building of two steep-roofed pavilions flanking a lower central range which was surmounted by a tall lantern. Public thoroughfares passed through huge arches in the terminal pavilions. The ground floor of the main elevation is articulated by round-headed arches separated by columns; above this, small statue niches divide the windows. The roofs were steep hips or wedges. The extensions were executed by E.-H. Godde and J.-B. Lesueur, 1837-49. The new building was meticulously illustrated in a publication by Calliat and Le Roux de Lincy, which no doubt proved of great use to British architects. To the main front an extra pavilion was added at each end joined to the old building by lower sections decorated in harmony with the original. The building was also extended back so that a huge rectangle containing courtyards was achieved. Though taking its note from the old work, the new (particularly the front elevation) avoided the irregularities and vagaries of detail with which

Boccador had enlivened his facade. Most significant novelty was
the use on the new pavilions of oblong-shaped pavilion mansards.

The history of the twin palaces of the Louvre and the Tuileries
is more complex, for both buildings were the result of evolution
over a period of centuries. Philibert Delorme's and Jean Bullant's
uncompleted work at the Tuileries for Catherine de Medici and the
later work of Jacques du Cerceau II were substantially destroyed
or altered by Le Vau's remodelling under Louis XIV but were
recorded in various pattern books. The Louvre's protracted
development in similarly diverse styles had been at the hands of the
architects, Lescot, Lemercier and Perrault. Under Louis XIV schemes
by several architects, including the Italian, Bernini, had been
drawn up for the Cour Carré before Perrault's designs were executed.
Under Napoleon I Percier and Fontaine added one small pavilion to
the west of the Louvre and a wing stretching eastwards from the

1. For these see Du Cerceau, Op. cit., II; Jean Marot, Architecture
française (Le Grand Marot), Paris, ca. 1670.
2. These are all in Le Grand Marot, reprinted by Mariette, L'Archite-
tecture française, IV, 1738; Blondel, Architecture française, Paris,
1752-5, IV. Parts of the two palaces were also illus. in: J.N.L.
Durand, Recueil et parallèle des édifices de tous genres anciens et
modernes, Paris, 1800, pl. 63; J. G. Legrand and C. P. Landon,
Description de Paris et de ses édifices, Strasbourg, 1808; Le Comte
de Clarac, Musée de sculpture antique et moderne, ou Description
historique et graphique du Louvre, Paris, 1826-8 (reissued part as
Description historique et graphique du Louvre et des Tuileries, with
modifications by Victor Texier, Paris, 1853). The two palaces
appeared also in travel books by Englishmen, e.g. A. C. Pugin, Paris
and its environs, I, pp 7, 33 & II, p. 103; George N. Wright and
Thomas Allom, France illustrated, London, 1843-7, II, p. 10 &
IV, p. 45.
Tuileries to balance some earlier work of the time of Henri IV. It was all very complicated and the Tuileries in particular must have been an extraordinary jumble of heterogeneous styles.

Plans to join the two palaces into one huge complex were contemplated and abandoned over the centuries, but it fell finally to Napoleon III to fulfil the ambitions of his predecessors. Having, like Napoleon I, crowned himself emperor in 1852, to the great interest of all Europe, he set about to achieve by peaceful means the glory which his uncle had achieved by war. Building activities at the palaces began at once. The chosen architect was L.-T.-J. Visconti, but following his death from an apoplexy in a hackney carriage in 1853, only months after construction had begun, the work was brought to its conclusion in 1857 by H.-M. Lefuel. "All Europe weeps," orated Professor Donaldson to the assembled members of the Institute of British Architects, for M. Visconti, architect of the building which "bids fair to be the finest sovereign residence in the world". But he took the opportunity to declare that

"At the same time it must be confessed that the conceptions of other architects, as Percier and Fontaine and more recently of M. Dusillion, had considerably assisted him in the solution."

Two months later he gave another puff to his quondam collaborator on the Hope house in Piccadilly:

"My friend Mons. Dusillion exhibited a design in 1849, the leading features of which are similar to Mons. Visconti's."

Of Dusillion's scheme we know little, but what seems clear is that Dusillion, like Visconti, drew for his inspiration justifiably upon the pre-existing buildings of the Tuileries and the Louvre in an attempt at a greater harmony than had been achieved in either palace hitherto. That they both owed something to Percier and Fontaine and to the palaces' earlier architects was inevitable.

Though Lefuel much enriched the details of Visconti's design, the latter left thorough drawings covering the basic composition of the complex, which were adhered to. The whole was a synthesis of motifs, ornamental and compositional, drawn from the existing palaces. But the choice of these motifs is so boldly eclectic and the treatment so extravagant, with a Baroque vigour and plasticity which is essentially of the nineteenth century, that the building cannot really be regarded as an attempt to revive the architectural styles of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century France so much as a set of frankly nineteenth-century variations on a Renaissance theme. Indeed, the same could be said for much of British endeavour in this vein in the 1850s and '60s as well. The most distinctive and most influential feature of the New Louvre was the repeated use of pavilions arranged symmetrically in threes on the 'a-b-a' pattern, each capped by a separate and quintessentially French roof. The central pavilions had roofs which are variously described as curb roofs, squared or quadrangular domes, or convex-sided pyramids. These were directly inspired on the one hand by Lemercier's Pavillon de l'Horloge (ca. 1641), most striking feature of the old Louvre, and on the other by the similar one by Le Vau (1665) which replaced
Delorme's rounded dome at the heart of the Tuileries. Visconti's flanking or terminal pavilions have, by contrast, roofs in the shape of truncated pyramids - richly decorated at the top and ridges like the central pavilion, studded with tiny lucarnes, and equipped with dormer windows of a quite fantastic lushness, the work of Lefuel. Again, the truncated pyramid was an obvious choice for its sources too were to be found in both palaces. The original was the Pavillon de Flore at the south-west corner of the Tuileries. This, as erected probably by Jacques du Cerceau, the younger, was actually surmounted (according to the views of it in The Grand Marot and Mariette) by a pavilion mansard, that is to say by a pyramidal roof with double slope, but Le Vau's alterations seem to have left it with a flat top. In any case the upper slope on a mansarded pavilion would hardly be visible from below; and if the break in the slope was decorated by iron cresting (as it almost always would have been in Britain in the 1850s and '60s) then it would have been virtually indistinguishable from a simple truncated pyramid. Le Vau duplicated the flat-topped pyramid roof of the Pavillon de Flore in the Pavillon de Marsan, his addition to the northern extremity of the Tuileries. Another such pavilion was also added during the

1. The squared dome seems to have made its first appearance ca. 1568 in the Château of Verneuil by Jacques du Cerceau, the elder (illus. in Du Cerceau, Op. cit.); repeated 1612 by Salomon de Brosse at Éléancourt. In these early cases the squared domes are less integrated into the rest of the design than in the Tuileries-Louvre examples but perch somewhat ridiculously above the surrounding buildings.

2. In the 1860s Lefuel remodelled the Pavillon de Flore, maintaining the basic form and truncated pyramid roof, but stepping up the decoration to the lavish extremes of the New Louvre (illus. ILN, 2 Feb. 1867, p. 120). After the destruction of the Tuileries in 1871 he did the same to the Pavillon de Marsan (illus. Elfr., 19 July. 1879, p. 804).
reign of Louis XIV to the Louvre, and this was incorporated into Visconti's scheme as one of the three pavilions of his southern range. The Victorians, incidently, would most certainly have failed to differentiate their terminology for these different roof types, with their customary laxity. All would have been "pavilion roofs" or simply "mansards".¹

Not only the roofs were derived from the pre-existing Louvre and Tuileries. The elevations of pavilions and corps de logis were complex amalgams of the historic motifs near at hand too. The corps de logis of the two main Visconti ranges owed most to Percier and Fontaine for their fenestration (with a pedigree back via Bernini to Rome) and perhaps also for the open arcading at ground level which recalled the nearby rue de Rivoli. But the detailing of this loggia with attached half-columns between the arches suggests also the ground floor of the Lescot wing of the Louvre where windows are set into blind arches and separated by half-columns. The Lescot wing, (begun 1546 at the very end of the reign of Francis I) is the oldest surviving part of the Louvre. Its richness of detail supplied further plunder for the architects of the New Louvre and ultimately for British architects, though this was not so much

¹. The pavilion mansard and truncated pyramid were not very common in late sixteenth and seventeenth-century architecture. More often steep hipped or wedge-shaped roofs such as existed on the original Hôtel de Ville were used and these looked identical to a truncated pyramid when viewed at right-angles to the roof ridge. The pyramidal roofs would have evolved out of these high hips in cases where a corner site required a long axis pavilion roof for both facades. Also, the pyramid type offered more space if accommodation or storage were considerations - this being the case in the nineteenth century more than hitherto, they became more popular than the wedge type.
the case until after 1870. Very obvious are the round windows draped with languorous nymphs which Lescot used in the middle of his pavilions on the ground floor, but which Lefuel applied in pairs to his pavilions. The small, rectangular top windows of the New Louvre pavilions are, like those of the old, flanked by arrangements of trophies and suits of armour. The enrichment of the pavilions with paired columns hints also at Lescot, though on the new building the treatment is richly plastic and Baroque, the columns supporting their own cornices which break forward over them, these in turn supporting capricious and sensuously curling brackets which link the advancing cornices with the wall plane above. The exact source for this is the drum of the dome on the second church of the Invalides by J.-H. Mansart (1692 - 1704). The pavilion corners are banded in the ubiquitous French Classical way. Dormer windows are eschewed except for the lavish examples upon the pavilions. Instead, military emblems suggesting the designs of Delafosse adorn a balustrade along the \textit{corps de logis} \(^1\), while broad, composite chimneys, decked with their own pediments and cornices give movement to the skyline. There is to the whole conception a rich plasticity, a deliberate playing with light and shade, which is wholly of the nineteenth century and which looks forward to the even more extreme Baroque of Charles Garnier's Opera and the taste of the turn of the century\(^2\).


\(^{2}\) Lefuel's work at the Louvre and his later interiors of the Tuileries in the \textit{Louis Seize} style appeared in his \textit{Palais du Louvre},
The complete building operations were watched in Britain with rapt attention. The old buildings had been available in the pattern books of Du Cerceau, Marot and others. The architectural press of the 1850s made sure the new ones should likewise be known. Plans, models and bird's eye views of the total complex as well as details (particularly of the Pavillon Richelieu with its squared dome) appeared regularly along with histories of the site and commentaries on the work in progress. Though the Illustrated London News declared sourly of the completed Louvre that "the effect to the eye is not commensurate with the vast sums that have been expended during three
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et des Tuileries: motifs de décoration, Paris, 1865-75. The late appearance of this publication may partly explain the popularity in the 1880s of a more Baroque treatment of the Louvre formula than it received as a rule in the 1850s and '60s (see below, pp 400, 447). For Visconti's work see L. T. J. Visconti, Description du modèle à l'échelle des 5 millimètres par mètre représentant l'achèvement du Louvre, Paris, 1853.

1. See Bldr, 10 Jly. 1852, p. 443 (plan); 11 Mar. 1854, pp 129-31 (model); 18 Mar. 1854, pp 137-40; 17 Feb. 1855, p. 76; 5 Jan. 1856, p. 7; 17 May 1856, p. 275 (view); 11 Apr. 1857, p. 207 (Pavillon Richelieu); 15 May 1858, pp 337-8; 7 Jan. 1860, pp 11-2; 14 Jan. 1860, pp 21-3; ILN, 5 Feb. 1853, p. 111; 24 Dec. 1853; 8 Mar. 1856, pp 243-4; 22 Aug. 1857, pp 205-6 (view of interior on occasion of inauguration); 15 Aug. 1857, pp 160-1, 170. 6 Nov. 1858, pp 421, 423; CEAJ, 1853, pp 353-4, 415-6; 1854, pp 41-3 (partly a review of Clarac's book); BN, 5 Jly. 1856, pp 362-5 (Pavillon Richelieu, the only illus. in entire volume); 1 Mar. 1856, pp 105-7; 4 Nov. 1859, pp 993,995 (Pavillon Richelieu); 1858, pp 105, 306. Also much more copious coverage in French periodicals with full and excellent illus. of the whole complex, and details which did not get into the British Press. Adolphe Berty ran a series of articles in Moniteur des architectes, "Monographe du Louvre et des Tuileries réunis", begun 1856 but not taken up again and completed till 1859-60; MDA, illus. much of the old Louvre throughout the 1850s, and of the New Louvre, 1860. Revue générale de l'architecture and Encyclopédie d'architecture reported the progress but illus. sparsely.
centuries on the now united palaces,"¹ the tenor of the notices given to the project by the English press was overwhelmingly rapturous. Professor Donaldson called it "the most vast and sumptuous palatial residence in the world,"² while another critic compared it with the wonders of Luxor, Thebes and Nineveh³.

Not only did the New Louvre draw attention by its own merits, its vastness and opulence, however; France held in Britain a captive audience as Republic followed Revolution, and Empire, Republic. The grandeur of Napoleon III's regime acquired immense international prestige, while the new Empress, Eugenie, and all the family connections of the Bonaparte dynasty, supplied The Illustrated London News with endless copy.⁴ Especial cordiality reigned between Britain and France as never before; state visits were exchanged between the Bonapartes and the British Queen⁵. Nor was Victoria the only Briton to visit Paris: already in 1851 The Illustrated London News was declaring

1. ILN, 15 Aug. 1857, p. 170. Another sour voice was to be that of Richard Phene Spiers (surprisingly, since he used the building as a model often enough): "I do not know any building which has more sham about it than the Louvre" (Bldr, 13 Mar. 1863, p. 194), contradicting thus Fergusson's claim that "the whole design is ... so free from the ordinary defects of concealment and shams that it must be considered as about the best specimen of palatial architecture of modern times" (History of the modern styles, p 227). See also Bldr, 13 Oct. 1855, p. 481, for criticism of indiscriminate admiration of all things French.
2. Bldr, 18 Mar. 1854, p. 139 (Address to Institute of Architects).
3. CEAJ, 1854, p. 41.
4. "The world will regard with renewed interest an edifice (i.e. the Tuileries) which has seen such startling mutations of ownership," declared ILN (5 Feb. 1853, p. 111), when the "Spanish demoiselle (Eugénie) occupies the apartments of Marie Antoinette."
5. Queen Victoria's visit to France, August/September 1855, allowed the ILN to show copious views of the Louvre, the Tuileries, Hôtel de Ville, and the Palace of St Cloud where the queen stayed.
that there had never been so many British in Paris as were then thronging the boulevards. The 1855 Exhibition brought greater numbers still. Nor did the flood abate much after that, especially when Britons were allowed into France without passports, as from 1st January 1861. The British public had plenty of opportunity, therefore, not only to get an idea of the new Paris developments through the medium of the architectural press, but to actually see the New Louvre complex for themselves. Frederick Lush in an unsurpassed panegyric on this "superb edifice" in The Builder, noted correctly that it was

"a palace which tempts foreigners from all parts of the world and which is a model and a lasting resource of design to students."

British officialdom was not oblivious of the Parisian developments either: close communication between the two countries at governmental level brought home to the English the vastness of the gulf that separated this sumptuous palace (and its incorporated governmental offices) from the shabby equivalents in London. When an open competition was announced in 1856 for designs for new War and Foreign Offices to be built in Whitehall, it was not surprising that a conspicuous proportion of the entrants should betray close familiarity with the Paris works, nor that the first prizes in all sections of the competition should be carried off by three of their number. Before looking more closely at the Whitehall competition,

1. [IN, 9 Aug. 1851, pp 171-2. Signs, it said in a snide allusion to Gallic sharp practices, were popping up everywhere, saying "English spiked here".]
2. [See BN, 4 Jan. 1861, p. 6.]
3. [Bldr, 14 Jan. 1860, p. 23.]
however, it will be as well to consider the handful of buildings which appeared in Britain before the construction of the New Louvre, which Hitchcock has labelled "Second Empire 'avant la lettre'"1, and also the reasons for the immediate and enormous popularity of the Louvre style (and to a lesser extent that of the Hôtel de Ville) in Britain in the late 1850s. Further, there is the influence of the less spectacular building programmes of Paris to consider.

The very precocious Parisian house for Henry Thomas Hope by Dusillion has already been seen. It related more to the maison à loyer, the most characteristic building type of mid-century Paris, than to the growing fashion for pavilion composition. Occasional pavilion roofs there were, however, in British architecture in the years prior to the establishment of the Second Empire and before the New Louvre was begun. The Hôtel de Ville, of course, was a quite sufficient explanation of this; and it was supported by a handful of other examples in the French capital built during the reign of Louis Philippe. Possibly the earliest instance in England of a truncated pyramid roof being used for deliberate picturesque effect was St Aidan's College, Birkenhead, an institution intended "to combine theological and general education with the pastoral care of the masses of the people". The architects were Wyatt and Brandon, and it was built in 18502. The college is a symmetrically

1. H.-R. Hitchcock, "Second Empire 'avant la lettre'", GBA, XIII, 1953, pp 175-30. See also his ANPC, pp 79-82, 192-3; and EVA, pp 208-14. To these I am much indebted.
2. ILN, 10 Oct. 1863, p. 373, gives Wyatt and Cole as the architects and the date as 1854-6, but it is illus. in BLDR, 6 Apr. 1850, pp 162-3, ascribed to Wyatt and Brandon, and said to be in process of
arranged edifice in the Tudor Gothic style save that the corner pavilions of the essentially Classical plan are equipped with truncated pyramid roofs, complete with lucarnes and metal cresting. Instead of the dormer window of Flamboyant Gothic or of more Classical style which in later years was so often to jut up into this sort of roof, here it is a sharp, pointed gable which breaks upward through the cornice. Another early use of the truncated pyramid was in a chain of warehouses for the Nottingham lace and hosiery industry, designed by Thomas C. Hine of that town. One of these, for Messrs Adams and Page, lace manufacturers, Stoney Street, Nottingham, was built in 1851, according to The Builder, though it was not opened until July 1855. Here a high roof surmounts a vaguely Jacobean facade, five storeys high, except for the pavilion which rises above the rest, an extra floor, and bears the truncated and crested roof into

Footnote continued from page 79

erection at that time, the execution being superintended by the designers and Henry Cole of Birkenhead. T. H. Wyatt was to have frequent if uninspired recourse to the French styles: Orchardleigh Park, Somerset, 1855 (see below, p.165), Knightsbridge Barracks (designed 1855 with M.D. Wyatt, built 1878-9, see Bldr, 2 Feb. 1878, pp 110-3); Liverpool Exchange competition design, 1866 (see RIBAD Y21/10, illus. in RIBAD catalogue, Wyatt family, fig. 81); Brook House, Park Lane, 1866-9 (see below, p. 91); Brockenhurst, Hants, 1869 (see below, p. 313); Newnham Paddox, Warwicks, 1875 (see below, p. 288). Wyatt also advised Thomas Holloway to use the Loire style for Royal Holloway College (see below, p. 372).

which a Dutch sort of gable projects. The rest of the building is covered with a continuous high roof (not a true mansard) which sweeps round over the deeply projecting terminal wings of the 'E' plan which the builder adopts. Higher cresting in a square at the ends of these two wings suggest truncated pyramids again, but in fact, as at the Rennes Palais de Justice and Mansart's Blois (which have the same sort of roof but lack the central pavilion), the extra height of the wings is an effect of perspective rather than a matter of fact\(^1\). As early as 1854 the truncated pyramid roof had caught on in an extensive housing scheme at the Kelvingrove Estate in Glasgow. Having begun the estate in an Italianate mode, the architect, Charles Wilson, switched rapidly to pavilion roofs and much metal cresting\(^2\).

As for squared domes, the first example in Britain (or something like one at any rate) would appear to have been at Philip Charles Hardwick's sensational Great Western Hotel at Paddington (1850-2).

1. W. B. Gingell's Bristol General Hospital was another early example of this sort of roof: not a real mansard in that its slope is not broken, but high, crested and dormer-studded and advancing (yet with no extra height) over projecting pavilions. The angle is enlivened by a tower with octagonal, double-sloped ogee dome which must relate to the Louis Quatorze fashion. It was designed in 1852 and selected in a competition in which T. H. Wyatt had the final decision. Construction took place, 1853-7. Ilus. Eldr. 17 Apr. 1858, pp 251-5; EN, 21 May 1858, pp 526-9 (reproduced in Hitchcock, EVA, pl. VII.79).

2. Drawings are held at NMRS and are dated 1853-8. The first French ones are of the west elevation, Park Quadrant, June 1854 (GWD/29/77). See also GWD/29/74-6, and general plans and views of the site, GWD/29/5-6. It is interesting to note how Wilson has created an elaborate three-light dormer out of a Palladian window. The result is not far from the decorative buttressed dormers popular in the 1870s and '80s, derived from the Hôtel d'Écouville, Caen.
Hardwick's dome was broader, lower and more integrated into the rest of the roof than was the case with the squared domes of either the New Louvre or most later British examples; yet The Illustrated London News declared that "the style of this important edifice imitates the French of Louis XIV, or later". This has caused general mystification to critics. Certainly "later" is unlikely, but Louis XIV seems acceptable enough for it was during that reign that experiments with the squared dome of earlier invention produced a number of distended or elongated variants, most notably in the designs (rarely executed) of Antoine Le Pautre. French also are the banded corners to the pavilions - but little else. The proportions of the pavilions are smaller than is characteristic in French architecture, and they rise higher, to be surmounted by ogee domes which are distinctly English. Hermione Hobhouse points out that these derive from the twin gate-houses of Westwood Park, a "fantastic Elizabethan hunting lodge in Worcestershire", which Hardwick had sketched in 1840 while his father was engaged on a major re-organisation of the house. Though betraying its early date by its cement exterior, the Great Western Hotel was an important building. Not only did it anticipate the French-derived roofs of

1. ILN, 18 Dec. 1852, p. 538.
3. Hermione Hobhouse, "Philip and Philip Charles Hardwick: an architectural dynasty", in Fawcett, Seven Victorian architects, p. 37. The drawings are in sketch-books at RIBAD. He used the same domes on Barnstaple Hall, a very Jacobean edifice (RIBAD U74/8).
later years, but it was also the first of the great railway hotels to spring up in London, setting a new standard of plush accommodation for the traveller, in emulation of trends in the United States and on the Continent\(^1\). Scarceky a hotel for the next sixty years could resist a French roof.

It will have been noticed that all three of the examples referred to here as pioneers of the French roof in Britain chose to blend the foreign element with features of the English Renaissance, further illustrating the point made elsewhere that the Renaissance styles of the two countries had something in common and that their amalgamation might prove a profitable exercise for the Victorian architect. But the novelty of the French elements often got all the attention, as at the Great Western. As the taste for the decorative François Premier style wore off in the late 1840s interest in French architecture focused on the skyline. To some extent French roofs were the French style where the British were concerned. Many architects of the 1850s and '60s used Louvre roofs, but few used the details of its elevations. Robert Kerr, writing about the French style for the country house, noted:

"... the chief characteristic consists in the adoption of the high-pitched roof. It is not usual for a single feature to produce a modification of style in the way thus indicated; but in this instance it is certainly the case to a very

---

1. Two perspective views are held at RIBAD (U14/17(1-2)). One shows addition of a huge iron verandah at the entrance. The other is reproduced in RIBAD Catalogue G-K, fig. 53; Hobhouse, Op. cit., pl. 39. It was also illus. CEAJ, 1851, pp 354-5; ILN, 18 Dec. 1852, pp 537-8 (reproduced in Hitchcock EVA, pl. VII.16); N. Pevsner, A history of building types, London, 1975, pl. 11.44. See also CEAJ, Sep. 1884, p. 270.
considerable extent".

Donaldson, too, felt that it was the roofs alone which gave French architecture its special "majesty":

"If the roof were to be taken off the Tuileries it would reduce the building to the humble proportions of an English palace; and if the palace of Versailles had such a roof it would not look, from the gardens and terraces, so mean and poor as it now does."

Edward I'Anson, an architect who showed a fair amount of interest in the chateau style of Francis I, found support from Ruskin for such roofs:

"The great feature of all these buildings", he wrote of the sixteenth-century chateaux, "is the roof. Ruskin has remarked that the first and most characteristic feature of a building is the roof - that the first ingredient of a habitable building is the roof."

Certainly Gothicists were not averse to the steep pavilion roof.

Having admired the French cone-roofed stair tourelles, wrought-iron roof-ridge cresting, and the spiky dormers of transitional Gothic-Renaissance work, Sir Gilbert Scott commented in his book on Secular

---

2. Bldr, 17 Feb. 1855, p. 76.
3. Lecture to RIBA, 17 Dec. 1855 "On some French chateaux of the age of Francis I", reported in Bldr, 12 Jan. 1856, pp 14-17; also CEAJ, 1856, pp 33-6. I'Anson had been educated at the College Henri Quart in France. Other instances of his interest include a lecture to RIBA "On the Renaissance of France", (CEAJ, May 1845, p. 157); an article "On the recent improvements in Paris" (CEAJ, May 1859, pp 157-160); a lecture at the Architectural Photographic Exhibition, Conduit Street, on "The Photographs of French Renaissance Architecture" (BN, 1 Feb. 1861, p. 106); and sketches of Chennonceaux and Chambord sent to the architectural exhibition of 1861 and '62 respectively (BN, 17 May 1861, p. 419, & BN, 18 Apr. 1862, p. 265). His building activities in the style appear less numerous, but include Colonial Assurance Co., Lombard Street. (See CEAJ, Aug 1856, p. 275, where it is described as "a very clever specimen of the style adopted") and Fetcham Park, Surrey (see below, p. L90).
and domestic architecture that, "though a later invention, the mansard roof is perfectly applicable to our style". In his opinion their combination with a Classical cornice proved an excellent alternative to the gable where harmony of a Gothic building with juxtaposed Classical facades was desirable in an urban setting.

The impact of French roofs upon Classical architecture in the 1850s was of more significance, however. In the style of François Mansart was to be found an architecture employing the orders with grace and symmetry, and, unique among the Classic styles, it had skyline. Towers concealing water-tanks had of course been used in such Italianate buildings as Trentham and Osborne, but French roofs offered a greater integration and unity of design which seemed desirable as High Victorianism moved on towards more compact and 'muscular' massing. Alexander Beresford-Hope (son and brother of Thomas and Henry Thomas Hope) spoke on the subject at the Architectural Museum in 1863. As a zealous Ecclesiologist he was jubilant at the "confessions of victory we have won from the other side". French roofs had been the conquering weapon:

"Point after point has been surrendered by the prudent strategists who have commanded on the classical side; earthwork after earthwork has been abandoned by its skilled defenders; and ground after ground has been occupied by the advancing host".

To prove his point he proposed a half-morning's jaunt in a Hansom:

3. Ibid., p. 15.
"Look at the improvements which have taken place in street architecture in London of late years. Look at the points that have been gained since 1851."

After praising the improvement in materials, the advance in polychromy and carving, he turned his eyes skyward:

"Look for instance at the Renaissance house in Upper Brook Street, erected for Mr Emanuel, with its high roof and varied skyline. Look at the house in course of construction for Messrs Longman in Paternoster Row, with its high French roofs and carved stone work; look at the Grosvenor Hotel, the Westminster Palace and the London Bridge Hotels, and the gigantic structure of a similar class about to be erected in Langham Place, and look at Montague House and many others I could mention."

As he said, none of these was Gothic. Few were particularly French either except for their roofs which sat aloft elevations of any sort of Renaissance origin. Often they were described as "Italian" rather than "French"; but to the Victorians "Italian" meant simply Classical to a great extent and could therefore be applied to a French Classical building without contradiction even if its elevations were markedly French. Of a conspicuously Parisian-looking building of the 1870s one critic wrote, demonstrating this point, that

"We think the architect has combined the advantages of the two extreme schools of the Italian as exhibited by MM. Visconti and Hittorff."

But the fact remains that a great many of the imitation Second Empire edifices of Britain were French only in their roofs. This was all that Classical architects needed, for, by means of the roofs they might compete with the Goths for dramatic silhouette.

1. Ibid., p. 17.
2. BN, 10 Sep. 1875, p. 295, re the abortive National Opera House for the Victoria Embankment (see below, pp 450-4).
The following year Hope was at the subject again in what the reporter termed "a piquant little onslaught against the Classical architecture of the last century". Inveighing as usual against the "scowling cornice", he proceeded to compare to its disadvantage Somerset House, and its "obnoxious skyline" (especially as seen from a Hansom cab, "dashing towards the Strand from Waterloo Station") with the Pavillon de Flore at the Tuileries.

On the need for the Picturesque even in Classical architecture poor Hope certainly spoke from the heart. He had been luckless enough to inherit from his step-father, Viscount Beresford, a late Georgian Classical house at Bedgebury Park, Kent, and had been obliged to employ none other than R. C. Carpenter, the Ecclesiologists' darling, to make it more acceptable: mansard roofs had been the answer. Aesthetics apart, Hope saw practical advantages in French roofs and chimneys. High roofs were essential for good drainage as well as for servant accommodation, and high chimneys for the sake of one's lungs:

"I inhabit a house which the late Mr Carpenter's skill converted into a Louis XIV chateau, with a Mansarde roof, planned so as to contain on each of its two floors rooms with sufficient headway, fireplaces and windows that can open, while he raised the lofty chimneys to such a height above the ridge as to make the house, generally speaking, smoke free (a condition which it had never before fulfilled), and at the same time to produce a very varied skyline."  

1. EN, 8 Jul. 1864, p. 513-4. See also his lecture at the Architectural Museum, 1861 (EN, 3 May, 1861, pp 376-7) where he denounced the cornice and promoted three forms especially conducive to good skyline: pyramid, cupola, tower. He took the opportunity (1864) to praise highly the old Pavillon de Flore and to denounce Lefuel's current project to "beautify" it.
2. EN, 8 Jul. 1864, pp 513-4. Years later J. J. Stevenson (House
As a matter of fact, it is only the chimneys which relieve what is a very unvaried skyline at Bedgebury Park. Nonetheless Hope seems to have been satisfied with it when he urged that hundreds of country proprietors might advantageously follow his example by the simple addition of a mansard to their outmoded houses.

"with a similar accession of satisfaction and comfort, whether in immediate personal enjoyment, the exercise of taste, or the reflection of increased happiness in dependents, from improved headways and airways, and lightways, and views."  

Hundreds did. Another advantage of the French roof was storage space. What could be better for a water tank? There were also economic advantages. They could be a cheap way of gaining extra space, particularly in the country house, as will be seen later. In the urban environment they might provide an easy way of side-stepping building regulations without the trouble of getting a special permit. But, undoubtedly, economy and building regulations were minor considerations when the choice of a French roof was being made in urban architecture. There seems to have been little difficulty in obtaining a permit to exceed the accepted height

Footnote continued from page 87

architecture, I, p. 240) was to argue the reverse: apart from their obvious appeal to Goths because of their height, French roofs were clearly popular "because they give a good deal of show for the money", but "they are apt to look pretentious here, as there is neither tradition nor convenience to justify them, for they make the neighbouring chimneys smoke, and when stuck on the top of houses already of seven stories, they compel the chimneys to be carried so high that they cannot be swept. They are dangerous for fire..." etc., etc.  

1. BN, 8 Jul. 1864, p. 514.  

2. See below, pp. 279ff. Bedgebury Park will be further discussed below pp 158-60.  

3. See below, p. 405. Building regulations in Britain were very unclear but there did seem to be an understanding that 100' was an upper limit beyond which permission was needed from the Metropolitan Board of Works. However, this advantage of the French roof was voiced, BN, 14 Jun. 1867, p. 408.
limits, and the often very decorative treatment (increasingly so as the years went on) given to French pavilion roofs suggests that economy came second to aesthetics. Elaborately patterned roofing plates in zinc or copper would not have been cheap; nor would the intricate iron cresting applied universally to roof ridges up and down the country. Henry Clutton lent his voice vigorously to the promotion of "these beautiful features which in the 15th century crowned the summits of all the noble buildings in France". He preferred cresting to high chimneys whose elegant development at the hands of the French was an event of the post-Gothic years:

"We cannot but admire the judgement of the mediaeval architects, first for securing an intense animation to the skyline of their buildings by concentrating all their powers of design upon those exquisite productions of the metallic art; and secondly, for making their chimneys of no importance when placed by necessity in contrast with a rival element of the picturesque".

Even so, he realised the advantage of the French composite chimney. He had not yet seen the elaboration of detailing which the New Louvre was to boast upon its chimneys, so he argued that the simplicity of the French type of stack was more sensible in days of coal fires than were the soot-gathering details of the chimney-pot clusters of the English Renaissance. Only four years had passed since the

1. H. Clutton, Remarks with illustrations on the domestic architecture of France from the accession of Charles VI to the demise of Louis XII, London, 1853, p. 72. He directs the reader for fuller information on the subject to Delaquerière, i.e. Eustache De la Quérière, Description historique des maisons de Rouen.

chimneys of the Hope house in Piccadilly had incurred much censure.  

As at the Hope house, constricted urban sites did not allow for a particularly dramatic treatment of the skyline of the typical office block by means of the roof types suggested by the New Louvre and the Hôtel de Ville; or at least, in these early days, there were no precedents for the application of these features to buildings which were not free-standing and of some civic importance. Tall chimneys or roof-cresting were characteristically the only elements to enliven roofs which, though steep and certainly French in origin, struck nonetheless a resolutely horizontal silhouette against the sky. Even on free-standing suburban villas this sort of roof was used, however, indicating that to some extent it was a matter of caution which prevented the use of more broken roof types. This persisted in some cases into the 1870s. There was Sir Morton Peto's house at No. 12A Kensington Palace Gardens (1865), for instance, by James Murray, and its neighbour at No. 11, by Edward Tarver for the Spanish merchant, Don José de Murrietta (1874) with higher but still...
hardly picturesque French roofs. Similar was the house of Sir Dudley Marjoribanks in Park Lane (1870). The architect here was T. H. Wyatt.

The slowness in urban, particularly office, architecture to adopt the plasticity offered by the French pavilion roof can probably be explained by the fact that pavilions themselves were not practical in street architecture. The necessary advance and recession of a pavilion composition would involve either a breach of the building regulations or a waste of land. By the 1870s architects were prepared to employ a pavilion roof without the nicety of a pavilion underneath as its raison d'etre. Longman's premises in Paternoster Row (1861-3), referred to by Beresford-Hope, was an early case of a small-scale commercial building to employ a pair of truncated pyramid roofs to activate the skyline, with only the slightest hint of the pavilions themselves. By contrast, the premises of Harry Emanuel, jeweller of Brook Street (also on Beresford-Hope's list), avoided the use of pavilion roofs despite the opportunity offered by an asymmetrically

1. SL, XXXVII, pp 165-7, remarks, "the tall roofs together with the dormers and urns give this house a distinctive Parisian appearance." This is the same house that the Duke of Marlborough was to decorate in the Rococo taste, 1937 (see below, p. 460). Tarver put a more picturesque French roof on a tower at Wadhurst Park, Suss., for C. de Murmetta (see EN, 9 Apr. 1875, p. 400). See also his 'Maison de chasse' for the Duchesse d'Ossuna (below, p. 327n.), a chimney piece (Archit, 2 Aug. 1889) and comments on the versatility of French architecture (Archit, 20 Dec. 1889, p. 363).


placed bowed projection on the right of the facade. Instead, a degree of plasticity was achieved simply by faceting, like a semi-hexagon, the steep and crested but horizontal French roof as it broke forward over the bow. This was very characteristic of the late 1850s and early 1860s.

Very popular was a corner site; but where by the 1870s and 80s this would have worn some spiky turret the High Victorian period simply adopted the technique precociously heralded by the Hope house: the corner was chamfered, the mansard above achieving some plasticity and movement as it adapted itself to the more sculptural corner; but turrets or domes in such a position were rare. The chamfered corner was a favourite device with the French in nineteenth-century urban architecture. Plans of Paris Street architecture in César Daly’s highly influential book, L’architecture privée au XIXe siècle sous Napoléon III, indicate a positive dislike of right angles. The French furthered enjoyed emphasising the corner by placing the entrance there. This related historically, perhaps, to the eighteenth century’s love of placing an entrance in the centre of a bowed projection though there were precedents in French Classical architecture for entrances across both inner and

---

2. There was the Bristol Hospital by Gingell (see above).
3. L’architecture privée au XIXe siècle sous Napoléon III; nouvelles maisons de Paris et des environs, Paris, 1864-77. Ier série, II, includes many plans with chamfered street corners.
outer angles, Ledoux's Hôtel de Montmorency, Paris (1772), being one example. Contemporary Paris architecture was the source for Victorian architects, however, aided by Cockerell's very early example at the Sun Assurance Office, Threadneedle Street, London (1841) which preceded even the Hope house. This was a rare case of the formula unaccompanied by a French roof and detailing. During the 1850s and '60s markedly French examples of the accented corner followed thick and fast, some amongst the office buildings discussed in the last chapter for their superficial veils of Louis Quatorze or François Premier detailing: Horace Jones's Sovereign Life Office (ca. 1857), for example, with its striking oval window giving emphasis to the street corner; and the offices in Fenchurch Street by Herbert Williams (ca. 1858) in which the angle is stressed all the way from the entrance at the bottom flanked by herms supporting a balcony, up to a dormer window at the top which is bigger than the rest. Other examples were P. C. Hardwick's Union Bank of London, Poultry (1865), Robert Kerr's National Provident Institution, Gracechurch Street (1861-2), and the City Offices Co., Lombard Street, by F. and H. Francis (1868).

2. For these two examples see above, pp 59, 60.
5. Illus. ILN, 1868, ii, p. 105 (reproduced in Summerson, LBW, pl. 3). The French angle entrance was taken up again in the Edwardian era, e.g. Morning Post building, Regent Palace Hotel and many other buildings under the influence of the Grand Palais. (See ch. 11)
Roofs of the steep but horizontal variety such as all these office blocks possessed indicated familiarity with the building activities of Second Empire Paris every bit as much as did the increasing appearance of pavilion roofs. Less spectacular than the Louvre but far more representative of the urban architecture of the day were the *maisons à loyer* or apartment blocks which were proliferating along the new boulevards as they cut paths with relentless formality through the irregularities of the disappearing mediaeval city. These *maisons à loyer* were planned in harmony with one another from street to street giving Paris a unity quite lacking in British cities. Ubiquitous was the steep mansard roof as culmination of the facade below, a feature which was an integral part of the total elevation. One British critic commenting on the inauguration by the emperor of the new Boulevard de Sébastopol in 1858 found the ordinary houses which lined the thoroughfare "models of street architecture". There were aspects of the materials and the workmanship which warranted praise, but special enthusiasm was reserved for

"the ornaments which the chimneys become, rising with dignity to a considerable height - higher than, or as high as, the steep Mansart or similar roofs, which are always made a conspicuous, instead of being a concealed, feature in their edifices and which, with bold, tall, and projecting dormer windows, remind us of the works of the early architects of the Louvre and the ancient chateaux of France."

1. *Bldr.*, 17 Apr. 1858, p. 257. Several of the houses in Bd. de Sébastopol were illus. in Daly, *Op. cit.*, Ier série, II. British journals paid an increasing amount of attention to this sort of architecture from 1840 onwards. See "An architectural note from Paris", by George Godwin, *CEAJ*, Dec. 1841, pp 406-8; "Parisian and London house-building," *CEAJ*, Sep. 1840, pp 310-1; and many such
Well, only just. With their lack of pavilions they were an adaptation of the traditional French roof to the restrictions of a continuous street facade, an adaptation which was only now in the urban boom of the nineteenth century coming into its own. César Daly devoted a volume to this sort of edifice. Victor Calliat’s earlier publication, Parallèle des maisons de Paris, contained examples of the type too. For architects who neither knew these books nor Paris itself at first hand the donation to the Institute of British Architects in 1855 of a set of drawings for an urban development project by J.-I. Hittorff could have been useful. The rue de Rivoli had been extended to facilitate traffic circulation around and through the Louvre. A freehold building society called the Société Immobilière des terrains had been founded expressly to promote the erection of buildings along the new street from the Place de la Concorde to the Palais Royal. These buildings, chief amongst which was the impressive Hôtel du Louvre (or Des Chemins de Fer), were further specimens of the discreet and harmonious street architecture observed in the Bd. de Sébastopol, topped by a continuous curbed roof, high chimneys and dormers, all very much a part of the total composition. Though this sort of elevation grew popular for commercial facades in British cities, no such
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regular articles in Bldr, during the 1840s and ’50s. For illus. after 1850 of the typical Parisian maison à loyer and hôtel particulier see House in Bd. Beaumarchais, designed by M. Rippet, CEAU, 11 Jan. 1851, p. 75, pl. 4-5; Parisian hôtels by Duban, Bldr, 20 Dec. 1856, p. 687; House in Rue de la Chaussée d’Antin, by M. Rolland, Bldr, 6 Mar. 1858, p. 159 & 12 Jun. 1858, pp 410-1. Then they follow thick and fast. For the rest of 1858 and 1859 see also: Bldr, 31 July, 1858, p. 519; 27 Nov. 1858, p. 799; 5 Feb. 1859, p. 87; 12 Feb. 1859, p. 115; 23 Apr. 1859, p. 282; 1 Oct. 1859, p. 649.
concerted effort ever characterised the urban development programmes of this country. Buildings of this type tended to stand in isolation. Even so, T. L. Donaldson (who had been instrumental in securing the Hittorff donation) expressed the admiration of the profession for the French approach in an address to the institute on the occasion of the presentation (and he did not mean simply the New Louvre):

"The works now carried on at Paris under the direction of the Emperor constitute one of the most remarkable features of modern times; indeed I cannot recall to mind any period since the time of the Roman emperors when works of such magnitude, magnificence and essential utility were executed at once."

Though less dramatic than pavilion roofs the Hôtel du Louvre variety was very suitable for an urban site, and certainly the motivation behind the use of the two types was the same. Robert Kerr, confessedly "firmly attached to the Classical party", corroborated Beresford-Hope's claims as to trends in that camp. He explained in nearly identical terms his choice on the one hand of a steep but horizontal roof for his National Provident Institute and on the other the set of varied pavilion roofs on his design for the public offices in Whitehall. Picturesque Classicism was his aim:

"He holds that Classic architecture alone is calculated to give lasting satisfaction in a London commercial building," it was reported in relation to the National Provident, but, "At the same time he sees no reason why the spirit of the picturesque should not be openly acknowledged."*

1. Bldr, 17 Feb. 1855, p. 76. See also RIBA Trans, 1854–5, pp 27-32. The architects involved in the rue de Rivoli project were Armand, Hittorff, Pellechet, and Rohault de Fleury. Drawings at RIBAD (Z9/10(1-9)). On the rue de Rivoli and Hôtel du Louvre see also BN, 14 Jun. 1856, pp 292-3; BN, 3 Jly. 1857, p. 686.
Six years earlier he had expounded the same idea as vindication of his Whitehall scheme:

"With regard to the style of the design, Mr Kerr lays down the principle that for the climate, the landscape and the mental associations of a northern country the picturesque is essentially appropriate ... At the same time he objects to the details of recognised mediaevalism for the edifice proposed ... He therefore professes to employ a picturesque Renaissance to present towards the Classicism of Whitehall and the park, one extreme of a graduation of composition whose other extreme would be the new Houses of Parliament and the Abbey."

Here was the crux of eclecticism. Already (in this particular instance at least) the Renaissance, and especially the French Renaissance\(^2\), was being seen to play a role of compromise between the antagonists, Gothic and Classic, a role which the Loire chateaux were to play a decade later for a wider cross-section of the architectural profession and with consummate skill.

The special circumstances of the proposed government offices site, lying between the Classical Banqueting Hall and Horse Guards on the one hand and the Gothic parliament and abbey on the other, was a crucial factor in the outcome of the Whitehall competition of 1857. Fashion was certainly important; the newly completed Louvre and Hôtel de Ville were fresh in every mind. But there can have been few contestants, either, who could overlook the role of mediation

---

1. *Bldr*, 26 Sep. 1857, p. 550. *ILN*, 8 Aug. 1857, p. 142, when discussing the Whitehall competition, expressed also the view that in the new buildings which would be visible from a great distance in every direction it was desirable that the roofs group harmoniously with the towers, steeples and domes of its neighbours.
2. 'Renaissance' is a French word and to Kerr it meant 'French Renaissance' (see below, p. 284).
which the Parisian style could play in this situation.

Not officially entered in the competition but ultimately stealing the show at the 1858 Academy exhibition was a vast scheme by Sir Charles Barry to contain all the government offices in one building stretching the length of Whitehall. Barry visited Paris three times during the summer of 1855 for the Paris Exhibition. This was not without influence upon his Whitehall scheme. Though taking his initial note from the existing Board of Trade and Treasury buildings which he incorporated into the scheme, Barry ensured that considerable movement was given to the skyline by his choice of domes and mansards, to "form a pleasing contrast with the numerous towers of the Abbey and the New Palace at Westminster", as he himself explained in a descriptive text appended to the drawings. The architect's son and biographer, the Rev. Alfred Barry, stressed also that by the use of finials and ribbing on the domes, and the decorative treatment of the reticulated surfaces, it had been hoped that the fundamentally Classical design would blend with its Gothic neighbours to the south.

The domes of this scheme were Italianate (though The Builder found them "suggestive of the simple but beautiful examples at the Invalides"); but another scheme in which Barry perhaps had a hand

1. RIBAD, OS/15 (which includes Whitehall elevation and block plans (see RIBAD catalogue B, fig. 28) and a more extensive view of the same front plus the park elevation, published in Rev. Alfred Barry's The life and works of Sir Charles Barry, London, 1867. These were reproduced in Bldr, 5 Jan. 1907, pp 6-7, in an article by Heathcote Statham lamenting their non-adoption. RIBAD holds also four pre¬liminary designs (C4/15 (a-c)). On the Barry scheme at the R.A., 1858, see Bldr, 8 May 1858, p. 305; Eccles, XIX, 1858, p. 171.
2. Bldr, 8 May 1858, p. 305.
and which had actually been entered in the competition of 1857 under
the name of Sir Charles's son, Edward Middleton Barry (critics universally
concluded that the son had been helped by the father), had made free
use of quadrangular domes of the Louvre variety. Both schemes made
extensive use of mansards, dormer windows and liberal metal cresting.
It must be admitted that in the older Barry's version it is the
Italian domes rather than the mansards which give the most variation
to the skyline; but the fact that he used mansards at all was a sign-
nificant change in his urban work.1

Apart from its demonstration of the middle role played by the
Renaissance styles, Barry's scheme was chiefly noteworthy for its
bid in the French manner to secure over a large area a unity of
architectural design which might give to London something of the
logical planning of Baron Haussmann's Paris. The fact that official¬
dom ignored the idea in a way to become all too characteristic in
later years, was a source of much regret in the Edwardian era when
a new consciousness of the importance of town planning was emerging.2

1. He used French roofs in two Scottish schemes, however (see p. 206).
Also in his designs (RIBAD 04/15(a-d)) for the Halifax Town Hall,
Sir Charles Barry used a truncated pyramid roof over the central
pavilion. His death in 1860 left completion of the building in
E. M. Barry's hands: that architect was responsible for the more
extensive mansards and the curious spire-cum-mansard which were
p. 165; BN, 31 Jly. 1863, pp 590-1; Bldr, 5 Jan. 1901.
2. Several new streets were laid down in London between 1860 and
1890 but attempts to achieve architectural unity or grand vistas
in the Parisian way were half-hearted or non-existent. The fact
that what was built in these streets was predominantly French
indicated fashion rather than fore-thought. The Thames Embankments
were probably inspired by the quays of the Seine. An isolated
case of a town-planning scheme with all the classic axiality of
Haussmann's was noted in Bldr, XV, 1857, pp 542, 561, 604, 636,
698. It was for a 'Central 'Place' in London uniting Trafalgar
The official entrants and prize-winners in the 1857 competition for the War Office and Foreign Office buildings contented themselves with rather smaller scale essays in the French Renaissance styles. Of the fourteen premiated designs in the double competition only two were not patently French in inspiration. Even the winner of the separate block plan award produced a French scheme. This was not surprising, as the author was A. Crépinet of Paris. The other premiated designs divided fairly evenly (like a premonition of the battle shortly to be waged between Scott and Palmerston) between exercises in French Gothic (with occasional help from the Louvre) and unabashed imitations of that building and the Hôtel de Ville.

The Gothic designs are less relevant to this discussion and more quickly dealt with. Prichard and Seddon's War Office scheme had very tall, truncated pyramids, wedge roofs of early sixteenth-century origin, and even boasted a satellite, mini-chateau to one side to house the Secretary of State, reminiscent of the satellite laboratory modelled on the Glastonbury Abbot's kitchen which Deane and Woodward had used at the Oxford Museum. Deane and Woodward's
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Square with the Borough across the River" by the pseudonymous Epsilon. The 300' wide bridge from underneath might seem like a "Temple of Karnak" on water or a "light and airy cave of Staffa" (p. 604).

1. Entry 12. See CEAJ, Aug. 1857, p. 170. The non-French designs were T. Bellamy's Foreign Office (5th prize) and Cuthbert Brodrick's War Office (5th prize).

own design had truncated pyramids which rose somewhat strangely straight out of the main stretch of roof, whereas Scott used them as sharply differentiated entities over pavilions and towers much more in the way they were typically used in the Classical architecture of their origin, putting into practice thus the theory he had propounded in his *Secular and domestic architecture*. Similarly Scott and others introduced into their Gothic designs the horizontal parapet or cornice, sometimes broken by dormers, which he had praised in public buildings in preference to the more English gable. So long as high roofs rose above it, this horizontal element could help Gothic buildings to harmonize more readily with their Classical neighbours.

The scope for a lively skyline that these varied roof shapes from Renaissance France gave to large-scale public building was to ensure their popularity during the years of High Victorian Gothic. Lockwood and Brandon, in particular, splashed out with wedge and pyramid roofs, in their Law Courts designs in the 1866 competition, and Garling did so too. Waterhouse developed his own distinctive

---

2. Concerning this competition see John Summerson, *Victorian architecture: four studies in evaluation*, New York, 1970, pp 77-117. For Lockwood’s scheme see *Bldr*, 23 Mar. 1867, p. 209 (illus); *ILN*, 16 Aug. 1867, pp 564-5 (illus); *CEAJ*, Mar. 1867, pp 70-2; *BN*, 1 Mar. 1867, pp 193-4, where it is described as "something like Batty Langley would have done had Mr Ruskin lived in his time". It was not liked by those "who know what art is" but was popular with "women and very young men". For Brandon’s scheme see *Bldr*, 27 Apr. 1867, p. 293 (illus); *BN*, 1 May 1867, pp 192-3 (illus); *CEAJ*, 1867, pp 101-2. Garling entered both a Gothic and a Classic scheme: see *BN*, 8 Mar. 1867, p. 169; 22 Mar. 1867, p. 208 (illus); *CEAJ*, 1867, pp 98-9, which noted "a sort of family likeness in
brand of French Gothic at the Manchester Assize and Town Hall (with occasional pavilion roofs). This he carried over into the field of domestic architecture when he remodelled Eaton Hall, Cheshire, for the Duke of Westminster. For the elevations of the Gothic schemes of the Whitehall and later competitions the architects employed various combinations of Venetian, French and Netherlandish styles which are of no particular interest here, apart, that is, from the stair-towers which Scott incorporated into the courtyard elevation of his Foreign Office design. With their external expression of the stair spiral within, they were a clear quotation from the François Premier range at Blois Château, though the Paris Hôtel de Ville idea had used the device more recently in its court elevations. This idea the Victorians liked both for its boldly decorative effect and for its

Footnote continued from page 101
Mr Garling's classic designs which betokens ... if not their origin, yet a striking degree of coincidence. We refer to the noble structures in that style in Paris." The other contestants drew heavily on French mediaeval architecture.
1. For Eaton Hall see below, pp 235-7. Waterhouse used truncated pyramids in his otherwise Gothic Manchester buildings. The Assize competition (1859) produced a number of rather more French Renaissance designs, e.g. by T. Roger Smith (Bldr, 7 May 1859, p. 309; EN, 29 Apr. 1859, p. 393); Thomas Worthington (Bldr, 14 May 1859, p. 324; EN, 6 May 1859, pp 421-2; drawings at T. Worthington & Sons, Manchester); Dieser of Leeds (EN, 6 May 1859, p. 421); Dyson and Dixon of Leeds (EN, 20 May 1859, pp 465-6).
structural honesty\(^1\).

More important for our purposes than these Gothic designs were those in the Whitehall competition which frankly admitted the influence from Paris. Half the premiated entries and the winning designs both for the Foreign and the War Offices looked to the Louvre or the Hôtel de Ville. Amongst these was a number of Frenchmen, not surprisingly swelling the proportion of Parisian designs. Crépinet has already been noted. Another, A. B. d’Hazeville secured second place in the War Office list\(^2\). The fact that he was "Inspecteur aux Travaux" for the Louvre works made not surprising the convincing Frenchness of his design, which suggests the Tuileries heightened, regularized and multiplied by two with a low pavilion section in the middle. There is a sophisticated elegance to

\(^1\) Stiffer, rather un-French treatment of this can be seen in Deane and Woodward’s Foreign Office design; C.R. Cockerell’s Liverpool and London Insurance Office, Liverpool (1855); and in a few houses e.g. Kerr’s Bear Wood, Berks, (1865-74); Douglas’s Oakmere (1867); E. W. Pugin’s Carlton Towers, Yorks (1873-5); Worthington’s Towers, Manchester (1867). The courtyard at Chambord has more slender and curving examples of the same thing which influenced Waddesdon Manor, Bucks, by Destailleur (1874-89); the clock tower at Cliveden by Clutton (1861); the courtyard, Cairus College, Cambridge, by Waterhouse (1868-70). Clutton, Op. cit., p. 68, said that staircase tourelles constituted the "pre-eminent and most beautiful feature of French domestic architecture of the 15th century". When open as at Blois they allowed "greater scope for light and shade ... affording a contrast with the solidity of the rest". He illus. (pl. 2) a modest example from the Hôtel de Chambellan, Dijon. Scott, Op. cit., p. 68, indicated also that French chateaux might prove mines of inspiration for stair designs, a field in which English mediaeval design had been deficient. I’Anson gave special praise to the Blois example (Bldr, 12 Jan. 1856, pp 14-7; CEAJ, 1856, pp 33-6) as did an article on Blois signed ‘J. M.’ (Bldr, 16 Jan. 1858, p. 50). Donaldson said they were economical of space (Bldr, 17 Feb. 1855, p. 76). Edmund Beckett (Op. cit., pp 73, 133, found them "uncomfortable and dangerous". See also below, p. 264.

\(^2\) Entry 75. See ILN, 29 Aug. 1857, pp 228-9(illus); CEAJ, Aug. 1857, p. 171.
d'Hazeville's scheme, a single-minded assurance in his handling of volumes and space which reflects that understanding of Classical design for which the French with their Beaux-Arts training were famous. By comparison the English designs often appear lumpy and ill-defined, and, on the whole, very un-French in feeling despite their roofs. In their quest for an 'English' style combining Classic order with the Picturesque, British architects were too ready to find in French pavilion roofs the answer to all their problems, to use them in any arrangement and with any style, showing little appreciation of apt proportion. Scott grasped something of the situation when he wrote of public buildings,

"If the roofs be shewn, they should rise fearlessly to the proper pitch, not seem to draw in their horns like a snail, as if dreading the touch of criticism. How many English architects admire the lofty roofs of the Tuileries or the Hôtel de Ville at Paris, and determine to take a lesson from them; but when they sketch such roofs on their designs become frightened at their own temerity and cut them down again to half measure."

This is indeed part of the problem. Too often the pavilion roofs perch mean and ridiculous above the lavish busyness of facades too vast for them to control. The longer the facade, the less effective is the French pavilion roof. D'Hazeville, showed his understanding of this by subdividing his facade into manageable sections, each with its own set of mansards in forceful combination. By contrast, John Rochead of Glasgow, and Banks and Barry on the park facade of their

1. Scott, Remarks, p. 211.
design, perched powerless little box-like roofs above the massive and undifferentiated horizontality of their Italian facades. The Versailles-like trophies and weapons, sprouting from segmental pediments in the centre of Rohead's War Office facade marry satisfactorily with the balustrades and statuary, but the truncated pyramids at each end are emasculated of their potency. On the Whitehall front of Banks and Barry's design inadequate height is not so much the problem as insufficient dimensions of the pavilions themselves to integrate happily with the rest of the facade. These architects repeated their mistake in later years by continuing to make use of French Renaissance roofs in a timidly decorative way, allowing them no scope to influence fundamentally the total conception of the building. Their Westminster Chambers, Victoria Street (1863-5), remain essentially a Barryesque palazzo, despite the second Empire touch to the facade; and a design by Charles Barry, jr., alone, for the National Gallery competition of 1866 displays the depths to which this half-hearted playing with the


2. This was a massive block of offices chiefly for parliamentary solicitors and professional men associated with Parliament and the Law Courts. A central pavilion is capped by a high section of roof with dormer windows and two flanking, crested and truncated octagonal cones (a variant of the more usual pyramids). The rest has Italianate balustrades with ball ornamentation. There is an Italianate tower placed obliquely across the acute angle of the Dean and Victoria Streets corner. See Bldr, 11 Jul. 1863, pp. 496-7 (illus., reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 178-9); Bldr, 13 May 1865, p. 329.
French Renaissance could descend. It is a long, low edifice with corner towers too small for the total size of the building, each bearing four small squared domes at the corners, travesties of their Parisian originals. The fact is that Banks and Barry never got over the older Barry's Italian style. The French or English Renaissance might supply some pretty details but the overall conception of the designs remained the same. As Italianate palaces they are grand enough; as offspring of the Louvre they are absurd.

Others, like Coe and Hofland, winners of the Foreign Office section, and also Kerr with his unpremiated design, tried to combine the Classical French arrangement of pavilions ('a-b-a') with an adjoining assortment of favourite and un-French elements - domes, towers which looked back to Osborne House or Trentham, pinnacles and so on. The result is confusion and formlessness in Kerr's case while in Coe's there is a feeling simply of superfluosity; the tower is not needed. Even so, his was a better eye for proportion; and the tower is an understandable attempt to anglicize the style. However, the more successful experiments with the Second Empire style were, one concludes, those which respected its limitations. It was enough that the style of the New Louvre or the Hôtel de Ville was a Classical style with a varied skyline; it was

1. RIBAD, C6/27 (1-2); C6/22 (1-6); OS 4/25. cf.also their country house, Stevenstone, Devon, (see below, pp 277-9).
too much to ask it, in large scale public buildings, to join with success in the sort of irregular concoctions which the Goths called both Picturesque and true. In country houses and to some extent in hotels as well it could be done, for the scale was small enough to achieve a tight-knit composition, but in enormous complexes of public architecture this sort of mixture usually meant a mess.

As a result, the competition experiments in the Second Empire style which seem to us most successful (and which were ultimately most influential as well) were those which were in fact the most conventional - closest, that is to say, to the French originals: one or more symmetrical, pavilioned facades, further pavilions at the corners of the rectangular plan. The Hôtel de Ville and numerous chateaux (Ecouen, Ancy, etc.) were planned thus around courtyards.

H. B. Garling produced an impressive enough example with his Hôtel de Ville arrangement of truncated pyramids and central cupola, with which he won the War Office section¹. Also there was John Dwyer's design which, though hardly inspired, did allow his truncated pyramid roofs the generous size they demand and integrated the central one nicely with the facade by means of an enormous rounded pediment which penetrated upward into the central pavilion

¹ Entry 77, 1st prize, War Office. Illus. Bldr, 1 Aug. 1857, pp 435, 437; REN, 11 Sep. 1857, p. 959; ILN, 8 Aug. 1857, pp. 142, 146-9. See also Bldr, 30 May 1857, p. 303; CEAJ, Aug. 1857, p. 171. When the War Office was centre of attention again in 1899 Garling exhibited another scheme for it at the R.A. which the new generation mistook for his 1857 design. It certainly looked as if it could have been designed in 1857 but was not very French (see Bldr, 27 May 1899, p. 516; 9 Sep. 1899, p. 242).
roof. The incongruous tower apart, Coe and Hofland's use of the pavilion composition with square-dome roofing would have been satisfactory enough had they been a little more generous with the size of these roofs and a little less determined to incorporate as much jumbled ornament as possible. Small cupolas crowd in on the central roof, and the already smothering fussiness of the facade is made risible by the absurd porte cochère. It was the designs of the Habershons (despite the weak central dome), and of Garling, which were the boldest from these would-be government architects and the most in sympathy with the spirit of the Paris style.

None of these designs was ever built of course, but nonetheless they are of some importance in the history of the French Renaissance Revival because they mark the arrival of the style, so to speak, and, as a result of the publicity they received in the press and from public display they are likely to have done more to foster it in Britain and America than the New Louvre itself, being as that building was, less readily accessible and (apart from the Pavillon Richelieu) less often shown in the press. Certainly there was a massive upsurge

---

2. Entry 54A, 6th prize, War Office. See Bldr, 1857, p. 282; ILN, 21 Nov. 1857, p. 520 (illus.); CEAJ, Aug. 1857, p. 171. The same plan was used with a Gothic elevation drawn by Charles Buxton as Entry 54, which won 6th prize, Foreign Office. Edward Habershon, in partnership with Brock and Webb, was later to design one of the most successful of chateau-style houses, Normanhurst, Suss., 1867 (see below, pp 260, 290). W. G. Habershon and partner, Fawckner, did a steep, French-roofed chateau at Hyères on the Mediterranean for J. Sunley (Bldr, 19 Aug. 1882, p. 236); also Louvresque roofed Park Hall, Cardiff (Archt, 12 Jly. 1884, p. 23).
in this style of building in the decades to follow.

The pavilion roofs of most of the competition designs were close enough to the Louvre paradigms - square domes or truncated pyramids, for the most part. The pavilion mansards used by Banks and Barry would have looked like truncated pyramids with their high square of cresting marking the break in the roof-slope. But the mid-Victorians were not to be long contented with so little variety. Kerr's Whitehall roofs were the most experimental and anticipated the ever more plastically modelled variants which were to characterise the 1860s and to leave their Paris sources far behind. To some extent the pavilions of the New Louvre gave some hint of the plastic potential which Kerr and others exploited. The use there of free-standing columns with salient entablatures give them an outline which is by no means a simple square; but this extra movement is not reflected in the roofs above. Both Kerr's pavilions and his pavilion roofs, by contrast, have a stepped profile - that is to say, the central parts of each side of the basic square are made to advance slightly in front of the rest. Kerr's whole design is busy and frittered in the extreme with enough finials and turrets for a Thai pagoda, but others were to use the stepped pavilion idea to achieve a more complex basic form while resisting his fussy

1. In 1869 further consideration was given to the government offices and Whitehall. A scheme for the whole street by Lt. Gen. Sir Andrew Clarke was published, _Bldr_. 13 Mar. 1869, pp 200-2. Richly decorated squared domes abounded predictably, though the new Paris Opéra and Italian architecture seem to have contributed something to the elevations and the quantity of sculpture (chariots, victories etc.) which enlivened the skyline. A model for this is held by the Dept. of Environment and was illus. in the exhibition catalogue, _Marble Halls_, no. 10, p. 44.
Richard Phene Spiers gave simple stepped projections to the sides of the truncated pyramid roofs and pavilions of his competition design for the Museum of Natural History, South Kensington (1864), whereas Kerr's design for the same competition virtually replicated his Whitehall entry. Something of the stepped pavilion roof was seen also at the Westminster Palace Hotel.

No field in Victorian architecture surpassed the hotel for experimentation with the French pavilion roof. The Great Western, as we have seen, had set the pace back in 1850 with its broad quadrantial French dome. It also established a new scale and standard for the modern hotel. Monster hotels sprang up rapidly in London in association with the various railway termini, and new thoroughfares. They also boomed in the provinces and at spas and seaside resorts to which the railway was bringing unprecedented custom. Much of the experimentation with variant roof forms took place in the hotel designs of the '60s. First to follow the Great Western in London was the Westminster Palace Hotel (1857-61) by Andrew and William Mosely, situated in the newly laid down Victoria Street. This was a very dull edifice with an elevation made up of Palladian windows and divided into three pavilions,

1. Illus. ILN, 7 Jan. 1865. Photos of drawings are held at RIBAD (21/51 (1-3)). See also EN, 5 May 1865, p. 314 (which did not like the roofs); EN, 3 Nov. 1871, p. 331. There is an Italian dome in the middle.
2. Illus. Bldr, 25 Jun. 1864, pp 473-5; EN, 14 Jul. 1865, pp 498, 501; photos of drawings at RIBAD (21/53 (1-2)) plus open letter to the First Commissioner of Works explaining why he, Kerr, should have won (he came second) rather than Fowkes. Again there was the usual Kerr commentary about following "the Gothic principle without sacrificing Classicism".
banded at the corners. On top were round-topped dormer windows, huge chimneys and truncated and crested pyramid roofs. The only surprise is that the symmetry of it all was spoiled by the way in which a tall and thin pyramid roof rose at the right-hand extremity of the building, one step higher than the rest of that pavilion roof. The point of this was to mark the apex of the triangular site as did an oriel and minor entrance (another instance of an interest already noted) as well as to experiment (albeit rather timidly) with greater skyline movement by the means which Kerr was pioneering.\(^1\)

A group of provincial buildings of the 1860s and later was to play out the potential of the idea. At the baths of the Southport Hotel and Hydropathic Establishment by Horton and Bridgford of Manchester (1866-70), a pavilion with steep French roof emphasised the centre of the design, but the centre of the pavilion itself was further emphasised by a yet higher truncated pyramid.\(^2\) Much later, the Grand Hotel, Eastbourne, acquired at the hands of Morton


M. Glover (1888) a new front with a similar arrangement of three pavilions in which the central truncated pyramid has an extra pyramid rising from it¹. This is not unlike the way in which Lemercier and Marot both placed lanterns on top of the truncated pyramid roofs of their unexecuted designs for the east front of the Louvre (illustrated in The Grand Marot). In the 1880s, when yet another rebuilding of theHôtel de Ville was making cupolas irresistible, William Leiper used the idea on his scheme for the Glasgow Town Hall². Ernest Bates’s Wolverhampton Town Hall (1869-71) had a central squared dome from which hipped extensions, like wings, projected on each side, a step higher than the main roof which stretched out towards the terminal pavilions³. Most elaborate of all was the Glasgow Institution for the Deaf and Dumb by Salmon, Son and Ritchie (1869). There was the usual symmetrical arrangement, terminated at each end by truncated pyramids; but the central pavilion was expanded to the width of seven bays, constituting one third of the total façade, its roof rising step by step until in the very centre a steep hipped section thrust upward as focus of the design. Even this wedge-shaped centre-piece was not simple, for another lower wedge roof projected forward from it bearing a clock. Close to this was the curious treatment of the terminal

4. ILN, 28 Jan. 1869, p. 89. The terminal truncated pyramid pavilion roofs also had a small hipped section protruding from their centres over a pair of oriel.
pavilion roofs at the Cavendish Hotel, Eastbourne (1866), by Thomas E. Knightly. There, two steep hip or wedge-shaped roofs intersected at right-angles, one slightly lower than the other. The pavilions themselves had a stepped profile, as in Kerr's Whitehall design.¹

All these compositions demonstrated the insatiable urge of the Classically-oriented Victorians for sculptural and picturesque effects to be had within a basically symmetrical format. The French pavilion system was the most versatile means to this end. As a contemporary critic noted:

"It would seem that the Renaissance styles are more promising of tasteful variety than any others, because of their extreme plasticity."²

Equally inventive were the experiments carried out with the French quadrangular dome. At the forefront here was the architect, James T. Knowles, with his schemes for the International Hotel which was never built and the Grosvenor which certainly was. The Grosvenor Hotel (1860-1) was one of the French-style buildings that Beresford-Hope especially approved of. Emphasising the importance of skyline in urban architecture, he had expounded to an audience at the Architectural Exhibition of 1861 that city buildings should not be considered so much for their elevations at close quarters as for

². BN, 29 Apr. 1870, p. 313.
"What they were at any point three-quarters of a mile off. From want of this precaution," he continued, "the great Westminster (i.e. Westminster Palace) Hotel as seen from the north-east corner of Green Park ... was a huge deformity, although it might have been made to have a very fine effect. The Victoria (i.e. Grosvenor) Hotel near Buckingham Palace was entitled to high praise. Those who looked at the Euston and Westminster Hotels and then looked at the Victoria could not say that architecture had not been progressing in London."

The French roofs of the Westminster Palace were altogether too timid. Quite the reverse are those of the Grosvenor. Huge bulbous angular domes rise at each end of its facade, given novelty not only by the outgrowth of smaller squared domes on their summits, but also by the way in which across each end of the building two such double domes are joined together to make one vast composite roof. Separating the upper domes from the lower are thin vertical strips articulated with miniature arcading, suggesting the influence of the huge palace which is the subject of the first discourse in Antoine Le Pautre's *Oeuvres* (1652). Over the centre of the Grosvenor's chief facade a broad, domical or quadrantial roof like that of the Great Western Hotel, again with its source in Le Pautre, was initially suggested but this was not built. A good example of this that was built was at the Norfolk Hotel, Brighton (1865), by Horatio Nelson Goulty. But even without this addition, the roofs of the Grosvenor are a highly original hybrid of ideas from Le Pautre, the Louvre and the Hôtel du Louvre - perhaps even the orient. Knowles was

1. EN, 3 May, 1861, p. 377.
3. The Grosvenor was illus. ILN, 7 Jul. 1860, pp 8, 13-4, showing the centre dome (reproduced in Summerson, LEW, pl. 17); Bldr, 1 Jun. 1861, p. 375 (reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 145); EN, 13 Dec. 1861,
certainly influenced by the latter Parisian hotel since his abortive International (1858) which it had been intended to erect in the Strand was a rare case of a British hotel design to employ a central carriage court as in the Paris example. He was also influenced by the orient: the International's domical roofs leave France right behind, so strong is the overlay of the Indian architecture which was receiving so much publicity at the time because of the Indian Mutiny. There was nothing French at all about these hotels' elevations. These are in a rather individual Italianate, perhaps Florentine, style, but showing strong influence from Ruskin in the prominence of rich, naturalistic sculpture. These Knowlesian hotels must rank amongst the most ebullient and original British buildings to have their roots in French Renaissance architecture. Knowles applied the domes (somewhat less satisfactorily) to a country house, Hedsor, Bucks, in the mid-1860s; his son and namesake who had helped on the Grosvenor took the characteristic Knowlesian elevation to the South Bank in a pair of matching monster blocks of residential chambers on the Cedars Estate, Clapham Common.

Foot-note continued from page 114
1. International Hotel illus. ILN, 3 Apr. 1858, p. 349. See also BN, 5 & 26 Mar. 1858, pp 249, 320.
(1860), for a developer called Henry Harris. Like the Grosvenor each block had a two-pavilion arrangement with no central accent, an arrangement which seems to have surpassed the three-pavilion composition in popularity during the 1860s. The roofs were of a simple truncated pyramid variety rather than domes.

Another group of hotels, this time by E. M. Barry, experimented freely with a range of Parisian features, including squared domes, and one of them, the Star and Garter at Richmond (1864), anticipated the Loire chateau taste of the next decade. The others by Barry were the Charing Cross Hotel (1863-5) and the City Terminus or Cannon Street Hotel (1865-6). In general outline the three were very similar, choosing like the Grosvenor a two-pavilion composition without central accent; but in each case the pavilions are more complex, embracing subsidiary turrets with separate roofs. This time the Building News objected to the two-pavilion plan: the skyline effect would have been improved if greater picturesqueness had been sought in the form of some central high structure, it was felt, or in the raising of a tower perhaps at one of the corners only. A pair of objects of any kind can never constitute a group, declared the critic. In both city hotels truncated pyramids were linked with curious little turrets which simultaneously related to the squared domes of Paris and to English seventeenth-century church steeples as at Wren’s St Margaret, Lothbury. At both these hotels,

the treatment of the roofs was very rich, with ornamentation at the angles and edges in boldly stamped zinc rather than the more customary metal cresting, while the turret spires were tipped with gilded metal-work finials. But the Building News critic objected to certain liberties taken with French features at the Cannon Street Hotel:

"We must protest against the custom of using balustrades in connection with Mansard roofs. The two things cannot go properly together ... The whole beauty of a Mansard roof consists in its running down unbroken, visibly to the eaves."^1

Here the balustrade lacked prominence enough to be a feature of importance, yet was sufficiently obtrusive to mar the effect of the cornice. Likewise, exception was taken to the application of terra-cotta shafts to the composite French-style chimneys at both hotels:

"For our own part we prefer the old French plan of making the chimneys very prominent and carrying them up in mass, possibly panelling them, but never using small columns at the angles."^2

31A The Star and Garter at Richmond was less fussily decorative, and despite its having a very similar composition to those of the London

---

^1. EN, 26 Oct. 1866, p. 705. On this tendency see also below, pp 113-4.
^2. Ibid. Cannon Street Hotel was illus. ILN, 13 Apr. 1867, pp 376-8; Bldr, 13 Oct. 1866, pp 758-63 (reproduced in Summerson LBW, pl. 18). Charing Cross Hotel was illus. ILN, 11 Jun. 1864, pp 563-4; EN, 9 Dec. 1864, pp 902, 904. See also CEAJ, Sep. 1864, p. 273; Jun. 1864, p. 156; Bldr, 3 Jan. 1865, p. 34; 3 & 24 Dec. 1864, pp 876-8, 930-2; 7 May 1864, p. 326; EN, 19 Jun. 1865, p. 467; 1 July 1864, p. 507; Pevsner, London I, p. 318. Charing Cross Hotel extended by J. Fish in same style, see Bldr, 22 Sep. 1877, p. 948. Cannon Street Hotel is now demolished: Charing Cross has been much altered, especially its skyline.
examples it contrived a quite different effect, more that of a private palazzo with its Italianate terraces and steps. It is the rounded pavilions and hipped roofs above, however, and the steeper subsidiary spires which give to this hotel a precocious taste of the Loire chateau fashion — a field in which E. M. Barry was to be more active than most in the 1870s. 1

Other prominent London hotels to get much publicity in the 1860s were the London Bridge Railway Terminus Hotel (1861-2), the Langham (1864-6) and the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn, which has already been noted elsewhere. Also, of course, there was Scott’s fantastic Midland Hotel at St. Pancras; but that need not concern us here being, like the Gothic designs for Whitehall, mediaeval in intention albeit with much from France. As for the Langham and the London Bridge Hotels, they could hardly have been more different; yet both (inevitably) looked to some extent to the French Renaissance.

The London Bridge Hotel, by Henry Curry, made little attempt at picturesque effect. It was essentially a large cubic mass, topped with a double-sloped mansard roof which, like the elevation itself, was given only tentative pavilion treatment at the angles. High

1. The Star and Garter accommodation hotel was built to one side of an older hotel; a banqueting hall also by Barry to the other. When the old hotel burned down, 1870, that was replaced by an Italianate ball and banqueting room (1872-4) by C. J. Phipps, who also proposed adding French-roofed turrets onto Barry’s banqueting hall. These were probably never built. The hotel was demolished in the 1920s. It was illus. Bldr., 27 Jun. 1874, pp. 535-7, 544-5; Christopher Monkhouse, "The Star and Garter Hotel, Richmond", Connoisseur, Sep. 1974, pp. 14-21. See also CEAJ, Jun. 1864, p. 156 (R.A. exhibit 801); Bldr., 15 Jan. 1870, p. 54; 16 May 1874, p. 408 (R. A. exhibit 1079); BN, 22 May 1874, pp 549.
chimneys and dormer windows were the only elements to enliven an undramatic skyline.

The Langham by John Giles and James Murray was, by contrast, a deliberate combination of regularity and irregularity, to cope with its site at the bend in Langham Place. As termination to the vista down Portland Place it presents a symmetrical facade of two pavilions with truncated pyramid roofs on top plus a pair of very English splayed bow windows below, and an incongruous porte cochère in the middle. To the left (out of sight from Portland Place) begin the irregularities. The hotel negotiates the bend in the road by means of a series of steps in and out, beginning with a bold and high Italianate tower with steep pyramidal dome, and ending with a bowed section only two floors high, marking the Coffee Room at the side. The Langham has all the vigour and confidence of the Grosvenor and combines with considerable success and originality something of French formality with picturesque composition which is expressive of the interior plan according to

1. Illus. Bljr, 22 Jun. 1861, pp. 427-9, EN, 22 Mar. 1861, pp 241, 248-9; ILN, 3 Aug. 1861, pp 119-20. Drawings at RIBAD (W3/28 (1-6)). Currey read a paper to the RIBA on the hotel, see EN, 7 Mar. 1862, p. 167; Bljr, 8 Mar. 1862, pp 163-4; RIBA Trans, XII, 1861-2, pp 116-21. See also EN, 30 Dec. 1859, p. 7173; 26 Apr., 4 Oct., 27 Dec. 1861, pp 343, 798, 1027; Bljr, 17 May 1862, p. 348; CEAI, Sep. 1864, p. 272. Now demolished. Currey designed St. Thomas's Hospital, Lambeth, with smallish French roofs (1865-71) and inspiration from France for the pavilion plan (see below, p.219); also the Palace Hotel, Buxton (1868), with mansard roof and triple-pavilion composition, the central one being a truncated pyramid (see Picturesque Derbyshire, Manchester, Valentine and Sons (publishers), 1907; N. Pevsner, Derbyshire, Harmondsworth, 1953, pp 73-6; Bljr, 1 Apr. 1876, pp 315-7).
best Puginian principles. Most original and perhaps most successful of all these giant hotels of the 1860s was not in London at all. This was the Grand Hotel, Scarborough, by Cuthbert Brodrick (1863-7). Towering thirteen storeys above the sea-front (though only six including the attics towards the town) it resembles to some extent the Grosvenor and the E. M. Barry hotels with its terminal pavilions and lack of central accent. The apex of its wedge-shaped plan is marked by a bowed section similar to that at the Langham. Dormers decorate the pavilions with a lavishness of sculpture which comes closer to the Baroque excess of Lefuel's Louvre than was generally essayed at that date. As for the pavilion roofs themselves, though closely relating to the French variety then so fashionable, they are like no actual Parisian model. Squeezed-up domes, rather egg-shaped in fact and studded with œil-de-boeuf lucarnes, they are topped with balustraded platforms from which to scan the view.


2. Similar are the dormers on David Bryce's Bank of Scotland Head Office, The Mound, Edinburgh (1864-71), an otherwise Italian Baroque edifice.

3.Drawing at RIBAD (C3/39). A water-colour view, dated 1867, is at the Scarborough Public Library. Illus. Pevsner, HBT, pl. 11.47; Hitchcock, ANTC, pl. 141; Taylor and Bush, Op. cit., p. 55; Marble Halls, no. 128; Peter Burton, "Scarborough Grand", AR, CXLV, 1969, pp 168-71. See also BN, 4 Jly. 1862, p. 16; 17 May 1867, p. 334; Bldr, 3 Nov. 1866, p. 813; Pevsner, Yorkshire, the North Riding, Harmondsworth, 1966, p. 331. Brodrick retired to live in France. Much of his architecture is tinged at least slightly with a French flavour, e.g. the chimneys and other details of his basically Italianate Leeds Town Hall.
By the mid-1860s the hotel wave was sweeping over the country:

"Railway termini and hotels are to the nineteenth century what monasteries and cathedrals were to the thirteenth century", said The Building News, "the only real representative building we possess ... leaders of the art spirit of our time."

Few architects had the independence to resist the French fashion so aesthetically suitable and practically adaptable did it seem:

"The French doubtless do excel in their treatment of classical architecture. It certainly is in their hands the style most perfectly adapted to modern wants and refinements. We cannot therefore do better than follow their lead," wrote a critic in The Building News, voicing an opinion that must have fairly represented contemporary opinion. The hotel boom continued throughout the rest of the century and so did the domination of the Louvre roofs for this building type, though there was a tendency for pavilion mansards to replace truncated pyramids and for the squared domes to get bigger, smoother and more rounded. The

1. EN, 6 Aug. 1875, p. 133. French-style hotels are legion; some which received publicity during the 1860s were: Queen Railway Hotel, Chester, by T. M. Penson, 1861 (ILN, 7 Dec. 1861, p. 578; BN, 17 Jan. 1862, pp 41, 44); Grand Hotel, Brighton, by John Whichcord, 1862-4 (Bldr, 20 Dec 1862, pp 914-5; 11 Apr. 1863, p. 255; ILN, 27 Dec. 1862, p. 703; BN, 22 Jly. 1864, pp 567-8; CEAJ, Jun. 1863, pp 178-9; N. Pevsner & I. Nairn, Sussex, Harmondsworth, 1965, p. 450); Upper Norwood Hotel and Hydropathic Establishment, by Whichcord, 1862 (ILN, 5 Apr. 1862, pp 338-9); Randolph Hotel, Oxford, by W. Wilkinson, 1864-5 (Bldr, 23 Apr. 1864, pp 297-8, reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 189); Imperial Hotel, Southampton, by J. Norton, 1866 (Bldr, 12 May 1866, p. 341 - "Mr. Norton has been influenced by the Tuileries"); Pump Room Hotel, Bath, by Wilson and Wilcox, 1869 (ILN, 10 Jly. 1869, p. 41). On the history of hotels see C. Monkhouse, The station hotel in nineteenth-century England: the genesis of a building type, Thesis (MA), University of London, 1970.

2. EN, 30 Jun. 1871, p. 507; cf. Bldr, 13 May 1865, p. 331, reviewing the Architectural Exhibition: "There is no architecture that is more deserving the attention of the student than that which is practised in the present time in France."
smooth and more delicate roof-forms of the Loire chateaux began to appear in urban architecture too, as meticulously detailed books on the chateaux of France began to be published in France, encouraging a wider range of sources and a more archaeological approach. But these developments belong to another chapter.

The 1860s, the age of 'muscular' Gothic, enjoyed the Louvre and the Hôtel de Ville roofs to the full and did their own experimenting with roof shapes, as at the Scarborough Grand, producing more original variants than were to appeal to later decades. They tended to be hard, angular, many faceted, and much decked with cresting, which was soon to decline in popularity. Inventions like Thomas Turner's roofs for the Lancashire Insurance Co. in Manchester were typical of the decade. Broken up into a mass of chunky sections and with an extraordinary rotunda (a veritable crown) to emphasise the street corner, it triumphantly denied all historic paradigms. This was the vindication of historicism in the mid-century. It was only a point of departure. The French Renaissance was no more than an inspiration for a set of original adventures. The next decades were a bit more accurate.

Before leaving the urban architecture of the 1860s and the Louvresque influence at that time, one final group of buildings must be considered. These were the several blocks of residential chambers which sprang up all over the Grosvenor Estate, Belgravia. Dynasties of both patrons and architects were involved in the Victorian building programmes of the Grosvenor Estate. Much of Belgravia and Pimlico (as with Mayfair) belonged to the immensely

rich Grosvenor family, headed by the Marquesses (later Dukes) of Westminster. For decades they employed successive generations of the Cundy family as their architects. From the accession of the 2nd Marquess in 1845 there had been a policy of refacing properties on both the Grosvenor Estates in London as the leases expired. Thomas Cundy II had usually favoured a Barryesque Italian style in brick with stucco trim. In 1864 there was a sudden change. A new generation was at the helm in the roles of both patron and architect. The 2nd Marquess was not to die until 1869, nor Thomas Cundy II until 1867, but the latter's son was taking over an increasing amount of the design work in the office from the early 1860s, just as Lord Grosvenor (later 3rd Marquess and 1st Duke) was involving himself more and more in matters to do with the family's London property. It was he who invited a group of architects (Thomas Cundy III, E. M. Barry, Kerr, Garling, and Street) to submit designs for the development of a block of land near Knowles's Grosvenor Hotel by means of a couple of criss-cross streets to be called Upper and Lower Grosvenor Gardens.

Inevitably the prevailing tone amongst the five contestants was Parisian. Even Street's designs were French Gothic. Garling's scheme, too, reflected the advance of the Gothic Revival which was to dominate competitions of the 1860s such as that of the Law Courts: his dormers were spiky; there were angle turrets, spired and niched; and the elevations suggested Ruskin's Venice. But the roofs were steep truncated pyramids, bristling with chimneys and cresting, and very reminiscent of his War Office design. Kerr settled for endless tiers of rounded arches topped by the New
Louvre's three pavilion roofs. Of Barry's schemes, only a design for a single town-house, with French roof and no pavilions, in the Brook House vein, has survived.1

It was the younger Cundy's designs that were accepted. They were shown at the Royal Academy in 1864.2 His idea was for a set of long terraces of superior town-houses, surmounted by Louvresque roofs, four pavilions per block. Most were subdivided vertically within in the English manner, the rows of Classical porches belying the palatial unity suggested by the Parisian composition. Some, however, were arranged as flats or "mansions" as they were often called, in the French manner, with each establishment restricted to a single floor, and in this were early cases of a building type which was to catch on in the 1870s and '80s.3 Cundy contrived a certain amount of variety from range to range of these houses by means of brick and terra-cotta decoration to contrast with the prevailing stone; and there was some variation of the Parisian roofs from block to block. As a contrast also to the symmetrical pavilion arrangements of the terraces he provided as a central focus to the view looking north along Lower Grosvenor Gardens, a tall, sculpturally

1. Perspective view sold recently at Sotheby's (photographic copy held by the Historic Places Division of the G.L.C.). I am indebted to the gentlemen of this department for directing my attention to these schemes.
2. ILN, 1 July 1864, p. 507; see also CEAJ, Jun. 1864, p. 156. Perspective views by Cundy of both streets, and dated 1865 are held at the Grosvenor Estate Office, Davies Street, Mayfair, that of Lower Grosvenor Gardens being reproduced in Andrew Saint, "The Grosvenor Estate – II: The Cundy era", CL, 17 Nov. 1977, p. 1477. Designs by the other contestants are held at the Estate Office too.
3. Not without a struggle, see below, pp. 377-61.
irregular grouping of buildings on the corner of Upper Grosvenor Gardens and Ebury Street, rather reminiscent of the corner section of the Langham Hotel. A set of pavilion roofs of different shapes and heights group together in a picturesque and essentially English way. They are truncated pyramids and steep hipped roofs for the most part, but an octagonal ogee dome joins happily in the composition too, and (like the squared ogee dome which Cundy used nearby in Lower Grosvenor Place) reminds us of earlier instances, most notably the Great Western Hotel, where the French and English Renaissances were deliberately brought together. In some blocks he introduced pavilion mansards as well.

Construction of Grosvenor Gardens commenced 1867. The response was favourable, The Builder entering into the prevailing French spirit:

"The Belgrave Mansions are built of pink brick with white stone ornamentation, and with their carved couronnements to windows and doors, their oval, carved, trussed and pedimented lucarnes, their profil de l'entablement, consisting of massive Portland stone cornice, and their casements, mobiles and dormants, present an appearance as thoroughly French as the Tribunal de Commerce on the Boulevard du Palais. First class shops will exhibit their attractive stores on the street level. Over them to the vivid realization of their French character, is an entresol. And above rise the suites of ready-furnished apartments, suitable for the occupation of the wealthiest classes, which have hitherto been unattainable nearer than Paris. The central shop is apportioned as another French feature, a first-class restaurant, from which the lodgers can procure any dish they choose to order, at a fixed price ... In fine, it will be possible to enjoy in these mansions the Parisian mode of life."

1. The original name for Nos. 25-52 Upper Grosvenor Gardens.
Even more enthusiastic was the reception granted to the next addition to the estate, begun 1868. These were huge blocks of mansions (now partly demolished) in Grosvenor Place, opposite the grounds of Buckingham Palace:

"These buildings are some of the superb aristocratic mansions or rather palaces which the Marquis of Westminster is erecting in that part of his town estate between Piccadilly and Pimlico ... Their style of architecture, with the high steep roofs and other characteristic features of the French hotel, or first-rate town house of the 16th century, affords a complete contrast to that of the Georgian era and the Regency in which so many good West-End houses in London were built."

Sixteenth century and "Henri Quatre type" (as The Builder described it) is perhaps a little early, in so far as the composition looks as if it has been taken directly from the Château de Bouflers by Jules-Hardouin Mansart as illustrated in Mariette. It is basically just another three-pavilion composition of Louvre type, but the sections of roof over the corps de logis linking the pavilions are hipped to create a more serrated and active silhouette than the Louvre formula allowed. This method of achieving a greater movement of skyline had, however, been employed since the Place Royale (des Vosges) in Paris, of Henri IV's reign (even Boccador's Hôtel de Ville) so perhaps the building journals were not so silly after

1. *ILN*, 25 July 1868, pp 91-2 (plus illus). BN, 6 Feb. 1869, pp 105-6, did not like the French style, however, nor the treatment of a number of separate establishments as one grand entity like a public building. Grosvenor Place was illus. also in Hitchcock, *ANTC*, p. 234. See also Pevsner, *London I*, p. 580. T. Cundy III did a block of shops for the Marquess of Westminster in Oxford Street (nos 491-7) with truncated pyramid roofs - now demolished (see SL, *XXXIX*, pl. 27b). See below, pp 273-6, for his country house, Park Place.
all. In fact, this roof variant, new to the Victorians but shortly to become popular, could as easily have derived from a whole range of buildings of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But the actual composition here is closest to Bouflers. The Château de Beaumesnil, dating from the end of Louis XIII’s reign was of the type too. It was illustrated in Claude Sauvageot’s book entitled Palais, châteaux, hôtels, et maisons de France du XVᵉ au XVIIIᵉ siècle which began publication, piece-meal, in 1862 and appeared in toto in 1867. This publication marked a new development in the literature of the French Renaissance Revival which was rapidly taken up in actual buildings - an archaeological concern for historical accuracy, at least in detail if not in over-all conception; and also a widening range of sources. Whether Cundy knew of Bouflers in Mariette or of Beaumesnil in Sauvageot we cannot be certain, but he clearly was no longer content, as his predecessors had so often been, to look no further than the Louvre and his own imagination.

The widened range of source material was shortly to include the supremely picturesque Loire châteaux of the early sixteenth century as well as the more regularly exploited seventeenth-century models. Before following urban architecture into this new phase it will be necessary to trace something of the history of the country house and its parallel development from the Rococo of the 1830s to the imitation Loire château.

1. A review of the earliest sections appeared in CEAJ, Nov. 1862, p. 357. See also below, pp 335, 433, 435.
CHAPTER FOUR: Houses I: 1830 -1865

As with public and commercial architecture the synthesis of Gothic and Classical elements in the French Renaissance styles had some appeal to both camps in the field of domestic architecture. Those interested in French Classical styles were more numerous in the years before 1860 probably because to them French architecture offered the means to compete with the Goths in the important Victorian taste for the Picturesque, while to the Goths themselves France simply offered an expanded vocabulary of motifs. In these early years therefore, certain features of late mediaeval French architecture, such as cone-roofed tourelles and steep, hipped roofs with metal cresting along the ridge, were common enough in Gothic houses where no especially French effect was aimed at; but all-out attempts to reproduce something like a late fifteenth-century chateau were rare. In the earliest years the two sides had been attracted to chronological extremes in the history of French Renaissance architecture: while Gothic architects looked for their details to the late fifteenth century, the first Classical house was Rococo. During the 1850s the gap was to narrow noticeably as characteristic High Victorian eclecticism began to have its effect. By the late 1860s a compromise had been found in the architecture of the reign of Francis I and the chateaux of the Loire, a style which had itself achieved so delightful a balance between indigenous Gothic and the Classicism of the south. In Scotland, on the other hand, the similarities between the local baronial style and the Loire chateaux had encouraged a rather earlier interest
in chateau-style architecture, but this development deserves separate consideration. In England and Wales the development of the French taste was more diverse to begin with, and perhaps more tentative.

It was not until the 1850s that the French Renaissance style became at all popular in country- or town-house building, though the 1840s did see two precocious essays in the style. Henry Thomas Hope's town-house in Piccadilly has already been dealt with; the country-house was Salvin's Oxon Hoath. The three country-houses which appeared ten years even before these seem somewhat like freaks, yet one of them is likely to have been influential, and all, like the Wyatt brother's interiors, were premonitions of what was to come. Even at this early stage in the mid-1830s the two sides of the story were represented: Pugin's St Marie's Grange, Hants., 1835, is a mini Gothic chateau; Highcliffe Castle, Dorset (formerly Hants), built 1830-4, incorporated late French Flamboyant Gothic features; while Wrest Park, Beds., 1834-9, is entirely French Rococo, both inside and out. In addition to their early dates other circumstances set two of these houses apart from the rest of the French Renaissance Revival as it was to develop in Britain in the remainder of the century. Wrest Park's full-blown Rococo was never to be repeated in country-house architecture, with the exception of a mansion on the Cote d'Azur designed in the 1890s by an Englishman \(^1\); its scholarship, too, was rarely equalled. Highcliffe

\(^1\) See below, pp 482-3.
too was unique in that it incorporated into its fabric features which had been removed bodily from an actual French chateau. This was to happen often enough throughout the century in the case of interior panelling, chimney-pieces and furniture, but not with features of the exterior.

Charles Stuart, the owner of the Highcliffe estate, a grandson of George III's prime-minister, the 3rd Earl of Bute, was a talented diplomat, with experience in Portugal, St Petersburg, Rio de Janeiro and Paris. He was also a romantic, it seems, and a francophile, for he chose on being ennobled the title Lord Stuart de Rothesay. He was certainly a man of taste, and numbered amongst his friends during his years as English ambassador in Paris the connoisseur and collector, Lord Yarmouth, later the third Marquess of Hertford, already encountered as adviser in matters of taste to George IV. Together Stuart and Yarmouth haunted the sale-rooms of Paris, Lord Stuart acquiring much furniture from Malmaison and other houses, and from the sale of the effects of the executed Marshall Ney. He purchased complete Rococo rooms from dismantled mansions, and finally the dismembered remains of the chateau of Les Andelys in Normandy.

According to Lady Waterford, Lord Stuart's daughter, the

---

1. Christopher Hussey, CL, 8 May 1942, p. 902 (see also CL, 24 Apr. 1942, pp 806-9; 1 May 1942, pp 854-7) claims that Lord Stuart saw the chateau being demolished in 1830 and bought the materials on the spot. In fact, the chateau was being demolished ten years earlier according to Cotman and Turner, Architectural antiquities of Normandy, I, p. 13, where it is illus. (pl. 15, reproduced Archt, 29 Nov. 1895). It was also illus. during demolition in Nodier's Voyages pittoresques ... Ancienne Normandie, II, pl. 194, pp 132-3. It seems likely that the pieces from Andelys were brought to England in 1824 on termination of Stuart's first term of office in Paris. They lay about on the lawn until 1830.
Highcliffe property had included a very ordinary Georgian house, "two bow windows, two rooms between"\(^1\). Renovations by Stuart had begun as early as 1808, but for the next twenty years he was hardly in England, so progress was slow. When he returned from Paris he brought with him not only a substantial part of Les Andelys and various fragments from Jumièges with which to deck the exterior at Highcliffe, but also Rococo panelling for installation inside in the drawing room and the Octagon\(^2\).

From Les Andelys came some of the detailing of the three window-strips to the right of the garden entrance, slung diagonally across the inner angle of the L-shaped plan. The mouldings of the upper-floor windows have the rounded corners characteristic of much fifteenth- and sixteenth-century French Renaissance work, numerous Norman examples of which had been illustrated in the 1820s by sketching antiquaries like A. C. Pugin and John Sell Cotman. Here at Highcliffe they were original, delicately decorative, Norman examples of a motif which was to be taken up enthusiastically by British architects working in the French Renaissance style in ensuing decades. The window-strip arrangement itself, wherein the fenestration of two or more storeys is linked vertically by pilasters, often continuous from ground floor to dormer, was also a distinctive feature of early French Renaissance architecture, giving an upward

---

Gothic thrust to the elevations despite Classic detailing. Although
the entire window-strips at Highcliffe did not come from Les Andelys,
the architect succeeded in this centre bay in reproducing quite well
the effect of this feature even though the windows were linked by
buttress-like mouldings, crocketed at the top, rather than the more
usual Classical pilasters; and, as was to be common amongst nine¬
teenth-century exponents of the style, the windows are too close
together. Window-strips are, after all, seen at their most striking
where single strips articulate an otherwise unbroken wall-space, as
for example on the stark bastions at Chambord. The life style of
the nineteenth century, and even of the later Renaissance, could
rarely accept this limited fenestration, and accordingly the
window-strip motif when used by the Victorians had a reduced impact.
In the east and south wings at Highcliffe they are attempted again,
over-­looking the garden from the drawing-room and the service
quarters, but there is insufficient height to achieve success

Also from Les Andelys came a quantity of small decorative
details on the exterior of the porch itself, mouldings, medallions,

1. These are square-headed unlike the French importation. Rounded
corners were intended for the lower windows in proposed east and
south towers according to a drawing of the garden elevation of ca.
1834 held at RIBAD (K5/14(5)). Neither the round corners to the
windows, nor the upper sections of the towers were executed, and
instead of the towers there were simply Tudorish bow-windows of
the same height as the rest of the wings, which much reduced the
French feeling of the house. The above drawing is one of six
(RIBAD K5/14(1-6)). They include 3 plans; entrance, garden,
and side (west) elevations. No. 4 (entrance elevation) has a
flap showing alternative treatment of a tower to the left of the
entrance.
and the like. Highcliffe’s greatest gem was, however, the Andelys oriel. This had elicited much enthusiasm from Cotman and Turner when they saw it on the original chateau in Normandy\(^1\). As Clutton was to point out later, oriels were not really very common in French Renaissance work\(^2\). Nonetheless a few examples did exist, the Andelys specimen being one of the best; and it was a feature which the British in the 1830s found consistent with their fondness for all such projections (round towers, bay windows) which might catch the maximum of sunshine throughout the day and at the same time lend plasticity and movement to an elevation. Oriels were to be found in Tudor and Scottish Baronial architecture, both of which styles were attracting some attention during the 1830s, but this French example was a good deal more decorative than was its typical British counterpart\(^3\).

In considering the French importations at Highcliffe one must not overlook the importance of the contribution of the English

---

2. Op. cit., p. 64. Windows tended to face inwards on to courts, he argued somewhat desperately, and therefore did not need to collect the rays of the sun from more than one aspect.
3. Thomas Worthington's competition design for the Manchester Assize, 1859 (sketch of elevation in possession of Thomas Worthington & Sons, Manchester), employed, somewhat incongruously, a very similar oriel as the main feature of each of the terminal pavilions of the main facade. One wonders if Worthington was familiar with the Andelys oriel as illus. in Cotman. A contemporary, however, linked it with a similar example in Nuremberg, (BN, 6 May 1859, pp 421-2; the Nuremberg example was illus. BN, 7 Jan. 1876, p. 23).
architect employed by Lord Stuart, for it was he who made the house, in spite of the pieces from Les Andelys, into an essentially English building, less atypical of late Georgian Britain than one might have expected. This architect was W. J. Donthorne. As well as designing some creditable imitation French Renaissance detailing himself

38B (particularly the Flamboyant canopy arch for the great entrance porch) and taking casts from the old French material to make replicas, Donthorne arranged the imported French fragments into a scheme which was very much his own. The older house had to be incorporated into the scheme but Donthorne was not much inhibited by it when planning the new one. There is a close similarity in the use of long entrance hall leading to central octagon, with rooms going off at oblique angles, with Donthorne's design for Marham, residence of H. Villebois.

A pair of drawings which survive at the R.I.B.A. and which appear to relate to Highcliffe show that the architect's approach to the problem of incorporating Lord Stuart's French spoils was, to begin with, indecisive. A Georgian Gothic church-like entrance and a few frilly parapetted towers (not to mention the Andelys oriel) are combined discordantly with simple, cubic, Classic blocks. Even in the final version the feeling of the house is not French so much as Tudor Gothic. It has something of the low, strung-out picturesqueness

1. The Companion to the Almanac, 1839 (quoted in CEAJ, 1839, p. 4), presumably referred to the French detailing when it described the exterior as "not a little remarkable". Highcliffe was exhibited at the R. A., 1835.
2. RIBAD K5/2(5).
3. RIBAD J8/17(2-3).
of Wilkins, for example, at Tregothnan or Dalmeny, and illustrates thus the link noted previously between English and French Renaissance architecture. The entrance porch on the north side of the L plan's outer angle led directly into a magnificently theatrical Great Hall. This, with its stained-glass window from St Vigor's, Rouen, and its double staircase was Donthorne's masterpiece, and it recalled not Wilkins, but Beckford's Fonthill. Indeed, Lady Waterford wrote that Donthorne had "a silly desire to build a house that would emulate Fonthill or Ashridge". He had in fact trained under Jeffry Wyatt (before he called himself Wyatville) in the days when he was completing James Wyatt's work at Ashridge. The Stuart ladies had, on the whole, a low opinion of Donthorne and his work at Highcliffe:

"I think Domthorne's (sic) want of knowledge as an architect and want of taste have become more and more apparent," wrote a despairing Lady Stuart to her husband. She did not share his romance and the growing taste for Gothic:

"If you see Domthorne, tell him of my horror of his points and pinnacles, especially as he promised to diminish the height of these useless make-believe chimneys and belfries."  

Highcliffe, now sadly demolished, belonged to the early years of the nineteenth century when the recognition that the Gothic style had its origins on foreign not English soil was encouraging an interest in continental examples. At the same time there had been developing a concern for archaeological accuracy, first seen in the

1. Pevsner and Lloyd, Hampshire, p. 292. AM, IV, 1837, p. 600, maintained that "the entrance hall is sufficiently large to contain the old church, Marylebone."

publications of antiquaries such as John Carter. More accurate than Highcliffe a house could hardly be where its Andelys details were concerned; yet at the same time Donthorne's treatment of them was akin to the approach of contemporary decorators to the French Renaissance. Like the Louis Quatorze shop fronts of the 1830s and '40s, the French motifs, genuine though they might be, were applied to the surface only. Highcliffe looks back over the late years of Georgian Gothick as much as it looks forward to the French Renaissance Revival. Certainly A. W. N. Pugin found when he visited the house that it perpetuated the "bad management and want of knowledge" typical, in his estimation, of early nineteenth-century practice. He wrote to E. J. Willson, 4th January, 1836, that Donthorne

"could not have had the slightest idea of Gothic architecture as he has turned Norman capitals upside down to serve for bases to the latest style of Louis 12 and Francis I., and made sad havoc with everything."

Apparently Pugin was prepared to countenance François Premier decoration only for furniture and the title-pages of books. On the other hand, late French Gothic was acceptable for domestic architecture - even for his own house.

St Marie's Grange was built on a site near Salisbury in 1835. Though more deliberately mediaeval than Highcliffe it warrants some consideration here because the high roof types it employed,

and particularly those added to it in later years, were common in Renaissance work in France despite their origins in Gothic architecture. St Marie’s Grange, therefore, anticipated innumerable houses from the 1850s onwards which made picturesque use of steep, wedge-shaped roofs and conetopped tourelles, sometimes in conjunction with Renaissance detailing, sometimes in more purely Gothic arrangements. The house as built was only slightly French, as can be seen from a drawing sent by Pugin in July 1835 in another letter to 39C Willson and made on the day the house was ready for the family to move in. This shows a steep, hipped roof with metal ridge-crested after the French manner and a couple of pyramidal roofs over the sacristy and the lavatory tower. Alterations to this were carried out some time before 1876, and possibly by Pugin himself as early as 1841 in a bid to make the house in which he could no longer live more saleable. These changes have somewhat diminished the Frenchness of the south side of the house: the lavatory tower has been tile-hung and Tudoresque bay windows have been added to what was once the chapel. On the east front, however, the effect is even more French than formerly, for, despite the engulfing of the sacristy with its pyramid roofs by an extension which provided an orthodox staircase (there had been only a spiral), corridors, and extra bedrooms lacking in the original rigorously mediaeval arrangement,

1. Fowler Collection, Johns Hopkins University (reproduced in Phoebe Stanton’s Pugin, p. 15). It includes a plan. A similar plan and sketch were published in AR, IV, 1898, p. 160 (reproduced in Hitchcock, EVA, pl. VIII, 7; and in Roger Dixon and Stefan Muthesius, Victorian Architecture, London, 1978, fig. 31 (erroneously said to come from AR, 1904)).
there was added to the north-west corner a round tourelle with tall cone roof, swept at the eaves in a very French manner. This marries very nicely with the original steep roof. Equally French had been an earlier scheme, illustrated in Ferrey's biography of Pugin\(^1\). This showed more clearly the extent to which Pugin had been influenced by late mediaeval French examples for the over-all concept of the house, in a way that Donthorne at Highcliffe had not. The antiquarian researches of Pugin senior for his *Specimens of the Architectural antiquities of Normandy* (1828) had not been unfelt by his son. Here at St Marie's Grange we find, for the first time in Britain, an assortment (albeit a modest one) of steep, hipped roofs, and pyramids such as was to become so characteristic of the French Renaissance Revival at its height; and, considering the notoriety of its architect, one might assume, perhaps, that Pugin's house was not without influence on what followed.

Highcliffe and St Marie's Grange were the products of the interest of the Gothicists in late French mediaeval architecture and the early Renaissance. The Classicists' interest in France, by contrast, focused on the France of the eighteenth century. Wrest

---

Park, the third of the French houses of the 1830s, was not only French Rococo indoors, as was many another house at this time; it was French Rococo outdoors as well. It was designed by its owner, the 2nd Earl de Grey, one of the last of the great amateurs in the eighteenth-century tradition. He well deserved the honour of being the first president of the Institute of British Architects, newly founded in 1834, the year Wrest Park was begun. A sketch-book and two documents in the earl's own hands which have been discovered in recent years make his involvement in the project indisputable. On this matter the two manuscript documents are particularly illuminating. One, a History of Wrest House, dated 1846, was written by the earl in the form of a letter to his daughter Anne (Lady Cowper); the other, The memoirs of the Earl de Grey, was completed in June 1859 shortly before his death. From these we learn that the earl had full command of all matters of design:

"I was, as you know, strictly and in every sense of the word my own architect," he wrote to his daughter. "I had vanity enough to think that I knew enough to enable me to make such a place as would suit me; and taste enough, or at least (was) sufficiently pertinacious and obstinate, to carry out my own views whether good or bad as well as any other person could for me; I also felt that I had such sufficient knowledge of the mechanical constructive branches as would prevent

---

1. These, plus the sketch-book, Views of Wrest (1831), are in the possession of the earl's descendant, Lady Lucas, of Sutton Scotney, Hants. Transparencies of the sketches are held at the Bedfordshire County Record Office (slides 1653 - 1699), plus a transcript of the accompanying text (CRT 130 Silsoe 4). Transcripts of the other two documents are held there also (CRT 190/45/2). All page numbers refer to transcripts, not to originals. AM, III, 1836, p. 531, reported that "His Lordship (i.e. Grey) is, we are informed, his own chief, if not sole architect."
me from building a house merely to fall down again."

He had, he pointed out, a little experience:

"As I had seen enough of the sort of attention paid by a professional architect (after the first plan was decided upon), when I was so much in communication with Mr. Nash during the building of the United Service Club; and found that all was delegated to some clerk, I thought I knew as much as the latter; and resolved to act for myself."[2]

But the earl's involvement was not limited to matters of design:

"I was up every ladder and upon every scaffold from early morning till dusk; ... we finished it so as to get in to reside in October 1839."

Lord de Grey was prepared to draw the line somewhere, however:

"There were things respecting which I frankly acknowledged my utter ignorance, viz. prices of materials, value of men's wages, custom of trade and business and so forth; and I looked out for some young man brought up to the business of an architect, who should receive such an amount of salary as we might agree upon at a monthly or yearly rate; and who should have no interest (except the duration of the work and his consequent employment by me) as to whether my works cost £1000 or £100,000."[7]

The man who was chosen and who carried out the role of clerk of works

1. History, p. 3.
2. See also Memoirs, p. 46, where the earl claimed "without naivety that (he) knew as much about construction and contrivance as Mr Nash and his clerks." He had been chairman of the Building Committee for the United Service Club when its premises were being planned by Nash.
3. History, p. 3. In Memoirs, p. 50, he wrote, "I was a bit of a hand at most sort of trades myself, a very fair carpenter, and painter; I might perhaps have laid a brick; but I never had been a stone-mason." This did not prevent him from showing the mason where he had gone wrong in relation to some cupids for the garden front.
4. History, p. 3. All this is repeated in slightly different words in Memoirs, p. 46. The man chosen was named there and said not to have "anything to do with taste or design". He was useful, however, for designing unpleasant necessities like pipes and drains (see ECRO drawing L33/162).
to the earl's "greatest satisfaction" was James Clephane, to whom credit has been given until recently for the entire enterprise.

Clephane had only just concluded a similar engagement with Lord Barrington, whose house had been built to designs by his brother.

Lord de Grey's taste for French Rococo interiors was, as we have seen, a not uncommon feature of the time, but his interest in the architecture of eighteenth-century France as well was unique amongst country-house builders. It may have owed something to the original buildings at Wresl Park, and to his ancestor, created 1st Duke of Kent in 1710, who was responsible for their erection and the laying out of the gardens in the style of Le Notre.

The old house itself had been an unstartling example of Georgian Classicism, but the gardens contained a splendid, early eighteenth-century, domed pavilion by Thomas Archer, with a continental Baroque flavour to it. Very likely this edifice strongly influenced the style of Lord de Grey's earliest architectural ventures on the estate. This was a pair of rather Gibbsian lodges for the Shefford entrance to the park. Drawings at Bedford indicate that the earl vacillated

2. The earl himself, noted that the gardens were "in the style of Louis XIV, and everything seemed to point out that as the characteristic of the house." (Memoirs, p. 45).
3. Drawings of it appeared in the sketch-book. Grey recorded (Memoirs, p. 45) that he had considered initially building the new house on the old site - pulling down half and living in the other while part of the new one was going up. Designs for such a scheme were drawn up by the earl's friend, "Mr. Shaw, the architect" - presumably John Shaw. One wonders what concessions to the earl's French tastes were to be found in this exercise in light of Shaw's later work. The idea was abandoned, however, as too inconvenient.
somewhat between the claims of the French and British eighteenth-
centuries. A preliminary drawing shows a distinctly French edifice
with *œil-de-boeuf* dormer, long French casement doors, and elegantly
dix-huitième gates attached. This was dated March 1829. A second
drawing which represents the lodges as they were built shows the
*œil-de-boeuf* replaced by a pedimented attic window, and a reduction
of ornament. Otherwise the design is clearly for the same building. About the same time, or possibly earlier, the Countess de Grey, the
then owner of Wrest Park had had her nephew, Lord Grantham (as the
earl then was), design for her another pair of lodges and a gate for
the Silsoe entrance to the estate. Here we see the germ for the
house itself. Lord de Grey recounted to his daughter:

"When I was in Paris in 1822 (I believe) I was very much struck
with some of the little summerhouses looking on to the boule-
vars, and thought that they might be made into very pretty
lodges."

The resulting Silsoe Lodges

"looked so well and appropriate when finished that I felt quite
confirmed as to the taste and the style of the architecture
if ever I built a new house."

1. BCRO drawings L33/181 (French version) and L33/182. There is
some confusion over the Shefford Lodges. The sketchbook contains
an illus. (BCRO slide 1686) which is labelled by the accompanying
text (in what seems to be the earl's own hand), "The Shefford
Lodge. Built by the Countess de Grey about 1816 from a design by
Lord Grantham" (i.e. Grey before he succeeded to the earldom, for
his aunt, the then owner of Wrest Park). The illus. of the lodge is
not at all like the Shefford Lodge as built but much more cottagy
like the Gravenhurst Lodge. The text to the sketch-book was clearly
compiled many years after the sketches were done and is perhaps
unreliable. Besides, the earl elsewhere claimed that the Silsoe
Lodges were "the first effort of my genius" (Memoirs, p. 45). Those
he dated at 1827 in the sketch-book text.

suggests the lodges at the entrance to Chantilly Stables by J. Aubert
When it came to designing the house itself, Grey found that direct observation of French buildings was not enough. He tried copying windows, the staircases and other details "in the old French style" at the Hotel Meurice where he was staying in 1825, but

"could not follow the strange and fantastical curves... I spoke to our poor friend Garwood to endeavour to find me some young architect or at all events to get me a list of French architectural works which might assist me. He did get me some names of books and with my list in my hand and a pencil and drawing book in my pocket, I started to the Bibliothèque Royale."

He copied and traced industriously and created thereby the "embryo plans" of Wrest Park. In due course the earl acquired his own copies of some of the books:

"One book called Architecture Francaise was most valuable; it was a collection of prints from all such works by many masters."

The fact that the entrance front of Wrest Park seems to owe a debt to the Hôtel de Matignon, Paris, by J. Courtonne, suggests that this book was J.F. Blondel's publication of 1752-6 rather than the similarly titled ones by Mariette and Marot. On the other hand, without a doubt the gates and corner pavilions to the walled garden at Wrest have their source in the facade and porte cochère of the Hôtel de Clermont, as illustrated in Mariette's Architecture Françoise. The Wrest garden elevation derives from a palace near Besançon designed by Blondel himself, in yet

Footnote continued from page 142
2. Memoirs, p. 45. In History (p. 2), clearly referring to the same work, he said it was in three volumes (Mariette was in three, Blondel four) and cost him 60 francs; "It was my textbook for many a year".
another work, his earlier publication, the *Maisons de plaisance*, published 1737-8. Lord Grey paid a fitting tribute to French seventeenth- and eighteenth-century architects and draughtsmen when he installed over the south door in the staircase hall a decorative cartouche in plaster, celebrating the arts and architecture, complete with palette, brushes, T square and dividers: flanking figures recline upon tomes labelled 'Blondel', 'Mansart', and 'Le Pautre'.

Simon Houfe illustrates how subtly the design for the Hôtel de Matignon, a city building on a restricted site, has been adapted for the rural situation at Wrest: the number of bays has been increased and the elaborate ornamentation has been much simplified as befits a building seen principally from a distance. Much of Courtonne's design has been retained however - the central, projecting oval entrance with its Rococo pavilion roof, the quoins, the balcony, the segment-headed windows. This general simplicity recurs on the garden front, the grandeur of Blondel's palatial design being toned down by the replacement of the pediment by an

---

1. J.-F. Blondel, *De la distribution des maisons de plaisance et de la décoration des édifices en général*, Paris, 1737-8, I, pp 110-1, & pl. 19-20. A copy of this book was sold in 1917 during the sale of the house and effects at Wrest Park (see sale catalogue (dated 10 Sep. 1917), p. 65, a copy of which is held at BCRO (L33 L list, 151)). Although a catalogue of the Earl de Grey's library was compiled for him in 1858 by John Edward Martin (see receipt for fees (£10) dated 1 Jan. 1858, BCRO L33 L list, 137) I am unable to trace a copy. Simon Houfe of Ampthill, Beds., owns a number of French architectural books from the Wrest Park library, but I have not been able to ascertain their titles. In any case, it is difficult apparently to establish when they were acquired. Some may have been in the family since the days of the Duke of Kent.
arrangement of sculpture and *rocaillle*, by J. E. Carew, which merely hints at pedimental construction and resembled similar arrangements which appeared in Blondel and elsewhere\(^1\). This alteration and the substitution of a simple cornice and an attic storey with a row of small, segment-headed dormers in the lower slope of a slate-covered mansard roof in place of Blondel's balustrade, give an air of unpretentiousness which belongs to an age turning increasingly to comfortable, spacious living instead of palatial formality. It is a much lower mansard than was typical of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century originals and seems to look forward to the many Victorian houses of non-descript Classical origins that added such attic storeys partly for the sake of fashion and partly to gain an extra room. Small, depressed, squared domes cap the corner pavilions of Wrest's garden front in place of Blondel's hip roofs, hints in miniature of the distended bulbs which were to bloom over Knowles's Grosvenor Hotel twenty-five years later\(^2\).

---

1. Cf. *Maisons de plaisance*, I, pl. 25, p. 133. The effect is not dissimilar to that of the sculptural arrangements on top of the entrance front pavilions at Buckingham Palace, as remodelled by Edward Blore, 1846-8. Interestingly Grey had been asked by Prince Albert to be one of a committee to superintend Blore's alterations. In his *Memoirs* (p. 66) Grey typically recorded his scorn for Blore, his admiration for Thomas Cubitt, the contractor, and also the fact that "Oliver (?) who had (been) my clerk of the works for seven years at Wrest was the clerk of the works under Blore." Behind the sculptural arrangements of the terminal pavilions were small truncated pyramid roofs - surely the earliest in Britain, though, being barely visible, hardly indicating any deliberate echo of French models. The sculptural pseudo-pediments could, however, indicate an indirect debt to French Rococo, via Wrest Park.

2. They derive from another Blondel design: *Maisons de plaisance*, I, pl. 26, p. 136.
If the outside of Wrest Park betrayed a close acquaintance with eighteenth-century French pattern-books, so did the internal plan. With the exception of the Bowes Museum and Waddesdon Manor, both of which were designed by Frenchmen, no nineteenth-century English chateau paid so much heed to French planning as did Wrest Park. Even so, the result is a compromise between English and French traditions. A passion for privacy seems to be an especially English trait; and this, allied with Puginian insistence on expressive and truthful planning, was to lead in the early Victorian period to a mania for analysis and subdivision in house design. At this none excelled more than William Burn. A Burnian ground-plan was chopped up into a jigsaw of parts. Not only was it held desirable that the exterior express clearly what internal features and functions it could (stairs, chapels, great halls, and so forth) but inside every activity and every social class was allotted its own clearly defined space. This resulted in a number of self-contained sub-units: Burn's most popular invention, the family wing, into which guests might not stray; gentlemen's quarters (smoking and billiard rooms with suitably male decor - even a bachelor's staircase); a separate servant's stair, of course, or even stairs, for strict segregation of the sexes. The whole scheme was tied together with a complex network of corridors. Nothing short of this could ensure absolute comfort, it was felt, or satisfy the British foible for etiquette. Not surprisingly Robert Kerr was to declare that there was nothing

1. For these see Chapter Six. Other houses like Shabden and Impney owed something to more contemporary French planning.
in French planning "from which English architects can take a lesson in respect of home comfort."\(^1\)

The French had no use for corridors. The principal apartments were characteristically in an *en suite* arrangement, one leading into another. Wrest Park, falling chronologically between the Georgian era (when a system not unlike the French one was practised) and the early Victorian period, and influenced from France as well, partook of both systems. From the dining-room, in the south-east corner of the garden front, one passed in the French manner first into an ante-room (which was rapidly taken over by the library as the "Print Room"); thence to the library itself, after which was the central vestibule (originally intended as a billiard room and with access both to the entrance hall and the garden). Beyond that was the drawing room. At this point the English demand for privacy interceded, and communication between drawing room and boudoir (western-most room overlooking the garden, except for the conservatory, and a gem of dainty Rococo decoration) was effected by means of a passage which ran behind this whole suite, serving a more English set of separate rooms along the entrance front. Related to Georgian rather than to French precedent is the central entrance hall, with its splendid double staircase winding up both sides. The French were less concerned than the English with grand staircase effects; certainly they rarely chose a central and symmetrical scheme such as Lord de Grey employed at Wrest Park, and often, as Destailleur

\(^1\) Kerr, *The gentleman's house*, p. 455.
was to do at Waddesdon, settled for relatively insignificant stairs at each end of the house, well away from the entrance. More French, perhaps is the small oval vestibule at Wrest, through which one passes on entering, before reaching the larger hall. Such rounded shapes were popular in French Rococo planning, but had been extensively used in England as well in the Romantic Classicism of Adam and Wyatt. In this case it was part of the debt to the Hôtel de Matignon. It is an ambivalent scheme at Wrest Park which to some extent achieves the advantages of both planning types - the splendid spatial progression of one Rococo room opening into another in the French manner, with, at the same time, the demands of privacy being met where it was felt to be most vital, that is, in the case of the mistress's boudoir. As with the exterior design, Lord de Grey was much involved with the internal decor, and also such finer concerns as the wrought iron work of the balconies, garden terraces and gateways:

"I had my French book always under my hand," he recorded: "referred to them for authority whenever I could find anything to suit me."?

1. Ground floor plans are held at BCRO (L33/151 & 154). Something of the vista effect can be appreciated in a water-colour by Thomas Scandrett (1797-1870) of the Library vestibule looking towards the main entrance through open doors (L33/233). BCRO holds a number of other interior views by Scandrett (L33/219-224) and further drawings of the interior and exterior by Lord de Grey and others (L33/225-232).

2. History, p. 8. He found doors, shutters, panels, rails, but not ceilings. These he designed himself though his first effort "looked like a turbot". On the whole he was pleased with his efforts (see above, p. 42n, for the boudoir). Most of the decor was to some extent of French eighteenth-century type, but one was singled out as "The French Room": "The notion of this room is prettier in idea than in reality - pink with medallions of Watteau-like figures,
That Lord de Grey chose to build a house in the style of the French eighteenth-century was an unsurprising corollary of the flourishing interest in that period's furniture and interior decoration. What is surprising is that no others responded to the same stimulus. One might have expected the position of its owner and architect to have induced imitation of it but none of Lord de Grey's contemporaries seems to have been much interested in the Rococo as an architectural as opposed to a simply decorative style. If the house at Wrest Park, and more especially the flat-roofed orangery (1851), all fruit-swags and tassels and pilasters with rose-spilling baskets for capitals, had heirs at all (and no direct influence is likely) they are to be found in the 1890s and later, as much in book illustration as in stone and mortar. Of contemporary kin, however, the closest in spirit would appear to have been the splendidly Baroque, though not especially French, gateway, the only slightly less violent garden terraces, and the prodigious stair-case

Footnote continued from page 148
as like a Sèvres cup as we could make them" (History, p. 14). The iron work of the terrace he admitted taking from his 60 franc book (History, p. 16), and one drawing for a rail (BCRO L33/205) virtually replicates that in Maisons de plaisance, II, pl. 53b, p. 57. This was used for a garden-front balcony. Debts of gates can also be traced to Blondel, not, however, his Architecture Francaise. Drawings relating to Wrest Park house and garden buildings at BCRO are numbered L33/150-209.

1. Pevsner, Bedfordshire, p. 173, calls the orangery "a very dissolute design". Drawings of it at BCRO (L33/189-190) show the date 1851 over the central doorway though it is not there on the actual building. L33/190 has the watermark 1845. The greater vigour of the orangery makes the late date likely. It was probably inspired by an amalgam of designs in Blondel's books. Wrest Park now houses the National Institute of Agricultural Engineering - gardens now open to public at weekends.
at Harlaxton, Lincs, created for Gregory Gregory probably in the 1840s. The gate and garden architecture are from the office of William Burn. David Walker suggests that the hand of John Bryce was behind them; and one might have assumed that whoever was capable of creating them could also have produced the stair, were it not for the fact that Jill Allibone has discovered evidence that Anthony Salvin, who had worked on the house until 1838, had visited Munich and Southern Germany during those years. Certainly there is a look of Bavarian Rococo to the Harlaxton stair¹. Perhaps the Burn office inherited a range of drawings from Salvin for all these features. On the other hand the fact that the iron railings of the back stair were copied directly from Blondel² reminds one (though the practice was common enough amongst architects no doubt) of a book of tracings of such designs by David Bryce which has survived and perhaps dates from this time when Bryce was Burn's partner³. Not only are closely similar stair rails included, taken from Blondel along with parterres and Rococo architectural ornaments, but much space was allocated also to the architectural fantasies of Juste Aurèle Meissonnier. Meissonnier could well have been

². Or Briseux? See J.-F. Blondel and C. E. Briseux, Motifs de ferrermerie ancienne des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, Paris, n.d. (19..?), pl. 28. This is a collection of facsimile drawings, but the sources are not specified. The Harlaxton designs do not come from Blondel's Maisons de plaisance or Architecture Francaise, or from Briseux's L'Art de bâtir des maisons de campagne, 1761.
³. Examples of ornamental sculpture, held in the Bryce Collection, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri. See below, pp 425-6.
the starting point for the Baroque excesses at Harlaxton. Be that as it may, Burn and Bryce were to make their contribution to the French Renaissance Revival in the 1850s and '60s, both employing the French Rococo interior. But there was never any hint of the Harlaxton Baroque in Burn's work and only slightly more in that of Bryce¹. As for Salvin, whatever his role with regard to the disputed stair, he was responsible for the rather French remodelling of Oxon Hoath, near Tonbridge, Kent, in 1846-7, the residence of Sir William Geary, 3rd Bt. This was partly in a Baroque style.

The French Renaissance roofs which Salvin added to Oxon Hoath included a rather eighteenth-century dome which does, perhaps, look back to Wrest Park. Even so, it was a scheme more precocious than backward-looking and had been accepted as the work of Burn and McVicar Anderson of 1878, until Jill Allibone unearthed designs for the house in the R.I.B.A. collection, which she attributes to Salvin². The house as built (and even more the scheme of the

1. See below, p.207.
2. John Newman, *West Kent and the Weald*, Harmondsworth, 1969, p. 581, attributes the remodelling to Burn and McVicar Anderson, but notes Dr Allibone's discovery in an Addenda, p. 645. "So what did Burn and McVicar Anderson do in 1878?" he asks. The answer is the addition of a billiard room on the east side, and the closing in of the gazebo on ground level of the south-east tower, converting it into a small sitting-room (possibly smoking-room) with access into the billiard room. This is made clear from a plan of the warming arrangements dated Sept. 2nd 1870, and now in the possession of the owners Mr and Mrs H. M. Bayne-Powell. This shows the arrangement of the main rooms as they are today except for the absence of the billiard room, while the gazebo is shown without internal communication with the rest of the house. The Drawings at RIBAD, W8/35 (1-4), consist of: 1. a view of the W. & S. fronts; 2. a view of the S. & E. fronts; 3. a view of the W. (entrance) front; 4. sketch with measurements of N. wall of library, plus sketch for a finial.
drawings) was precocious because it brought together in the one building a range of French Renaissance features drawn from both the early, more Gothic period (as was the case with St Marie's Grange) and from the Classical seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as at Wrest Park. This was not at all the general rule until the late 1860s. The arrangement of these diverse roof motifs, and the massing of the house in general are, however, essentially early Victorian. The assorted French roofs are scattered; they do not work together with any force to build up around some focal point a total effect which is unified, dramatic or picturesque, as was the aim of the '60s and '70s. Part of Salvin's scheme was not executed (probably for lack of money), but not even the complete arrangement as seen in the R.I.B.A. drawings achieves the unity of the High Victorian ideal. There had originally been a mid-seventeenth-century house on the site which was replaced by the late Georgian ragstone building, five bays by seven, which can be seen in an engraving after a drawing by J. G. Wood, held at the house (ca. 1800). The most notable feature of the Salvin additions was the large dome already mentioned over the bowed garden front, the fenestration detailing of which he also altered, reducing the number of mullions and transoms of the sash windows. The dome has something of the flavour of a band-rotunda to it. It is octagonal and rises to a crown of metal cresting. The convex slope is broken to insert a concave strip half way up its height. It would appear to be a free and vigorous interpretation of the same sort of fancy, eighteenth-century dome which Wrest Park had reproduced so much
more faithfully ten years earlier. In Victorian hands the motif has become swollen as would other characteristic roof shapes, the squared dome, the truncated pyramid, in ensuing decades. The lower slope of the Oxon Hoath dome has been made big enough, like that of a mansard, to accommodate dormer windows on the front facets of the octagon. To the east of this dome-capped bow Salvin met the Victorian demand for picturesque asymmetry by adding a square tower which rises a storey higher than the main body of the house, and is roofed with a genuine mansard, like those on the Silsoe Lodges at Wrest Park, and probably the first such to adorn a Victorian house as a deliberate revival of French Classicism. The upper floors of the tower contain bedrooms, while the ground floor was originally the open, round-arched gazebo (already referred to) without access to the interior till the 1870s. Between the dome and the tower, and around the rest of the main part of the house as well, the cornice is enlivened by the capricious way in which pediments, some distance separated from the upper-floor windows, break upwards into it, recalling the similar, but far more brilliant, effects of Delorme and

1. Octagonal bell-shaped domes appeared on a number of buildings in early seventeenth-century France, notably churches, e.g. the church of the Jesuit College (later St Paul and St Louis), Paris (1625-41); St Etienne du Mont, Paris (1610-25). But they lack the break half way up the slope which links the Oxon Hoath dome more closely with those of the eighteenth century. Besides, Salvin is less likely to have been familiar with them (unless from visits to Paris) than with the eighteenth-century sort which was illustrated by Blondel and others. A similar sort of dome was used on the conservatory at Alton Towers, Staff., by Robert Abraham, way back in 1820 (see Pevsner, Staffordshire, p. 58 & pl. 75). Amongst contemporaries it is, apart from Wrest Park, closest to the dome which W. E. Gingell put on his Bristol General Hospital (see above, p. 81n).
Bullant. Certainly it was from the sixteenth century, or even the fifteenth, that the other French devices of Salvin’s scheme derived. There was a small and separate, very steep, hipped roof, like a wedge and bearing a central, rather Classical dormer, over the main entrance. This has been removed unfortunately, though even when there it was hardly equal to its single-handed contest against the dullness of the Georgian facade; for the tower with steep, pyramidal roof and cartouche which Salvin sketched in to the left of the five-bay entrance front, and also another, smaller tower to the extreme left over the service extensions, were never built.

Salvin was to use an octagonal dome on another remodelling of a Georgian house in the French taste. This was Marbury Hall, the Cheshire seat of James Hugh Smith-Barry. It is a simpler dome than that at Oxon Hoath, and would appear to indicate direct influence (an early case for a country-house) of the contemporary work at the Louvre in Paris. The date of the Marbury alterations is 1856-8. Here Salvin’s earlier, somewhat random interest in the French Renaissance has become focused upon the architecture of the reign of Louis XIII or early Louis XIV, partly as a result of the much publicised Parisian project... Even so it was perhaps some vestige of the eighteenth-century taste, as manifested in the Oxon

1. RIBAD W8/35 (3). The smaller tower rises over the northern extremity of the service block, probably to skylight the old billiard room in the upper portion of this wing. The interior arrangement of the apartments was probably not much altered by Salvin, though there are various distinctively nineteenth-century details, such as the coved and sky-lit stair, and assorted reminders of the Rococo Revival, e.g. heavy, gilt, Rococo pelmets and a lavishly French Rococo chimney-piece.  
Hoath dome, that made Salvin chamfer the corners of both bay and squared dome of Louvre-type thus converting them into an octagon. Otherwise a debt seems likely to the central pavilions of the New Louvre, or to their prototypes in the Pavillon de l’Horloge and the Tuileries. The placing of the pediment below the roof, rather than breaking up into it, resembles in particular the central pavilion of the Tuileries by Le Vau (1665). This rather Parisian pavilion and dome form the centre-piece to the symmetrical park front at Marbury, replacing a giant-order, tetrastyle, Ionic portico. The old building already had advancing pavilions at each end of this garden front thus making its conversion into a Louis XIII facade, with characteristic a-b-a pavilion arrangement a simple matter.

The material was brick, where the French would more likely have used stone, but the window dressings, string-course, pediment and columns at the garden-door of the bow, as well as the strongly pronounced quoins, typical of the early seventeenth century of François Mansart and others, were all in stone. Some of these features belonged to seventeenth-century England as well as France, however; the red brick plays up the ambivalence of many of Marbury’s features. The 1850s were early days for the Queen Anne Revival, yet, like its contemporary, Wellington College, Marbury Hall does seem to reflect an upsurge of interest at that time in the seventeenth century not only of France but of England too, suggesting a closer tie between the French Renaissance Revival and the Queen Anne movement than is usually recognised. Like Wellington College (as well

2. For further discussion of this question see chapter seven.
as the Oxon Hoath tower) Marbury Hall boasted one of the earliest examples in Britain of a genuine, double-pitched mansard roof, studded with dormers, as a deliberate bit of historicism. This stretched along the central portion of the park front, the wings being equipped with steeper, flat-topped pavilion roofs. Larger wings extended back from the main corps de logis towards the south-west to enclose a courtyard after the manner of a French hôtel.

Marbury's courtyard seems to be a rare case in England of this favourite French arrangement, which probably had its origins in the mediaeval fortress. Many early Renaissance chateaux, being erected on the foundations of older buildings, perpetuated the idea. In the later Renaissance, it became more especially an urban feature - a wall and gate-house along the street often being all that made up the fourth side of the square courtyard. Montagu House (the old British Museum) by Robert Hooke, clearly modelled on French originals, was an isolated instance of the idea in London, dating from the late seventeenth century, which came to public notice when it and its wall and lodges were demolished to make way for Smirke's building during the 1840s. Scott recommended the French court in modern design, but not many took up the idea. W. E.

1. Built originally for the 1st Duke of Montagu, ancestor of the Duke of Buccleuch who, as will be seen below, was to build a mansion of the same name, 1859-62, in the French taste with influence from the New Louvre very much in evidence. The first Montagu House was sold to become the British Museum in 1753 (See J. M. Crook, The British Museum, Harmondsworth, 1973). It was illustrated in Bldr, 31 Aug. 1844, p. 432, and 24 Apr. 1849, p. 199.
2. Secular and domestic architecture, p. 156.
Nesfield's French Gothic scheme for Combe Abbey, near Coventry, Warwicks., (1862) was to have had such an arrangement but only one wing was actually built\(^1\). Scott himself introduced a small carriage-court at Kelham Hall, Notts., (1859-61) but the plan was not in accordance with the ideal which he described in his book. In that scheme one would enter the courtyard by way of a gate-tower in the north wall, directly opposite which would be the principal door-way. Once in the vestibule one would find the staircase to the right, perhaps, great hall to the left and the main rooms ranged across the south front, looking on to terraces of parterres and flower-gardens. Apart from the orientation (the main rooms faced north-east) and the lack of a great hall on the left, this is in fact very much as things were arranged at Marbury Hall. Entrance to the courtyard was gained between a pair of symmetrically positioned square pavilions or lodges, with truncated-pyramid roofs in New Louvre style and oeil-de-boeuf dormer windows. Each pavilion was flanked by the ends of the long wings, which with their low hipped roofs have a very Queen-Anne look to them. Access to the house itself was gained from a centrally-situated door opposite the entrance to the courtyard: a central pavilion advances slightly and contains the door, with a window on each side. Eccentric, steep pyramids on the roof of this advancing section show that Salvin had not entirely forgotten the early Renaissance details which he had mixed with the more Classical features at Oxon Hoath. Even

\(^1\) A pencil sketch ("Bird's eye view shewing proposed alterations, Combe Abbey") is held at V & A (D. 1400-1907); reproduced in Girouard, VCH, pl. 386. Leyswood, Suss., by Norman Shaw, was an example actually built (1866-9).
so Marbury has a greater unity and more coherent massing which makes it the more successful of the two houses.¹

Other Classical houses of the 1850s show the influence of mid-

158, C seventeenth-century France too. The most surprising is Bedgebury Park, Kilndown, Kent, which (as has already been mentioned) R. C. Carpenter, architect of many a Gothic church for the Ecclesiological Society, altered for Alexander Beresford-Hope, no less ardent supporter in public life of the Gothic style². This Gothic taste had been indulged at the Kilndown church which became under Beresford-Hope's patronage a showpiece of Ecclesiological principles, with Carpenter, Butterfield and Salvin all responsible for various details of the interior. Bedgebury Park, by contrast, had been transformed into "a Louis XIV chateau". Hope's belief that with the assistance of high mansard roofs the Classical styles might be able to rival mediaeval architecture for picturesqueness has already been discussed. What is remarkable is his own choice from the history of French building of so singularly unpicturesque a roof-type. The inspiration would appear to have been from chateaux such as Clagny (by J. H. Mansart, 1674-9) and Choisy (J. & J. J. Gabriel, 1684-6), particularly their garden fronts. These were early

¹. Salvin displayed occasional interest in the French Renaissance throughout the rest of his career: County Hotel, Carlisle, 1856-7 (mansard roof, late sixteenth-century French detailing, truncated pyramid roof on tower); alterations to West Cowes Castle, I.O.W., for Royal Yacht Squadron, 1856-7 (steep wedge roof). For drawings for Grantham Lodge, Belvoir Castle (ca. 1855) see below p. 326n.
². For his schemes for Inveraray Castle (1877) see below, p. 230.

2. Completed after Carpenter's death in 1855 by his assistant, William Slater. It is now the Bedgebury, Hollington and Lillesden School for girls.
palatial examples of the trend which was to become common in the
eighteenth century towards a pronounced horizontal emphasis. Both,
though demolished, would have been known to the nineteenth century
from the engravings of Perelle which were published by Mariette.

Apart from a few details of the interior, the French chateau
alterations by Carpenter went no further than the roof, though an
incongruous if rather more picturesque tower with "alpine-looking"
spire, as John Newman describes it, was added at the same time to
the stable block to the right of the main entrance. Originally
there had been on the site a small, two-storeyed, brick house dating
from 1688, which Beresford-Hope's step-father, Marshall Viscount
Beresford, had encased in 1836 in sandstone, adding at the same time
wings across each end to create an H-shaped plan. As the central,
main entrance is marked by a slightly advancing three-bay pavilion
as well, it required only the substitution of a mansard roof for
Lord Beresford's parapet to effect the desired transformation into
a triple-pavilioned, Classical chateau. The original Georgian

1. The longitudinal roof made a rather earlier appearance in urban
hotels, however. The Petit Marot illustrates several examples of
such buildings dating from the mid-seventeenth century which have
the same sort of roof arrangement as Bedesbury Park, i.e. without
the central pavilion (unlike Clagny and Choisy). E.g. Hôtel d'Aumont.
2. J. Mariette, Architecture française, 1727-1738. Choisy appears
in Vol. II (1727); Clagny in Vol. V (1738). Plans and elevations
of Clagny were also published by Michael Hardouin, the contractor,
in 1680 (Livre de tous les plans, profils et élévations ... du
château de Clagny ...). There is also a picture of Clagny in
a volume held by NLS called Collection of French engravings, 1672-89,
by J. Silvestre, J. Le Pautre et al.
lay-out of the apartments within remained untouched; nor can it really
be said that the exterior alterations achieved the effect of a
Louis XIV chateau with any great success. Sir Reginald Blomfield
described Clagny as "dull and commonplace" and Choisy as "a great
lump of a house, overpowered by a heavy mansard roof". Even more
so was Bedgebury Park. Its proportions were not those of its proto-
types. Where Clagny had a facade of 3+5+3+5+3 bays, two storeys
plus attic in height, Bedgebury boasts only 3+2+3+2+3 bays, but
three storeys and a double row of attic dormers in the roof. The
third floor was of course dictated by the house he had inherited,
but the double tier in the roof (not as common in France as it was
in the Netherlands and Germany) shows his Gothic instinct for height
vying with the natural horizontality of the style he was using. The
result is boxiness at the expense of grandeur. Nor was the house
made more interesting by the failure to cover the central pavilion
with its own separate mansard as both Choisy and Clagny did (though
the shortness of the facade probably dictated this), and the absence
of pediments (anathema to Hope) above each pavilion meant a further
loss of grandeur.

Unfortunately Beresford-Hope altered his house too soon: ten
years later he could have done something much more exciting. But
in the earlier 1850s the sort of harmonious amalgamation of Gothic
and Classic motifs which emulation of the Loire-chateau was to offer
to the 1860s was only inadequately understood. Architects of this

1. Blomfield, A history of French architecture, 1661-1774, London,
1921, I, p. 183, & II, p. 58.
decade were more inclined to work in one of the opposing styles or the other, or if interested in both to work out separate designs in each rather than to attempt their combination in a single building.

One architect of the 1850s who showed interest in both the Gothic and Classic aspects of the French Renaissance, but who did not combine the two in the same project, was Philip Charles Hardwick. There was his interest in the broad, quadrangular domes of the age of Louis XIV seen at the Great Western Hotel (1851); and contemporary with this he was busy with some minor alterations in a French Classical mode at St Giles House, Dorset, home of the great philanthropist, 7th Earl of Shaftesbury. As surveyor to the Bank of England, following Cockerell's resignation, Hardwick's first love seems to have been for the Classical styles; yet his extensive country-house practice found him experimenting in a number of diverse modes - Jacobethan, Italianate, Gothic, and amongst these latter, a small group with a distinctly French flavour to them. As early as 1848-51, at Aldermaston Court, his most successful Jacobethan house, he had topped the tower with a highly individualistic roof, half mansard, half spire. More overtly French were certain details of a couple

1. Battlements were replaced by a hipped roof with Classical dormers, while two towers were heightened by an extra storey and capped with truncated pyramid roofs. J. Newman and N. Pevsner, Dorset, Harmondsworth, 1972, p. 471, date the alterations to 1854 and say the towers were removed 1886. Christopher Hussey in a series of articles (CL, 10, 17 & 24 Sep. 1943, pp 464-7, 508-11, 552-5) says (p. 466) that the hipped roof and dormers were added 1850 and the "ornate spires" to the towers in 1860. For the house before alterations see John Hutchins, The history and antiquities of the County of Dorset, 1774, see also CL, 20 Aug. 1904, pp 270-2; 15 & 20 Mar. 1915, pp 336-42, 370-6.
of houses he was working on in the mid-50s. These were The Abbots, Sompting, near Worthing, Sussex, and Addington Manor, Bucks. Both houses sport a quantity of gables and some very English fenestration, including square and round, projecting bays, and mullioned Tudor windows with square hood-moulds above, which relate them to Hardwick's Jacobethan experiments. Yet each has a number of features of roofs and towers, and of fenestration as well, which are consciously French. Both houses have oriels with octagonal, cone roofs, very early examples of what was to be a favourite motif of the French Renaissance Revival in following decades; and Addington had a trio of Flamboyant Gothic dormers across the centre of the entrance front, plus a number of windows with rounded corners. As for the octagonal, cone-roofed oriel this has something of a German look to it, though a prototype can be found in France at the picturesque Château d'O, Argentan, Normandy; and something not too different is to be seen also at the Complègne Hôtel de Ville (well known to the Victorians), not to mention the octagonal, cone-roofed turrets of buildings like Gaillon and Amboise as illustrated in Du Cerceau. Clutton's claim

1. Designs for The Abbots were exhibited at the R.A., 1854. Perspective view of entrance front at RIBAD (U14/6), reproduced in Hermione Hobhouse, "Philip and Philip Charles Hardwick", in Fawcett, Seven Victorian architects, pl. 43. Addington Manor (demolished 1926) was exhibited at the R.A., 1856, and also at the Architectural Exhibition, 1867. See CEAJ, Jun. 1867, p. 159, where it is called "Haddington" and considered less "shapely" than Aldermaston. Drawings held at RIBAD (U14/4(1-3)). On Addington see also Eccles, XVII, 1856, p. 187; Bldr, 1856, p. 273; C. L. Eastlake, A history of the Gothic Revival, edited by J. M. Crook, New York, 1970, appendix, 740.

2. Jacques Androuet Du Cerceau, Les plus excellents bastiments de France, Paris, 1576-9. Gaillon is in vol. I; Amboise in vol. II. On the Complègne Hôtel de Ville, see below, p. 216. Château d'O was
that oriel were not common in French architecture will be recalled. They appealed particularly to creators of pseudo-French houses, however, and the Abbots-Château d'O type appeared time and again in the mid-Victorian years. As well as an oriel of this sort, Hardwick used at The Abbots a long tourelle with octagonal cone-shaped roof, corbelled out on the outer corner of the main tower, where it clings like a surprised insect, more suggestive of an English parish church tower than of a French chateau. Otherwise, apart from the fact that the roof of the main tower itself is a truncated octagonal cone (instead of a steep hip or wedge) this tower and associated tourelle could be related to the Louis XII part of Blois Château, though in that famous example the tourelle is cradled in the inner angle of the tower. When the French applied a long turret of this variety to an outer angle it tended to be of greater girth in association with big expanses of wall, as for instance at Azay or Chenonceaux. On so thin a tower as that at The Abbots it looks unsafe; besides the tower is too high for the house, a typical Victorian fault. Otherwise The Abbots is picturesque enough, but more Tudor than French in its over-all conception and a trifle fussy; Hardwick seems not to have appreciated the power of blank spaces. Even so, it is an advance on the horror vacui of Aldermaston's lacy surfaces.

Footnote continued from page 162
ev eventually illus. in Gustave Eyrîès and Paul Perret, Les châteaux historiques de la France, Paris, 1877-81, III.
1. E.g. Tyntesfield; The Towers; Wyfold Court. See chapter six.
2. Blois and Chenonceaux were both in Du Cerceau, Op. cit., II. The Louis XII tower at Blois was in Müller, Sketches of the age of Francis Ist, pl. 17. Clutton, Domestic architecture of France,
Like The Abbots, Addington, built 1856-7 for J. G. Hubbard, Governor of the Bank of England and later Lord Addington, was an example of that favourite Victorian device, partial symmetry. As at The Abbots, there were two gables with a taller tower to the left; but at Addington two smaller towers (which help tie the bigger one into the total composition in a way not achieved at The Abbots) were placed symmetrically between the gables, and separated by the range of dormers. These small towers were machicolated and pyramid-roofed. Apart from these, the round-cornered windows on the entrance front, and the oriel overlooking the garden, there is little French about the detailing of the house, yet a considerable chateau feeling is imparted in the perspective view from the north-west in the R.I.B.A. Collection. This is perhaps largely due to the seductive skill of the architect’s paint-brush, however, for another view of the front, also in the R.I.B.A. Collection, makes the place seem far more prosaic and was perhaps nearer the truth. In these two houses Hardwick appears to have been interested in the French Renaissance only as a source for an occasional motif with which to titivate otherwise English Gothic or Jacobethan designs. They were not his most successful

Footnote continued from page 162
illus. a closely similar tower at the Logis Barrault, Angers (pl. 6). Azay and Chenonceaux appeared in Victor Petit’s Châteaux de la Vallée de la Loire des XVe, XVIe et XVIIe siècles, Paris, 1861, pl. 51-2. The illus. in these works were not very detailed; architects probably needed to visit the chateaux themselves. See also Appendix B.
work. This approach was fairly characteristic of the decade: the more Gothic aspect of the French Renaissance was chiefly attracting dabblers. These were the years of maximum impact of Ruskin's and Scott's enthusiasm for North Italian Gothic. But Scott had also stressed to Goths the appropriateness of various French features to their chosen style; dormer windows, high-pitched roofs, stair tourelles, and so forth. Eastlake devoted some space to the praise of a group of Gothic country-seats of this period which reflect this sort of attitude though they were all begun before the publication of Scott's Secular and domestic architecture (1857). Those singled out by Eastlake were T. H. Wyatt's Orchardleigh Park, Somerset (built for William Duckworth in 1856); J. L. Pearson's Quarwood, Gloucs. (built for Rev. R. W. Hippisley, 1857).

1. He did, however, attempt a more thorough-going French building some ten years later and with a good deal more success. This was the stables at Rendcombe, Cirencester, 1864-7, for Sir Francis Goldsmith, M.P. They are late sixteenth-century, rather Henri II in style, with dormer windows breaking up through the cornice after the manner of Bullant; tiny, Classical oeil-de-boeuf lucarnes, high in the roof; a massive gate-way, again rather Bullant-ish, with pediment, swag, and a high, truncated pyramid roof, crowned by a Classical lantern, perhaps from the Chambord bastions, perhaps English. (See Hermione Hobhouse, Op. cit., pl. 44; Bldr, 10 Jun. 1865, pp 412-3).

2. Steep crested wedge roof; octagonal cone-roofed tourelle, otherwise Tudor Gothic. See Eastlake, HGR, pp 301-2, & Appendix 131; Bldr, 8 May 1858, p. 306; CEAJ, Jun. 1858, p. 193 (praise except for the "ambitious roofs").

3. High wedge roof with lucarnes over tower and pyramidal spirelet. Otherwise rather English Gothic. See Eastlake, HGR, pp 303-4 & Appendix 149; Girouard, VCH, pl. 40.
and Prichard and Seddon's Ettington Park, Warwicks. (for E. P. Shirley, 1856-63). To this group of essentially Gothic Revival houses which employed a scattering of French roofs amongst their more ordinary English gables, one might add Scott's own Kelham Hall, Norton's Tyntesfield, J. P. Jones's Dundarane, and many others.

Related to these houses, but more wildly aggressive and rather more French in details if not in over-all feeling, was Elvetham Hall, Hants. Built by S. S. Teulon for the 4th Lord Calthorpe, 1859-62, Elvetham is a highly bizarre, polychrome-brick edifice, of bulging bow windows, dormers, and a multiplicity of French cone and pyramid roofs, which build up to an amazing crescendo around

1. French wedge roofs and cone-topped tourelles. Otherwise Italian -cum-English Gothic. See Eastlake, HGR, pp 304-6 & Appendix 169; Girouard, VCH, pl. 34; EN, XVI, 1869, pp 158-61 (illus. reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 36); EN, XVI, 1869, pp 576-9.

2. Notts., nr Newark, for J. H. Manners-Sutton, 1858-61. French hipped roof on tower; Italian Gothic. See Bldr, 1860, p. 205; 1863, p. 237; 1866, pp 482-3; EN, 28 Jun. 1861, pp 542-3; CEAJ, May 1863, p. 128; Eastlake, HGR, Appendix 156; Morris, Seats, IV, p. 43.

3. Avon, nr Bristol for William Gibbs, 1862-6. More French than the preceding group. Château d'O oriel; central tower with crested truncated pyramid roof with corbelled tourelles at each corner. Illus. in Bldr, 1866, pp 99-101 (reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 164-5; Girouard, VCH, pl. 8); Archt, 30 Mar. 1894; CL, 17 May 1902, pp 624-9. See also Eastlake, HGR, Appendix 233. Drawings are at the house which remains in the family (Lord Wraxall).

4. Lancs; shown at the R.A. 1864 and said to be erected (EN, 6 May 1864, p. 333); illus. EN, 10 Feb. 1865, pp 100, 105 (reproduced in Girouard, VCH, pl. 394), and said here to be "about to be erected". Probably never built. Lots of spiky roofs. Jones also designed in similar style the Bishop Auckland Town Hall (Bldr, 7 Apr. 1860, pp 216-7); Reform Club, Manchester (Bldr, 26 Mar. 1870, pp 247-9; EN, 18 Mar. 1870, pp 211, 215).
the entrance tower. The main body of the building has a genuine
two-slope mansard; round-cornered windows after the French manner
 mingle with Gothic lancets, trefoils, and traceried openings entirely
of Teulon’s invention. The total external effect is not like that
of a French chateau, and the interior is even less so. It is an
extreme outcome of the Early Victorian mania for analysis and sub-
division, while simultaneously anticipating developments of the
1870s. Pugin had demanded truthful and functional design, the
reflection on the outside of the necessities of the inside. What
he did not demand, however, was the reflection on the outside of the
non-necessities, the deliberate perversities of the inside. There
are no simple rectangular rooms. Every nook, corner, and deliberately
irregular bay has its echo in some external bulge and in the jumbled
profusion of the roofs. Yet there is a huddled feeling to the
massing and a compactness of composition which belongs to the High
Victorian period. Also the irregular room-shapes interpenetrate
to create a subtle spatial flow which looks forward to the schemes
of Norman Shaw. It is a sort of half-way house in Victorian archi-
tecture – partly an extreme, partly just a suggestion. Of course
it was the extreme which had the greater impact in its own day, as
now: it was richly carved and painted, savagely picturesque,
wildly eclectic – and unpopular as extremes usually are.

1. Irregularity for its own sake is specifically condemned: A. W. N.
2. This was made the more complex by additions in the early twentieth
century of a number of rooms along the entrance front in the original
Teulon style. The old porte cochère, directly under the tower was
closed in, another being added in front of it.
3. BN, 16 May 1862, p. 539, liked it, but not so the rest: Bldr.
Elvetham Hall and the rest of these houses were only vaguely related to the early French Renaissance, but to have been more so seems in the 1850s and early 1860s to have been no guarantee of popularity either. The only Gothic house of that period in England to deliberately seek the effect of the transitional Gothic-Renaissance chateaux of the late fifteenth century, was Minley Manor, built 1858-62 near Farnborough, Hants., quite close to Elvetham. It was not at all well received. The client was Raikes Currie, a Catholic banker, and its architect was, appropriately enough, Henry Clutton, whose *Domestic architecture of France* which appeared in 1853 was the only English book to concentrate on any aspect of the French Renaissance style as a mode of building worthy in some degree of resurrection by modern architects. Only in some degree, for he stressed that he by no means wished to recommend it "as a perfect model for modern imitation", and that indeed to reproduce such buildings in modern-day England would not be possible, given the difference in available materials and the change in standards and methods of workmanship. Clutton's use of red brick with stone trim - the readily accessible English combination - does, however, invite comparison with the Louis XII wing at Blois (one of the few

Footnote continued from page 167

2 Jun. 1860, p. 345, said it was "grotesque rather than architectonic"; BN, 3 May 1867, p. 301, said it was "gimcrack in design". See also CMAJ, Jun. 1867, p. 193; Bldr, 26 May 1860, pp 331-3 (illus.); BN, 25 May 1860, pp 412, 419 (illus. reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 125). Contract drawings are at the house (now the Elvetham Hall Management Training Centre) and are reproduced in Girouard, VCH, pl. 33; Marble Halls, no. 24.

French Renaissance buildings to use these materials) though undoubted borrowings are few. Clutton, no more than his fellows, could sanction copying, even where models in the appropriate material did exist. His attitude to the use of certain French motifs with English Gothic was very much the same as Scott’s\(^1\). The aim was not to reproduce a fifteenth-century chateau, but a modern English house which might profit from the better points of early French Renaissance design. Significantly the main principles of French architecture which he singled out for praise turn out to be central notions in Puginian and Ruskinian thought - and here is a major reason for the increasing interest in the early French Renaissance at this time. The "peculiar excellence" of the style under consideration he declared to consist in "the distinct and individual expression which is given to every member of the building", and "the great beauty and energy with which the details are executed". To some extent it can be said that both these merits are reflected in the designing of Minley.

It is important to stress at this stage, however, that it is difficult for us to gauge the appearance of the house that Clutton built, so considerably was it augmented and changed by George Devey and Arthur Castings in the late nineteenth century. What is clear is that it was smaller and a good deal less complicated than it now is.

\(^1\) "There can be alleged, we think, no very valid reasons why high roofs, large dormer windows and girouettes with their beautiful accompaniments of skill in metal-work, are not as applicable at the present time as in the 15th century." (Clutton, Op. cit., p. 63). The Louis XII wing at Blois appears as pl. 7 in Clutton's book; the interior of the Francis I stair at Blois is pl. 8.
Only the right-hand section of the entrance front is substantially Clutton's, and even that has had Devey's entrance porch slapped in front of it. Nonetheless Clutton was responsible for the big pavilion on the right with its roof of extreme pitch and its associated tourelle—perhaps an early debt (like the tower at The Abbots) to the famous Louis XII tower at Blois, though here there is also a look of the well-known chateau of Fontaine-Henri, near Caen in Normandy. That house, much visited by early sketchers in the 1820s and '30s, had always incurred much censure for the proportions of its roofs (there was as much of the building above the cornice as below, it was pointed out) and so did Minley Manor. To Clutton also belonged the unusual little oriel and the general arrangement of the roofs and dormers across the rest of the front. The simplicity of the dormers is noteworthy. If Blois was his major influence, the architect did not feel tempted to reproduce the elaborate cusped and canopied attic windows of that building but employed instead simple triangular pediments relieved only by stripes in brick of contrasting colour. The Flamboyant ogee arch

7. Britton and Pugin, Specimens of the architectural antiquities of Normandy, p. 23, called the north-west roof of Fontaine-Henri "strangely preposterous and unaccountably lofty, weighty and unsightly". The reaction to Minley was similar when shown at R.A., 1858: CEAJ, Jun. 1858, p. 193, called the roofs "inappropriate"; Eccles, XIX, 1858, p. 173, was pleased to notice the influence of the foreign chateaux on a number of designs at the exhibition, but declared that the roofs at "Menley" (sic) were "almost too steep. But, if a fault, it is one on the right side." Bldr, 8 May 1858, p. 306, thought the chimneys reached "the limit of safe construction". For similar censure see Bldr, 13 Apr. 1861, p. 244; EN, 19 Apr. 1861, p. 321.
of the entrance was a Devey contribution. Such fussiness did not belong to the High Victorian period of architecture, and one suspects that, as at his Ruthin Castle, Clwyd, Clutton's Minley would have demonstrated rather more than it now does the power of the unadorned wall. Certainly the late alterations did nothing to simplify the house, and their initiator, Bertram Wodehouse Currie, who had inherited the property in 1881, seems to have ultimately regretted the scale of the work done for him. In his memoirs, written not long before he died in 1896 but published posthumously in 1901, he looked back to his father's first essay at Minley. He noted that Clutton had

"aimed at reproducing on a small scale a part of the famous Château de Blois. This was rather a bold undertaking and I cannot say that the idea was a happy one, though the details were carefully worked out, and there was less of sham decoration than might have been expected. Any attempt to build in such an ambitious style at a small expense is doomed to failure. Instead of trying to combine the maximum of ornament with the minimum of cost, the aim should be to spend whatever money can be afforded on solid construction and just proportion. If I had to build again myself, I should be content with a simple elevation, a solid staircase, and well-shaped rooms."

The £55,000 spent on the renovations (1885-8) had secured more than that. To the garden facade Devey added a chapel like an impoverished Ste. Chapelle, plus a loggia in front of the dining-room window; to the west of the house he added a rather Queen-Anneish orangery and a covered walk-way linking it to the house. Low walls created a courtyard at the front; new stables were added beyond, as also were

lodge; while the main front of the house itself was transformed by a number of striking features. A new porch was applied just to the right of centre; and by means of the addition to the left of an octagonal stair-turret for the servants (which balances the high block on the right) and in the middle (as pivot) a pavilion with diamond-shaped clock, Devey gave to the facade a touch of controlling symmetry which emerges almost with surprise out of the initial chaotic impact of roofs and turrets. Previously (one assumes) the left-hand portion of the main facade had consisted of a simple elevation topped by a high roof with a sequence of gables and dormer windows. One drawing by Devey at the R.I.B.A. shows a tower with tall octagonal spire in the centre where the clock gable now is. Whether this was a discarded suggestion of his own, or whether it was a feature of the Clutton elevation which Devey chose to demolish, is not clear. The stair tower in the same drawing is square and low. It may owe its octagonal shape and certainly its lantern roof (which reminds one of those on the Chambord bastions) to Arthur Castings. Devey died in 1887, his work being continued by Castings, his assistant; and it is to Castings that we owe the heightening of the service block - a long wing very much in the style of the rest of the house, projecting at right-angles from the north-

\[1. Drawings of all these survive at RIBAD in the uncatalogued Devey Collection (Devey II). Originally the orangery was to have been more French than it is - with elliptical arches, diamond and circle panels. The stables entrance is treated like an oversized Chambord dormer window, i.e. the entrance arch (elliptical) is surmounted by a concave-sided triangular pediment with shell at the top, finials at the sides and large volutes on each slope.\]
east corner of the house where the old stables had been. It was executed after Bertram Currie's death, for his son, Laurence, in 1898. This addition had allowed for considerable internal rearrangement in the main block and it was Casting no doubt who was chiefly responsible for the internal decor. This is simple and not particularly French, though Bertram Currie recorded that the exterior being

"in the style of François I ... it seemed right to adapt the interior to the same period. The walls of the ground-floor rooms were panelled either with walnut, or with oak, or with painted deal, and the staircase and landing were covered with tapestry representing scenes of hunting and hawking in the sixteenth century. These were designed by M. Martin of Paris, and imitated more or less from examples of old tapestry in France."

Currie called it "the style of François I." but Louis XII would have been more accurate. The picturesque chateaux of the Loire to which Currie doubtless alluded had little effect upon English architecture until the late 1860s when their adoption like

1. Currie, Op. cit., II, p. 177. The date 1898 is over the service entrance from the main court. Castings' drawings are also at RIBAD in the Devey Collection. The Architectural Association visited the house, 17 Sep. 1887, when Devey's alterations were nearly completed (Bldr, 24 Sep. 1887, p. 423). The house at this stage (minus Castings' service wing, and the stair tower lacking its lantern) was illus. Archt, 12 May 1899. In its final state it appeared in Archt, 5, 12 & 26 Jan. 1900, and 26 Jan. 1906, p. 64, where it is stated that "the buildings (Devey) loved most were French chateaux which were suggestive of a relationship to Gothic buildings" (Clutton was not mentioned). For illus. of the orangery and chapel by Devey, and the entrance gate by Castings see AR, XXI, 1907, pp 86, 213. Castings was responsible also for a tall prospect tower some distance from the house to the south-west - in red and black brick with flint work: associated tourelle, machicolations, and lantern roof. It is very like the Tour St. Vincent, Dreux. Minley Manor is well preserved by its present owners, the Army (H.Q. of the 11th Engineer Brigade). Further references to Minley include: CL, 23 Dec. 1899, pp 808ff; Eastlake, HGR, Appendix 163; Pevsner and Lloyd, Hampshire, pp 51, 338.
that of the Queen Anne style was to some extent a deliberate response to the question of a style appropriate to the Victorian age. In the 1850s this potential of the Loire-chateau style had not been realised, though interest in the style was certainly emerging. The building journals were reporting occasional lectures and travellers' impressions of the chateaux. Certain details like the diamond panels which were derived from the chimneys at Chambord, were supplementing upon the decorative facades of commercial architecture the busy detailing of François Premier urban architecture, as has been seen. But the picturesque country house of the 1850s, if inspired at all by France, remained very much a sprawling Gothic affair, adorned to a greater or lesser extent with motifs which in France had carried over from the

mediaeval period into the age of the Renaissance. In Scotland, on
the other hand, the special relationship between French and Scottish
architecture in the sixteenth century was encouraging an early
interest in the Loire style. One example of this did find its way
to England in David Bryce's Eastburgh House, Herts. (1858), without
materially altering the status quo despite its publication in The
Building News. Even so, south of the border there were in fact two
isolated cases of houses in a fully-fledged Loire-chateau style,
planned in the 1850s, as well as a couple in which overtly chateau
features (while heralding the new interest) played only a minor role.

Of these latter, the first, Montagu House, was a town rather
than a country mansion. This (now demolished) was the London
residence of the 5th Duke of Buccleuch. In a sense it stood in
direct descent from such great London palazzi of the 1840s and
'50s as Barry's Bridgewater House and Vulliamy's Dorchester House, in
its function, position and tone; but stylistically, like its pro-
posed government neighbours in Whitehall, it was a child of the New
Louvre. As a matter of fact, both the duke and his architect,
William Burn, were judges of the government offices competition -
a fact which caused a raised eyebrow or two. With its paired
pavilion roofs, its balustraded parapet and its fenestration which
derived from Percier and Fontaine, Montagu House had something of
the dignity and palatial symmetry of the new civic buildings of
Second Empire Paris. Compositionally, its closest kin amongst

1. BN, 16 Nov. 1860. For more on this see below, p. 208.
Victorian houses that were built were the work of essentially urban architects - Hedsor House by Knowles of the Grosvenor Hotel; Kensington House, an urban mansion by the younger Knowles; Park Place by Cundy of the Grosvenor Estate - even the Bowes Museum which was modelled on a provincial hôtel de ville. Its ties were equally close with the big hotels of the day, residential chambers like Knowles's Cedars Estate Mansions, various unexecuted designs for town mansions "for noblemen", and even Burn's own design for the Buchanan Street Railway Station, Glasgow, which he was working on at the same time as Montagu House.

Though construction did not occur until 1860-2, planning for Montagu House began as far back as 1853. Alternative schemes for

---

1. E.g. Design shown at Architectural Exhibition, 1859 by William Horton (see BN, 18 Mar. 1859, p. 255, & illus. in BA, 10 Nov. 1876, p. 298). It was to be even grander than Montagu House: 3 pavilions with Louvresque roofs; paired columns; oeil-de-boeuf windows; arched windows resembling arcading on the ground floor, all reflect the influence of the Louvre. Cf. also design for town mansion by L. R. Roberts, awarded Soane Medallion 1856: much indebted to New Louvre; side elevation very like Montagu House (see BN, 13 & 20 Feb. 1857, pp 164-5, 188-9). Contemporary urban institutions were often similar, e.g. Crossley Orphanage, Halifax, 1857-64, (begun by John Hogg; completed by Paull and Ayliffe, see Bldr, 7 Jan. 1865, pp 9-11); Second prize competition design for Liverpool Free Library and Museum by T. Holmes (BN, 19 Jun. 1857, pp 635-7).

2. Six drawings for this are at RIBAD (Arc III, 99-104) plus specification, dated 23 Nov. 1857 (Box J12). They were for a competition held Jan. 1858 (see BN, 1858, p. 27). None of the designs was executed. Burn's designs owed much to the New Louvre: paired, unfluted Corinthian columns which he used not only on the pavilions (as Visconti had done) but to separate the pedimented windows of the main body of the building as well. As at Paris there are no dormers, but instead a balustrade. The ground floor windows are set in blind arcading recalling the arcading of the New Louvre; oeil-de-boeuf windows (with Gibbs surround) on the pavilions as at Louvre; also wreathed medallions quoted from Lescot.
rather Florentine elevations with low, hipped roofs, were considered, but a Louvresque note predominated from the start, albeit with some vacillation between truncated pyramid roofs (as were finally employed) and squared domes surmounted by lanterns. What was novel about the selected design was that not only were the basically Louvresque composite chimneys embellished with the circle motif taken from the chimneys of Chambord, but the very Classical treatment considered for the dormer windows in the preliminary schemes - oeil-de-boeuf or with segmental pediments - was abandoned in favour of a pedimental decorativeness derived frankly from Chenonceaux. Montagu House must in fact have been one of the earliest buildings in England to have used this distinctive and ultimately popular dormer type where the concave sides of the pediment are surmounted by convex brackets like tiny flying arches. Also prophetic of things to come was the use on this French-style building of round windows which could not help but echo the characteristic French bull's-eye used all over the Louvre, but which were treated with a Gibbs surround: as with features at Marbury Hall, an early hint of the ambiguous relationship between the Queen Anne and French Renaissance styles.

Urban palace though Montagu House was from a stylistic point of view, it had close links with country house architecture as well. Italianate steps and terraces descended from the principal apartments

1. RIBAD holds 22 drawings in all (J12/4(2) & Arc III 196-209) which include preliminary plans and elevations dated 1853–6 (some with fly-leaves for alternative roof treatment); contract drawings dated May 1859; and survey drawings dated 1895. One elevation is reproduced in RIBAD Catalogue B, fig. 123.
into a large garden which extended right down to the river affording (for the first year or two at any rate) the privacy of a rural mansion. But building was not complete when the superb site was threatened by the proposal for a new roadway along the Embankment. A more significant link with the country house was the plan. William Burn's pre-eminence amongst country house planners has already been mentioned. Montagu House, despite its near rectangular basic shape (dictated by the site) was a masterpiece of Burnian planning at its most complex. Here there is nothing of the simple Palladian villa arrangement which provided the basis for Stafford House or Bridgewater House, though like them, the main apartments were on the upper floor. In best Victorian country-house fashion every class and function has been catered for. As with the external elevations this was not achieved without some changing of mind between 1853 and 1859. The focal importance of the grand stair was ultimately reduced, as was the area allocated on the ground floor to office space (the "Chairman's Hall" and the "Evidence Room") supplying the needs of the duke's public life. On the upper floor the introduction of a large picture gallery and also a greater emphasis on a Burnian "family" wing (or perhaps "corner" in this wingless house) caused a considerable reshuffling of the principal apartments. Naturally the decor was sumptuous, much of it in a rich, pseudo-Louis Quatorze with coved ceilings, heavy coffering and much gilding. It is

1. Consternation was great. See Buccleuch papers (SRO, GD224/643; GD224/642/6) for spate of correspondence on this.
2. Montagu House was illus. BN, 28 Nov. 1862, pp 416-7 (reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 169); ILN, 24 Sep. 1864, pp 311, 313; SL, XIII, St Margaret Westminster Part 2, pp 218-9, pl. 101-4. See also BN, 2 Aug. 1861, p. 644.
interesting to note the close similarity of design between a somewhat florid mock-Rococo chimney-piece at Montagu House and one at Wynnstay Hall, Clwyd, the second of the two houses alluded to above where hints of the Loire-chateau style were blended with other features of French architecture.

Although the plan of Wynnstay Hall was of a straggly, late Georgian variety, legacy of an earlier house and in no way French, there seems to have been a fairly concentrated bid to complete the interior decorations in one French style or another. As well as the Rococo chimney piece (like the Montagu House one, all coy babies and naturalistic foliage) there was a number of sixteenth-century features: the Chambord lozenge pattern appeared on ceilings, and door and window imposts in various rooms, and the splendid oak ceiling in the Grand Hall is said to have been copied from the Hôtel de Ville, Rouen. More interesting are the other chimney-pieces: one, a massive wooden affair in the Grand Hall, with a Fontainebleau cartouche in the centre of the over-mantel, is surrounded by a quantity of arabesques and supported by bulging candelabra. Even more striking is the chimney-piece in what was the boudoir of the lady of the house. It is a close (but very Victorian) copy of the famous chimney-piece in the Salon de Marie de Medici at Blois, all cherubs and lush foliage. Indeed the whole room must have been modelled on that at Blois for the ceilings of exposed beams richly decorated are likewise quite

1. The Field, the farm the garden, 23 Dec. 1865, p. 462.
similar. But it is the exterior of Wynnstay Hall which is our major concern. Wynnstay's principal archaeological debt is to Serlio's discreetly Classical mansion, Ancy-le-Franc, which probably dates from the very last years of Francis I's reign (ca. 1546). But there is also a tentative bid to merge this Classicism with more Gothic elements derived from the Loire chateaux; for, tucked away at one end over the private, family wing is a pair of rather quaint little cone-roofed tourelles. These, however, are perhaps less surprising than the debt to Ancy, for the architect was Benjamin Ferrey, Pugin's biographer and fellow pupil. The intriguing thing about the house is the way Ferrey has adapted a symmetrical, three-pavilioned, French plan to the dictates of the irregular and rambling foundations of the earlier house. In March 1858 Wynnstay Hall, seat of Sir Watkin Williams-Wynn, 6th Bt., was gutted by fire. It had been an early Georgian house by the Smiths of Warwick,

1. Cf. W. H. Ward, The architecture of the Renaissance in France, 2nd ed., London, 1926, I, pl. 81. Though some details are different this would appear to be the same chimney-piece as that which appears as pl. 13 in Müller's Sketches of the age of Francis Ist. This illus. might have been the source of the Wynnstay piece since the positioning of the cupids about the roundels in the Wynnstay example is closer to Müller's sketch than to Ward's photograph of the real thing. On the other hand, the ceiling in Müller's room is not beamed as it is in Ward and at Wynnstay. The Field (23 Dec. 1865, p. 462) says the Wynnstay specimen was carved in Ruabon stone by a Welshman and was "quite fit to compete with the best efforts of foreign artists". The same Blois chimney inspired one at Gayhurst, Bucks., by Burges (see Charles Handley-Read on Burges in P. Ferriday, Victorian architecture, London, 1963, p. 199).

2. For an account of the fire see Askew Roberts, The gossiping guide to Wales, Oswestry, 1872, p. 62; also his Wynnstay and the Wynns, Oswestry, 1876, p. 53, which substantially repeats the former.
for the alteration of which there had been many proposals (including ones by Adam and Wyatt), only a few of which had been actually effected. Ferrey, who had already been active at Wynnstay before the fire, building a new picture gallery, was called in immediately to design a new house and work was commenced before the year was out.

Although drawing predominantly upon Classical models, Ferrey was bound by the irregular foundations and by his training to produce an edifice of sprawling asymmetry. The plan, therefore, was of necessity a somewhat retardataire arrangement with a whole ribbon of apartments opening off a corridor which ran the length of the house. This was at right-angles to the Great Hall into which entrance had been gained from the porte cochère beneath the central tower on the south front. The corridor led at the east end of the house to a conservatory (later covered in as a billiard room) and ultimately to the L-shaped family wing with its twin tourelles. The ground at this end of the house falls away gradually, so that although the family wing has considerable height when viewed from the east (basement, main floor, and a range of dormers in a very steep hipped roof) it seems by contrast very low in relation to the main part of the house from the south. Ferrey has shown considerable

2. The Field, 11 Dec. 1858, p. 471, reports that "active operations for rebuilding (the) mansion at Wynnstay are going on."
3. This was blocked in, however, some time early this century and the entrance moved round to the west where it had been in the original house by the Smith brothers.
ingenuity in manipulating the Classical formula of his initial inspiration in order to marry this incongruous element into the total composition. He did not quite succeed, for the family wing does in fact have the appearance of having been tagged on to the end of what should be a Classical, French, three-pavilion composition.

What tells us that it must have been part of the original plan is the position and size of the third (the right-hand) pavilion. It is only two-thirds as wide as its counter-part at the south-west corner, and its roof is correspondingly lower; and whereas five bays separate the main, central tower from the one to its left, there are only three between it and this small one on the right. The missing two bays have been transposed beyond the small pavilion as a further means of tying together this long facade by a process of diminishing steps. It is a curious mixture of irregular and regular composition which does not quite come off, yet one cannot deny its ingenuity and the house does have grandeur¹. It deserves a better reception than the one its contemporaries gave it².

¹. Certainly the front part of the family wing was no late addition for a "special commissioner", reporting in The Field, 23 Dec. 1865, p. 462, after a visit to Wynnstay for the fox-hunting, noted that the interiors which were finished included Lady Wynn's room in the family wing. Work dragged on, however: even in 1876 the house was "by no means completed", according to Roberts, Wynnstay and the Wynns, p. 60. Ferrey's son, Edmund B. Ferrey, added a chapel that year (Bldr., 19 Feb. 1876, p. 174). The building as it is today (except for the porte cochère under the main tower, and the conservatory) is illus. in Morris, Seats, III, p. 67; Roberts, Wynnstay and the Wynns, p. 4; Thomas Nicholas, Annals and antiquities of the counties and county families of Wales, London, 1872, I, p. 367 (reproduced in review of same, BN, 4 Apr. 1873, p. 403). Building accounts are at the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth.

². No reception at all for the most part. Only CEAJ (Jun. 1861, p. 156) had anything to say when a drawing was shown at R.A., and
The style, said to have been suggested by the owner, was described by "an able artist" as "a rather severe adaptation of the Louis Quatorze style". "Louis Quatorze" by this time seems to have become a blanket term for French Classical of any sort. The debt to Ancy-le-Franc is pretty clear. As has been seen, there is not the regularity of Ancy with its square plan and identical corner pavilions, but the articulation of each storey of the three pavilions as well as the upper floor of the main part of the building by means of pilasters indicates close acquaintance with that chateau. The big central pavilion at Wynnstay and the smaller one to its right display an interesting combination of the features of Serlio's pavilions and of the inside court at Ancy: as in the Ancy pavilions a central tier of windows is set between paired pilasters, but where Serlio left the space blank in the middle of each pair, Ferrey has made his pilasters enclose a niche as in the courtyard at the French building, thus achieving a more elaborate surface decoration (though delicate still) than that which we see at Ancy.

Footnote continued from page 182
that was harsh: "beyond its extent (it) has little to recommend it ... (it is) excessively tame and unworthy of the author's name and reputation". The fox-hunting commissioner enthused, however: "Carthaga Nova will in every way far surpass the old building". But he had enjoyed Sir Watkin's hospitality.
1. Roberts, Wynnstay and the Wynns, p. 4.
2. This is pointed out by Mark Girouard (VCH, p. 191). If Ferrey did not personally visit Ancy he would have found it illus. in Du Cerceau's Les plus excellents bastiments, and Mariette's Vue des plus beaux bâtiments de France, Paris, 1685; also in the modern book, Baron C. E. Chaillou des Barres, Les châteaux d'Ancy le Franc, de Saint-Fargeau, de Chastellux et de Tanlay, Paris, 1845.
3. The left, or south-west, pavilion has a different arrangement: two tiers of windows (except for the top floor and dormer level where there is only one window and no pilasters at all) are each
In addition, Ferrey has made the central windows of his main pavilion into a gently bowed oriel spanning two floors, which further enhances the elegance of the building, though the feeling here is more of the English than the French Renaissance. As for the roofs, the truncated pyramids of the two bigger pavilions could also have been suggested by Ancy, though lanterns rather than iron cresting crown its roofs. Far more likely it is simply another case of influence from the New Louvre and the extensions to the Paris Hôtel de Ville.

The smaller pavilion at Wynnystay has, by contrast, a steep hip or wedge-shaped roof of more mediaeval origin. And then there were the family wing's cone-roofed tourelles. Viewed from the east they give to this wing a decided hint of Azay-le-Rideau or Chenonceaux, an effect which anticipates houses by John Douglas in nearby Cheshire. Certainly the appearance of these turrets is suggestive more of 1870 than 1860. Yet one precedent there was, and in Wales furthermore at the residence of a family connection of the Williams-Wynns.

This was an obscure villa called Rhianva, "marine residence" of Sir John Hay Williams, 2nd Bt., whose daughter-in-law was a sister of Sir Watkin Wynn of Wynnystay. It is a veritable little

Footnote continued from page 183
set between pilasters. The corners of the pavilion are marked with quoins rather than pilasters, and recall French buildings ranging from Fontainebleau (Cour du Cheval Blanc) to early Mansart.

1. Sir John's son and heir, later Sir Hugh Williams, 3rd Bt., married in 1843 Henrietta Charlotte, sister of Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, 6th Bt., rebuilder of Wynnystay. The two families were related distantly to begin with.
chateau and dates from 1850. The fact that this first example of a Loire-style mansion south of Scotland was to be found in Wales rather than England tempts one to posit a relationship between the early dissemination of the style and Loudon's principle of a desirable correlation between architectural style and environment; and perhaps the wooded banks of the Anglesay coast, near Beaumaris, where Rhianva was built would have qualified for some degree of picturesque treatment in accordance with Loudon's theory. Nonetheless, it must be regarded as an isolated freak, only tentatively imitated at Wynnstay about ten years later and suggesting direct contact with France. The architect was a shadowy Liverpool figure, Charles Verelst, who had changed his name from Reed by royal permission to enjoy an inheritance. Rhianva is an unusual little house, compounded of Jacobean and Loire-esque features: the chimneys are in English Renaissance clusters and the central pavilion facing the sea has a distinctly Jacobean gable and the same elongated oriel seen at Wynnstay. Otherwise it is a mini-chateau with steep, hipped roof, lucarnes and round, corner bastions, cone-roofed and markedly battered at the base. The note of a "marine residence" is struck by the presence of an open verandah across the front at second-floor level. What makes the house very like contemporary essays in the chateau style in France (examples of which appeared from time to time in journals like Le Moniteur des architectes), but like parts only of the original chateaux, was the trim size and the symmetry. It is rather like the old part of Chenonceaux, isolated and regularised, or the central section of Valencay.\footnote{Rhianva survives as holiday flats. The National Library of}
There was a similar feeling to Battlesden House, near Woburn, Beds., the other non-Scottish exercise in the Loire-chateau style which preceded the fashion of the 1870s. Having been actually built 1860-4, Battlesden may seem not too precocious an example of this style, but in fact it carried out with a minimum of changes a scheme devised probably back in 1856, well before the architect got the commission. The owner of Battlesden was Sir Edward Page-Turner, 6th Bt; the architect was George Henry Stokes, son-in-law of Sir Joseph Paxton. The Paxton connection was vital to Stokes for it was through his father-in-law that he got all the commissions in which he exercised what proved to be a very advanced and diverse concern for the architecture of France. Where Battlesden was concerned, Paxton had started out life as a garden boy on the Page-Turner estate, so knew the family well. The extent of his involvement in the rebuilding of Battlesden is not really clear. Correspondence certainly indicated that he turned the commission over to Stokes: "We have got Sir Edward Turner to begin Battlesden so that Mr Stokes will now be very well filled (?) for some time," wrote Paxton to his wife, Sarah, in March 1860. On the other hand, another meeting
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Wales holds two loose prints of the house, one of which dates from ca. 1850 (the engravers, Newman & Co. were at 48 Watling St., London, with which the print is inscribed, ca. 1835 - ca. 1850). The other view, which shows the addition of various castellated and turreted out-buildings, probably pre-dates 1868. The house is dated 1850 by Thomas Nicholas, Annals and antiquities of the counties and county families of Wales, I, p. 50. I am indebted to Mr Arthur Little of Thomas Worthington & Sons of Manchester for telling me of this house. 1. Letter no. 1516, dated 27 (23?) March 1860, in the Paxton MSS in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire, Chatsworth. On 6 March 1860 (letter 1508) Paxton had first mentioned the project: "I am going with Mr Stokes to Battlesden on Thursday. Sir Edward Turner
with Turner was noted by Paxton in a letter the following December, while in February of the next year he was complaining that "Sir. E. Turner and Mr Stokes took up about two hours of my time". Even so, a surviving sketch-book of Stokes's, dating from 1853-6, contains a scheme which with only slight alterations was transformed into Battlesden. Perhaps Paxton's advice was needed on technical matters; certainly it would appear not to have been on matters of design. What is interesting is that the same sketch could just as well have been an alternative idea for Stokes's first exercise in a French style, Belle Vue, the Halifax residence of Sir Frank Crossley of the newly rich carpet family. Indeed that is probably what it was initially, for the renovation of Belle Vue (a house built originally in the 1840s) dates from 1856-7, and Stokes would have had the commission when the sketch was done. Furthermore another sketch for Belle Vue, virtually as built, is to be found near the Battlesden drawing. The two demonstrate nicely what a superficial concern style was. A virtually identical composition has been titivated with tourelles and turrets to make a not very successful Loire chateau in one case, and with the pilasters and *ceil-de-boeuf* dormers.

Footnote continued from page 186
wants something built there." The visit revealed the old house to be "almost a ruin" (letter 1511, dated 11 March). Further meetings between Paxton and Turner were had before the deal was clinched (letters 1511 and 1513 (dated 14 March 1860)).
1. Letter 1554 (14 Dec. 1860) and letter 1552 (7 Feb. 1861).
2. Sketch-book also amongst the Paxton MSS at Chatsworth.
3. Though Paxton was not without interest in French architecture himself. He was vastly impressed by Versailles when he visited it in 1834 ostensibly to examine the water-works: the palace had "an appearance beyond description," he wrote to Sarah, 5 May 1834 (letter 11).
of a Louis XIII mansion in the other. Both have a steep roof with basically horizontal skyline, broken in the middle by a separate pavilion which rises and advances only very slightly over the central bays of the facade. At Belle Vue this central section contains the garden entrance, flanked by small oval lights, with an open arch and balcony above, and a Classical pediment projecting into the roof. This is the focus of a facade, three bays each way, articulated with pilasters at first-floor level and banding below. In the proto-

Battlesden sketch, by contrast, the central focus with advancing pavilion roof is treated as a large bowed window, flanked at first-floor level by corbelled tourelles with slender cone spires. To right and left there are two rather than three bays; and the mullioned windows surmounted by strapwork give the design a Tudor rather than François Premier look which the pyramid roofed tower to the side cannot dispel. It was a very weak design which Stokes amended to good effect when he got the opportunity at Battlesden to translate it into stone as the garden elevation of that house. There, the Tudorish fenestration including the central bow is the same, as are the cone-roofed tourelles, but the central section has been given more importance by being raised an extra storey and capped by a very steep hipped or wedge-shaped roof flanked by a pair of towering chimneys. The dormer in this pavilion roof is of the François Premier variety from Blois Château (a simple straight pediment with three finials) as had been all the dormers on the 1856 sketch; but the rest of them at Battlesden have been given small hipped roofs instead, in a rather "Old English" manner. The turrets at each end of the house have steep wedge roofs in
place of the pyramids of the sketch. As for the entrance front, for which no preliminary drawings exist in the Chatsworth sketch-book, it was not markedly different - simply an entrance portico with columns, urns and niches to replace the huge bow of the garden front and a sixteenth-century cartouche higher up on the central tower. Battlesden's career was short - it was demolished in 1886, having passed into the hands of the Duke of Bedford. As for Belle Vue, it survives as the Calderdale Public Library and is directly opposite the People's Park in Halifax. It was the laying out of this park by Paxton at the behest of Sir Frank Crossley which had led to the commission for the extension of the Crossley residence by Stokes. As has been seen, Belle Vue was an elegantly Classical French mansion of early seventeenth-century type. Influence could well have come from any one of a great many of the urban hôtel designs which appeared in pattern books from Marot onwards - more modest versions of the grand Choisy-Clagny type of composition which was probably the source of Bedegbury Park. Of these urban examples, perhaps the Hôtel du Grand Prieur comes closest to the garden elevation at Belle Vue, though the Halifax house is actually a trifle more decorative with its banding and pilasters and its complicated

1. See Leighton Buzzard Observer, 25 May 1886, p. 8. The house was illus. in LBO, 1 Dec. 1896, p. 3. A copy of this (minus indication of source) is held at BCRO, donated by Mr N. Page-Turner of Woodhayes, Devon. Three photographs of the house are in the possession of Rev. I. G. A. W. Page-Turner of Woodstock, Oxon. The LBO view shows the garden front with a different sort of pavilion roof in the centre: in place of the steep wedge of the photographs there is a pavilion mansard. It has been hitherto believed that no visual record of the house survived.
central pavilion as opposed to the simple, triple-arched centre-piece of this seventeenth-century prototype. Furthermore, Stokes has placed his entrance with large segmental pediment and a very English porte cochère to the side. It is the garden door which is the focus of the most imposing front: clearly Stokes was little influenced by French methods of planning, though he would have been bound to some extent by the existing house. As might be expected he did, however, make use of the French eighteenth-century styles for his interior decoration, producing a number of rooms which are in that typical Victorian blend of Palladianism and formalised Rococo.

Belle Vue was not Stokes’s only venture into the more Classical of the French styles. Perhaps even more startling than his Loire chateau experiment at Battlesden was the distinctly Louis Seize palace which he concocted for Adolphe Charles de Rothschild (1860).

That it was not built in England but at Prêgny, near Geneva, goes a long way to explain this choice of style, though where British architecture is concerned it could represent the last gasp of the

taste for the Rococo which had produced Wrest Park. With its bowed
central pavilion and elaborate dome overlooking the garden it has
something of the feeling of Wrest Park and, like that house, probably
owed a lot to eighteenth-century pattern-book designs: some in
Briseux's *L'Art de bâtir des maisons de campagne* (1751) look quite
likely sources. The detailing appears more vigorously mid-century
than that on Wrest Park - more like the Wrest Park conservatory in
fact: large beribboned garlands dangle about the windows of the
three pavilions of the garden facade: *Louis Seize* oval windows
punctuate the wall of the *corps de logis*; the spandrels of the
windows are equipped with carving of almost Knowlesian lushness.
As for the steep roof and *ceil-de-boeuf* dormers which rise above
the balustrade and urns, these are actually not the work of Stokes
but were added later by a local architect, Gindraux. Though this
sort of pavilion front does seem to require some sort of steep roof
(the similar designs in Briseux all have them), it appears that
the building was covered by "une terrasse a l'Italienne", except
perhaps for the dome which may have been original.

This out-of-the-way commission came to Stokes as the last
link in a chain of Rothschild patronage which he shared with Paxton.

---

1. According to A. Chappuis, "Le Château de Pregny: une remarquable
rénovation de toiture", *Pro-Métal*, C, 1964, pp 76-81, where it is
stated that for the sake of extra accommodation the roof of blue
Ardoise slate was added by Gindraux. Later, the architect, Gignoux,
replaced the zinc trimmings with copper. Prégny was exhibited by
Stokes at R.A. 1864. Work had begun in 1860: "Stokes is going
to Geneva today," wrote Paxton to his wife, 11 Mar. 1860 (Paxton
MSS, Chatsworth, letter 1511). The Chappuis article is reprinted in
*Bulletin technique de l'Association des Techniciens Genevois*, I, 1965,
pp 6-9. See also Léon Savary, "Une demeure princière aux portes de
MSS notes by Edmond Barde held by the Archives d'État, Geneva.
The first had been Mentmore, Bucks. (1852-4), for Baron Meyer Amschel de Rothschild. The house was neo-Elizabethan; only the interiors and fittings were French. This was followed by Ferrières, near Paris, for Baron James, senior member of the family's French branch. It was an awkward design, still more Elizabethan than French despite its venue, and probably largely the work of Paxton, though Stokes was certainly involved. Stokes also collaborated with Paxton on the commission for the Scarborough Spa Saloon, 1857-9, settling, however, for no more than a modest mansard retiring behind the balustrade of a reticently French Classical elevation. It was left to another team of architects to equip it at a later date with the coarse array of New Louvre roofs it now boasts.

1. Chadwick, Op. cit., p. 194, calls it "An attempt to create a Third(!) Empire clothing for a Victorian house derived from an Elizabethan plan form." Though exhibited under Paxton's name at the R.A., 1856, it is listed as by Stokes in the latter's obituary (BN, 10 July 1874, p. 54). Building took place 1855-8. Paxton wrote from the Hôtel Meurice, rue de Rivoli, to Sarah: "We have endless bother with the Baron and Ferrières. I am sick to death with it." (Paxton MSS, letter 1341, dated 21 March 1858). He would have been flattered, however, by ILN's report of the emperor's visit there (ILN, 3 Jan. 1863, p. 9, 11): "The model property certainly of all France, but more especially of the department of the Seine-et-Marne of which it is the principal attraction."

2. See Chadwick, Op. cit., pp 196-7, & illus., p. 230. Paxton and Stokes' building was much damaged by fire in the 1870s. Although it was usually stated that the rebuilding by Verity and Hunt, 1877-80, was in toto, the body of their pavilion does in fact incorporate a certain amount of the older building (see BN, 6 Aug. 1880, pp 150-1). Verity and Hunt fitted it with squared-dome roofs over the towers and a massive central pavilion with truncated pyramid top and oeil-de-bœuf windows. Archt, 21 May 1881, p. 344 called it "wonderfully like a central railway station." It was illus. Archt, 4 Sep. 1880, p. 151. See also Archt, 7 Aug. 1880, p. 88; Bldr, 4 Aug. 1877, p. 794.
Stokes's commitment to the French historic styles, it will now be clear, was unusually strong for a country-house architect of the 1850s. It was characteristic of the decade that his greatest emphasis should be on French Classicism. Gothicists did not need to be more than half-hearted in their dabbling with French motifs - the feeling of the house might remain completely English. Classicists, on the other hand, found in French seventeenth- and eighteenth-century architecture ready-made answers to their problems. If even greater picturesqueness was required then a version of the Loire chateaux with the irregularities ironed out would do, as was demonstrated at Rhianva and Battlesden. As a matter of fact, even when the Loire style attained fashionability in the early 1870s there persisted this desire to render the formulae regular and symmetrical. Only very occasionally were there attempts to reproduce something of the asymmetrical fairy-tale charm of such gems as Azay, Chaumont, Villandry or Maintenon.

Before George Henry Stokes is forgotten another of his sketchbook designs must be pointed to, for here, too, despite his Classical leanings, he was something of a pioneer, producing a charming little scheme for a Loire-type chateau with a picturesque array of steep and varied roofs which, following Puginian principles, clearly indicate on the exterior the arrangement of the plan within, and work together with a High Victorian compactness. Signed 'G.H.S.' and dated 2nd March 1856, it was perhaps another tentative idea for Belle Vue.

1. The main rooms are planned around two sides of the building in an
Stokes was an unusual example of an architect who was prepared, in this early phase of the French Renaissance Revival, to experiment in the very diverse styles of French architecture and to see perhaps the potential of the Loire style as a meeting ground of the two extremes in the 'Battle of the Styles'. Other architects might adopt here a Chambord chimney, or there a dormer from Chenonceaux; but it was to take another decade for the profession generally to appreciate the significance of the Loire style, and clients to identify with its romance. The Loire style came earlier to Scotland.

Footnote continued from page 193
arrangement similar to that at Belle Vue. It is a much smaller plan, however. The stair tower and tourelle look like another debt to Blois. Italianate porch and perron are perhaps incongruous; also the drawing-room bow. This design was illus. in Chadwick, Op. cit., p. 231, as was the sketch-book drawing of proto-Battlesden. More homogeneous than the above-mentioned chateau, but less successful as a whole, was yet another design in the sketch-book - this time for a very tiny house, perhaps a lodge. Quite a happy ensemble is achieved of Classical elevations, articulated with pilasters, and a hipped roof of extremely high pitch. A Tudor bay window and large arcaded porch and perron blend better with the overall conception.
CHAPTER FIVE: Scottish Baronial and France

In the early 1820s Sir Walter Scott had his house at Abbotsford extended. He chose a castellated, turreted manner, partly related to the Gothic castle style, made fashionable by Nash, but partly also with its source clearly in the native Renaissance architecture. Architects were quick to take up the idea in Scotland, making thereby their inevitable contribution to the Europe-wide revival of national Renaissance styles; their counterpart to the so-called 'Jacobethan' mode south of the border. The fact that from the beginning the houses often displayed a hint of the Loire chateaux (thereby preceding Rhianva by more than twenty years) was perhaps not so much deliberate as a natural corollary of the stylistic ambiguity of the native sixteenth- and seventeenth-century models, as Hitchcock has suggested.

Franco-Scottish friendship had enjoyed a prolonged history, but was never so strong as during the middle years of the sixteenth century when a series of royal marriages cemented the ties. James V married two French princesses within as many years and spent those years in France, cultivating a taste for the Renaissance culture of the court of Francis I. By the time he returned to Scotland in 1539 with his second queen, Mary of Guise, he had already set in progress the building of additions to Falkland Palace and Stirling Castle, both of which displayed in their external elevations French Renaissance

1. Scots like Burn and Bryce were active in this field too.
2. EVA, p. 208.
detailing, such as had not hitherto been seen in Britain. This initiative on the part of the Scottish court did not immediately inaugurate a school of Franco-Scottish Renaissance architecture as might have been expected; yet, it is widely if not universally accepted that the various French masons from the Loire and Sarthe districts who are known to have enjoyed royal patronage in Scotland at this time were not without influence upon the course of subsequent Scottish architectural history. The Scottish Baronial style that developed and flourished in the late sixteenth century and much of the following one as well appears to have consisted of a collection of motifs drawn directly from the domestic architecture of the Loire School, applied to a framework that had its roots deep in the tradition of the mediaeval Scots tower-house. For our purposes, however, it is less important that we believe this feature or that to be of French derivation than that the nineteenth-century revivers of the style believed it to be so. In point of fact they did.

Robert William Billings in his influential four-volume work, The baronial and ecclesiastical antiquities of Scotland (1845-52), brought to the study of ancient Scottish architecture more precise detail than had been seen in Grose's Antiquities of Scotland, or Sir Walter Scott's Border antiquities, while preserving still something of their picturesque treatment. Concerning the French contribution

to the development of the Scottish Barional style, Billings had no doubts. He wrote in his introduction that

"From the year 1500 to 1660, or thereabouts, Scotland adopted the sterner features of French and Flemish residences and so cleverly mingled their peculiarities with the castellated architecture of her own growth as to produce a Barional style peculiar to the country."

Robert Kerr, too, pronounced the character of the style to be
"primarily French of the Tudor period, and Scotch only by modification."  

Billings detected a particularly French flavour to the characteristic cone-roofed angle bartizan:

"Aberdeen is remarkable," he wrote, "for the number of private dwellings ornamented by that light, graceful, angular turret which was adopted from the French chateau architecture; and they are a lasting and striking memorial of the extent to which, before the union of the crowns, the habits and ideas of our Continental allies were finding their way into the most distant parts of Scotland."

It was the conical capping he referred to, for he readily acknowledged that the open, battlemented and corbelled bartizan had a long native tradition. He might have added also that gabled dormer windows, though part of the domestic Gothic assumed in Renaissance Scotland a new decorativeness, involving both crude imitations and direct reproductions of French pedimental construction, particularly of the era of Francis I.

Elaborate dormers and cone-roofed turrets were to be, along with the native (or perhaps Flemish-inspired) crow-stepped gables,

---

the most striking features of the nineteenth-century Scotch Baronial houses of William Burn and David Bryce, the style's two chief exponents. It is unlikely that either of these gentlemen did not share Billings's views on the French associations of the Baronial style: Burn sponsored his research to the tune of £1000 and Bryce's buildings provide ample evidence of his close familiarity with Billings's publication. Bryce's mature Baronial houses show a sensitive understanding of the original style's characteristic approach to massing as well as its detail, and within the more complex framework of a typical, fairly compact High Victorian plan, produced a succession of houses, which by no means fail to capture the spirit of their sixteenth-century Scottish antecedents, despite the injection of additional French features like roof-ridge cresting. Some of Bryce's work was, however, more overtly French. By contrast Burn's rather earlier Baronial houses, lacking Billings's publication as a guide, as well as the urge to accuracy which Pugin's crusade had set in motion not just in the Gothic style, tend to be essays in late Georgian Picturesque composition (with a horizontal rather than vertical emphasis, alien to the originals), to which an assortment of dormers and turrets has been added as if at random (though his internal planning was masterly and innovative as has been seen). The results rarely remind one of the Scottish glens, but do occasionally of the Loire Valley. Unintentionally perhaps; but, just as it has been suggested that the combination of French and English sixteenth-century features in Victorian architecture might have indicated to begin with some attempt to develop a potential which
had existed in English Renaissance architecture, so also it seems likely that nineteenth-century Scottish architects sought to develop a potential which had existed in their native style, too, when in the seventeenth century it had been eclipsed by Palladianism. Besides, nineteenth-century historicist architects were seldom dedicated to historical precedent (even in the more archaeologically aware decades to come) to such an extent as to allow it to prevail over matters of modern convenience and standards of comfort. The Scottish Baronial style, more than most, seemed to the Victorians to be in need of modification to make it acceptable. Kerr saw it as

"in a word ... an uncivilized style (which) ought never to be brought into juxtaposition with anything more highly cultivated than the beautiful heather-braes of Loch Lomond."

It was by no means suitable for "a sweet English village". Kerr might not have known it but even the Scottish upper-classes of his day had succumbed to the seductions of luxury. Very likely the inherent Frenchness of the Baronial style was seen as an avenue which might lead it towards greater "civilization". Conversely if the elegant French chateaux could help "civilize" the Scottish, their kinship with the Baronial style probably encouraged the aesthetic theorists of the day to see them too as chiefly suitable for a hilly terrain, even if limestone escarpments in its lower reaches were the best the Loire itself could muster. For these reasons then, the Loire chateau style got a head-start in Scotland.

William Burn's Scottish Baronial designs which followed quickly

after Abbotsford included a continental note from the start. At

Tyninghame House, East Lothian, which he rebuilt for the 9th Earl of Haddington in 1829, the conical roofs of the round towers have a markedly concave profile which Alistair Rowan describes as "slightly Germanic". David Walker points out, too, that the corbelled bartzins at Tyninghame were slimmer than they would have been in old Scottish work. To what extent Burn consciously entertained any of the theoretical notions discussed above we do not know. We do know, however, that he was interested in the contemporary fashion for the Louis Quatorze interior as early as 1829, in which year he installed a chimney-piece in this style at St Fort in Fife. Other houses, too, were given similar features, without the accompaniment of a full-scale dix-huitiéme decor; but, by the 1840s and '50s, he was equal to this challenge as was seen at houses like Harlaxton and Montagu House. What is also clear concerning his attitude to Tyninghame is that he was not particularly bothered to reproduce an historically convincing house in the Scottish Baronial style. Not only are the proportions those of a Georgian Gothic house, but there are also Tudor chimney stacks and fenestration (relating directly to Burn's many exercises in Neo-Jacobean architecture) which he mixed freely with turrets and crow-stepped gables.

Over the years that followed Tyninghame the continental note crept into other reconstructions of old Baronial houses. At

Thirlestane Castle, Berwicks. (1840), for instance, Burn added big pyramidal roofs to the existing symmetrical arrangement of pavilions, giving them an exotic-looking concave swoop. It was not until the late 1840s, however, that the French element in these designs was fairly frankly admitted. This was to be at Fonthill, Wilts., a new house near the ruins of Beckford's folly. The client, interestingly, was the 2nd Marquess of Westminster, on whose London and Cheshire estates so much French-style building was to take place twenty years later. Actually, the house as built in 1856 was quite Scottish, rather drab, and no doubt considered very out of place in the gentle countryside of Wiltshire. It was the preliminary designs which looked French. These date from September 1846 to 1852. Most interesting are three variant ideas for the west elevation, drawn up in 1847. A chapel was to be the focal point of the facade framed by two bastions of great girth, battered, machicolated and topped by swooping cone roofs and shell-pedimented lucarnes. The first of these drawings gave to the chapel three large church windows with Flamboyant tracery and, above, a set of spiky finialled dormers. For the other end of the house, drawings of 1847-52

1. Drawing at RIBAD (J12/161). Tyninghame was illus. in Walker, "William Burn" in Fawcett, Seven Victorian architects, pl. 15.
3. RIBAD, Arc III 166-184; J12/36-47.
4. RIBAD, J12/36c (10 Mar. 1847). The others are J12/36a & b (dated 4 Sep. 1847 and June 1847 respectively).
suggested an enormous turreted tower astride a porte cochère as dominant feature of a two-sided entrance court, set about with French pyramidal roofs. None of this was executed; nor did Burn succeed in completing Buchanan House, near Glasgow (1851-3) for the Duke of Montrose, to his original plans which, like the Fonthill ones, made use of French-looking dormers and turrets. The only French house which he actually built was Montagu House in London, and that (as we have seen) was in the New Louvre mode without a hint of Scotland to it.

In relation to this it must be mentioned that, quite apart from its precocity in exploring the style of the Loire chateaux, Scotland was not backward in responding to the contemporary activity in Paris, producing a crop of buildings very comparable with those in the rest of Britain. Here we are concerned only with the Loire chateau style in Scotland. William Burn's investigation of the style had been only tentative. It was left to his pupil and sometime partner, David Bryce, to develop the potential of the Franco-Scottish idea.

Five years before the partnership between Burn and Bryce was terminated in 1850, and eight before the latter's first independent venture into Franco-Baronial architecture, one isolated and early

---

1. There are several perspective views of the S.E. angle, the great tower and range of offices, all rather similar. For reproductions see Walker, "William Burn", pl. 20; Hitchcock, EVA, pl. VIII.30; Girouard, VCH, pl. 28; RIBAD Catalogue B, fig. 121.

2. RIBAD, J12/100-105 (reproduced in Hitchcock, EVA, pl. VIII.29).
example of a house in this style was commenced in the north of Scotland. It was not the work of a Scotsman, but of Sir Charles Barry, and this no doubt goes a long way to explaining the daring liberties which were taken with the Scottish style at this date. An exotic quality pervades the whole, leaving gaunt Baronial architecture far behind. The house was Dunrobin Castle. The clients were the Duke and Duchess of Sutherland. In light of their evident francophilia witnessed at Stafford House, it seems likely that the initial idea was theirs, though Barry had done a design (not executed) for Drumlanrig Castle, Dumfriesshire in 1840 which was to have placed French pavilion roofs on top of the towers.

As regards Dunrobin, Lady Waterford thought it

"Such a very romantically picturesque place, it almost justifies the Cockney remark of a Frenchman who saw it, and compared it to 'une vraie scene d'opera'."

Dramatically situated on the Sutherland coast, Dunrobin Castle had indeed a fairy-tale quality, though something of this has been lost since a few of the original turret roofs of extreme height were destroyed by fire and replaced by more typically Scottish coverings

1. Of truncated pyramid type. The towers resemble in detail and dimensions those at Barry's Neo-Elizabethan Highclere. Drawing of Drumlanrig at RIBAD. This scheme was illus. RIBA Trans, New series, I, 1884-5, pl. 91, where it is erroneously said to be for Dunrobin (I am indebted to David Walker for this reference). See also Rev. A. Barry, Op. cit., p. 142. See above, p. 49, for Barry's Franco-Elizabethan design at RIBAD. He visited France, Aug. to Oct. 1845 (see diary for that year at RIBAD).

2. To Mrs Bernal Osborne, 18 Oct. 1860 (A. J. C. Hare, The story of two noble lives, III, p. 87). Stanley Kubrick evidently agreed when he had it masquerade as a Danubian castle in his film, Barry Lyndon (1975).
by Robert Lorimer in 1919. Barry's designs, dating from 1844-5, were executed by an Aberdeen man, W. Leslie, who found it necessary to change the scheme somewhat owing to the fact that, as the Rev. Barry points out, the information upon which it had been based had been inaccurate,

"and that the designs could not be carried out without greatly enlarging the plateau on which the house stands at great expense and without more alterations of the old castle than the Duke was prepared to sanction ..."

Entries in Barry's desk diary for 17th and 18th February 1845 find him "correcting Leslie's plans of proposed additions". According to his son, Barry continued to be consulted frequently; and, on visiting the castle in 1848, made suggestions for alterations to the great entrance tower which were carried out. Even so it seems Leslie must be given the credit for introducing a greater quantity of Scottish features than Barry had intended - the corbelled and crow-stepped gable on the east, no doubt (like those at Elcho Castle, Perthshire, in Billings), plus the attic storey there; as well as alterations to the south side, overlooking the sea, where Barry's initial information had been most in error according to the Rev. Barry. An early plan by Barry at the R.I.B.A. shows, on the other hand, rather less discrepancy with what was built in this area and more to the north and east; for a vast entrance court was intended to be enclosed by the service wing to the west (which was built) and

2. "& returned them to him" (Feb. 18th). On 20 Jan. 1845 he had been at Trentham, "assisting the Duke with the plans of Dunrobin".
a long range of bedrooms to the east (which was not), the two to be linked by a pair of porters' lodges. Otherwise, the main body of the house was not materially different from what was built. The southwest corner, in particular, was virtually unchanged, for this had as its core the original tower house, as can be appreciated from views of the old castle done by William Daniell, and by members of the family.

Irrespective of which architect contributed what feature, the resulting cluster of pinnacled roofs, towering above Barry's Italian garden, was more romantically picturesque than was to be usual with houses of this genre. The cone roofs of the many turrets, some tiled, some with metal coverings, had the same markedly concave slopes that Burn had applied to his tower roofs, but made even steeper here. The general form of the entrance tower is close to that in the Fonthill drawings, and went back no doubt to Pinkie House, Midlothian; but the roof tops at Dunrobin are totally French. Most interesting is the main truncated pyramid roof with an unusually

1. RIBAD, C4/12 (iii) (a).
2. Aquatint by Daniell in his A voyage round Great Britain, 1814-25, V, pl. 29. Also an oil painting by him in the possession of the Countess of Sutherland at Dunrobin, as are two paintings by members of the family, ca. 1820 (copies at NMRS). Also at the house is a set of ten architectural drawings accompanied by a note by George Scott (the agent), dated 4 Dec. 1879, indicating that they were drawn for James Loch (the then agent) by Peter Keir (Leslie's resident draughtsman at Dunrobin) "during the rebuilding and about the date of its completion about 1852 - after that Keir went to Sir Charles Barry at the Houses of Parliament". Copies of these are at NMRS (SUD/77/1-10) and include elevations and plans. Parts of old house in darker colour. The point where the unexecuted bedroom wing was to have joined the house (at the hall on the ground floor) is shown.
steep and concave profile: an uncommon roof-shape, steep or otherwise at this date. Like the Drumlanrig ones, it preceded anything of its kind in England.

When David Bryce built in the French chateau style he was less inclined than Burn or Barry to give that continental, concave sweep to his tourelle roofs. A modest, outward flick at the gutter was usually enough. On the other hand, he introduced to his houses a range of motifs so indisputably French, and not used by the others, that the timid flirtation seen at Fonthill now flaunted itself before the public eye. Chief among these new motifs were steep, wedge-shaped roofs with crested ridges and large diamond-patterned chimneys, and the repeated ensemble of tower and tourelle, quoting the Louis XII range at Blois with a good deal more accuracy and confidence than was to be seen in England for some years, hints of it though there were. The fact that a house like Winton in East Lothian, illustrated in Billings, had a very similar tower and tourelle, minus the steep roof, would have given Blois a special appeal to Scottish architects.

Bryce's first exercise in this new range of French elements

---

1. But used here in so different a way as to suggest a quite different source from the Hôtel de Ville then being extended: some example in domestic architecture perhaps. Less spectacular pyramidal roofs and bell-shaped domes were used in Lorimer's 1919 restoration (see C. Hussey, The work of Sir Robert Lorimer, London, 1931, p. 34; CL, 3 & 10 Sep. 1921, pp 284-91, 318-26). The Barry house was illus: ILN, 28 Jly.1855, pp 113-4; 29 Sep. & 6 Oct. 1866, pp 301, 321; 14 Sep. 1872 (reproduced in Hitchcock, EVA, pl. VII.5); Morris, Seats, II, pp 49-50; Girouard, VCH, pl. 415.
was at Kinnaird Castle, seat of the 9th Earl of Southesk, designed 1853 and built 1854–8. There had originally been an old tower house on the site, but this had been transformed by James Playfair into a symmetrical, castle-style house in 1789. This Bryce used as his framework; for, despite giving to it the intricate skyline and plastic modelling fashionable in the Victorian age, he maintained much of Playfair's symmetry. He moved the entrance from the west to the north, beneath a rather Baroque porte cochère, as focus of a symmetrical sub-section of this facade composed of a pair of crow-stepped gables flanked by Blois towers¹. Victorian aesthetics as much as Scottish or French tradition made him perch the tourelle on the outer angle of these towers, as Hardwick was soon to do at The Abbots, though Bryce did employ the correct Blois usage of it in a re-entrant angle on the north facade. The tourelles he capped with tiny ogee domes, suggestive of both Scotland and the Loire. Except for a fat tourelle leading up to a look-out platform on the central roof, the garden front, complexly detailed though it is, is exact in its symmetry.

¹ A preliminary drawing of this front showed a less symmetrical arrangement: only one of the flanking towers was to have a tourelle. Another tower well to the left had a steep, wedge roof, rather than the crow-step gable it ended up with. A large but incomplete set of drawings by Bryce is at the house (which belongs to the present Earl of Southesk), dating from Nov. 1853 to Feb. 1858. There is also a specification for the Montrose Gate lodge, accounts, and bill of quantities (copies of drawings and specification at NMRS, AND/37/9-13, 43-88). Also at the house is a perspective view by Bryce, and a view of the Playfair house by Agnes, Lady Carnegie. See also Bldr., 26 Apr. 1856, p. 230; Fiddes and Rowan, Op. cit., p. 125, pl. 47-4.
The correct Blois tower arrangement was used again soon after wards (1858-60) at Eastburgh House, Pinner, Hertfordshire, the only new house Bryce built in England. This was for a distant kinsman of the Earl of Southesk, David Carnegie of Stronvar. The Blois tower and its diamond-panelled chimneys were tacked on to a somewhat dreary house with a Tudor canted bay, some crow-stepped gables and a quantity of roof-ridge cresting. Though this house brought to England the Franco-Scottish style with (in the Blois tower) a greater fidelity to a Loire model than had been hitherto seen south of Scotland, and was furthermore published in The Building News, it had no impact upon English architecture\(^1\). What is important about Kinnaird and Eastburgh is that they were the first buildings to deliberately combine Scottish and obviously French features without there being an existing Scottish Baronial house there from the start. Eastburgh was brand new; Kinnaird had been shorn of its original Baronial aspect by Playfair. Bryce added to it French roofs and chimneys (without the ambiguity which characterised Burn's work) and at the same time he added crow-steps, Maybole oriels and details of carving which probably came straight out of Billings. Burn only hinted at French architecture; Barry tried to disavow the Scottish; but Bryce brought the two together as equals.

In 1854, the year that work began at Kinnaird, the Earl of Aboyne toyed with a project similar to Kinnaird for Aboyne Castle, his Aberdeenshire seat. The idea came to nothing, and even the

\(^1\) See BN, 16 Nov. 1860, p. 377. Now demolished.
architects involved are not certain; but a pair of very proficiently executed drawings for a re-modelling of the castle in the Franco-Scottish mode is held at the castle. They bear only the address, 52 Parliament Street, Westminster, and the date, 17th October 1854. Examination of contemporary directories is disappointing: of the residents at that address the only possibly relevant name is that of the firm of surveyors, J. B. Denton and Drake, of whom little is known.\(^1\)

Confusion is caused by the existence of another set of drawings for an unexecuted scheme drawn up probably only a few years earlier by Thomas Mackenzie of Elgin (who died in 1854) and which resemble the Parliament Street ones in certain ways.\(^2\) Frustration is caused by the lack of any clear knowledge of what the earlier house had been like. Mackenzie's drawings in particular suggest that the south or entrance front had had a simple Georgian elevation with central bow. Behind and to the left, it had been attached to an older and higher tower house. At any event, both Mackenzie and Denton and Drake proposed the removal of the entrance to the east front, to be accented imposingly in both cases (the coincidence is startling) by means of a lofty porch of the type seen at nearby Fyvie Castle. Where Mackenzie surmounted the arch by a pair of crow-stepped gables, Denton and Drake substituted a steep French roof.

---

1. Watkins Commercial and General London Directory and Court Aid, London, 1854. In the list of surveyors, they merit the symbol 'a' signifying 'architects and surveyors'.
2. These are at the castle too. Copies held at NMRS, as are the Denton and Drake ones (ABD/11/27-8).
some chimneys with the French circle motif, and a set of dormers. The two versions used identically positioned bartizans. Denton and Drake had the carriage drive sweep round to the entrance through an arch in the service wing to the north, as Burn had done at Fonthill. The south elevation was fancier. There was to be a symmetrical, three-pavilion composition with high French roofs, the central bowed pavilion receiving especially elaborate treatment. Above the cornice perched a nest of turrets and dormers clustered round a sort of hexagonal pyramid roof. Steep turrets and chimneys from other parts of the house towered beyond, giving a varied rather fussy silhouette. None of this was done. The house received Baronial and castellated additions later last century, but today only the old tower house survives.

In the 1850s and early 1860s a few other architects experimented in the Franco-Scottish mode (Andrew Heiton, for instance, at Dun-alastair, Perthshire, 1852), but without Bryce's commitment. Until the late 1860s, when some of his pupils took up the style, Bryce made the style fairly much his own, though it was always secondary in his œuvre to his more straightforward Baronial output. His contemporaries, tending to be rather free with their interpretations of styles, found in his work rather more examples of French treatment than we do today. The Anglo-Scottish house, Panmure, was felt to have a hint of "the old French chateau". Bryce's obituary, too, labelled it "French Renaissance", as it did the very Scottish house,

Eastend, and the now demolished Inverardoch, concerning which we
have no information to the contrary. Similarly Glenapp in Ayrshire
was inappropriately termed a "stately chateau" when exhibited at the
Royal Academy in 1874. On the other hand, the obituary perversely
failed to recognise the obvious French features of another house,
calling it 'Italian' instead. Perhaps this is understandable for

69B Belladrum at Beauly, Inverness-shire (1858), from the little we
know of it, seems an unsatisfactory mixture of styles which hardly
convinces as a chateau. Views of the garden front only survive.
Bryce's task had been the renovation of a pre-existing eighteenth-
century house for James Merry, not the building of a new one, which
might partly explain the awkward results. Certainly the garden
front was Italian to some extent, with its cornice surmounted by a
balustrade with ball and obelisk elaborations, behind which the
dormers were nearly lost to sight. The roof over the central section
seems to have been low and unspectacular, but to each side, and set
back towards the facade of which we know nothing, were high hipped
roofs with ridge cresting. A cone-capped tourelle appears to
terminate the unseen entrance facade, while disproportionately
high chimneys with the Chambord diamond motif bestride the whole
edifice. In this continental company it is not surprising that the
octagonal ogee domes on top of the terminal pavilions of the garden
front take on an exotic air despite their descent from Heriot's
Hospital in Edinburgh and other seventeenth-century Scottish buildings.

The unsatisfactory nature of Belladrum derives from the use in a low Italianate villa composition of a set of motifs which by their inherent forms as well as tradition belong to compositions which are towering and picturesque 1.

In his later French designs Bryce was more successful. There were not many. Apart from the North British Insurance Office, Dublin (1866–8), with its octagonal stair tower based on the famous Blois example 2, there were only three other French-inspired buildings by Bryce. These were Meikleour, near Blairgowrie, Perthshire, the seat of the 5th Marquess of Lansdowne; and two Edinburgh buildings, Fettes College and the Royal Infirmary.

For Meikleour (1869) Bryce devised a pair of preliminary schemes which in the event were not executed. Both for the entrance front, they were in the Classical style of Francis I, one in particular achieving a pleasing combination of Classical formality with a varied skyline. The centre of the facade was to be accented only by a slightly advancing porch; but to each side were to be, first, a squared pavilion with steep, truncated pyramid roof, and then, a round cone-roofed bastion. Terminating the facade at each end were to have been lower pavilions, each of three bays, surmounted by a steep roof and large French chimney. The second scheme was similar but more modest, the high truncated pyramid roofs of the inner pavilions having been replaced by lower ones which are the same height as the roof of

the corps de logis. The entrance facade as built was in fact very close to this second scheme; but the difference in effect between sketch and fact is a reminder of the ability of the prettily tinted perspective view to mislead. The few alterations that were made in execution were certainly not desirable aesthetically - the outer pavilions were omitted altogether, while the roofing of the inner ones was reduced yet again to low hipped extensions of the main roof, a sad loss of skyline effect. Much of the cause of disappointment resides, however, in the use of an obtrusively ugly stone; the failure to give sufficient size or contrast to the banding at the angles of the pavilions; and, most serious of all, a subtle difference in the proportions of the entire building. Everything has the appearance of being a little bit lower and broader: the lack of banding makes the pavilions seem wider; the height of the main roof which had been twice that of the upper-most floor has been reduced to the same size. The second of the preliminary sketches is hardly more varied in skyline than the finished building but the sense of greater height which it imparts is telling.

Far more satisfactory is the garden front. For a start, no seductive preliminary views exist to tell of abandoned alternatives; but the lowness of the building is here entirely suitable, for, surprisingly, all hint of sixteenth-century France has gone, to be replaced by a very elegant exercise in dix-huitième Classicism. The centre pavilion has a large pediment decorated with a Rococo cartouche. In front, the terrace descends to the lawn by a pair of delicately bowed flights of steps. 1869 is an unexpected date for such an exercise. Perhaps the fact that the Dowager Marchioness of Lansdowne
who was responsible for the commission) was a daughter of the sometime French ambassador to England, the Comte de Flahault, may explain the inspiration from the French eighteenth century, both inside and out. Whatever the reason for the choice, not since Wrest Park had there been so dedicated an exercise in eighteenth-century design, except for Stokes's Pregny in Switzerland; and it is interesting to note that Scotland which had led the way with the Loire chateau fashion was setting the pace again with this early premonition of the taste for eighteenth-century French Classicism which was not to emerge in England until the last two decades of the century.

What is also interesting about Meikleour is that it indicated an advance upon Kinnaird and Belladrum in its scholarship. The pedimental cartouche, for instance, appears to derive from a plate in Blondel's *Maisons de plaisance*. The source of the whole garden-front composition is less easy to pinpoint; indeed, it is likely that no specific design was copied but that it was inspired by the whole body of house designs of this type which populate French pattern books from Marot onwards. Bryce had a very good library of such books, including *Maisons de plaisance*, both the *Grand* and the *Petit Marot*, and a number of books of ornament by artists such as Berain, Jean Le Pautre, Tijou and Delafosse. Bryce's habit of

1. See Ch. 11. The two perspective views of the entrance front are held at the house, belonging to the present Marquess (copies at NMRS). The first of them and a view of the front as built are in Fiddes and Rowan, *Op. cit.*, pl. 45-6 (see also p. 127).
2. Vol. II, pl. 31, p. 41, figure IIIe.
3. D. Bryce, *Catalogue of books in architecture and allied subjects which belonged to the eminent Scottish architect, the late Mr. David Bryce, R.I.A., F.R.I.B.A.* ... compiled by George Berry, Edinburgh, 1928. (Copy at E.P.L.)
taking tracings of ornamental details from pattern books has been noted already.

His library was less well equipped with literature on the sixteenth-century French styles; but this did not prevent a display of scholarship at Fettes College, Edinburgh, equalled only at West Park and Waddesdon Manor. The school brims over with an esoteric set of quotations from the historic buildings of France, only some of which he could have known in sufficient detail from the printed matter available when work commenced in 1864. It seems likely that he visited France between the completion of Kinnaird and Belladrum and the beginning of work on Fettes, so considerable is the increase in the academic approach to detail. Furthermore there is a similarity in his later work to the neat symmetry of the nineteenth-century French approach to the Loire style, which was not paralleled with such precision by English architects prior to 1870 with the exception of G. H. Stokes and Verelst at Rhianva. Occasionally modern French designs of this type appeared in published material in France, though virtually never in Britain prior to about 1870. Unknown in Britain would have been the Angevin work of René Hodé. There is a hint of his Château de Chanzeau (1846) about the unexecuted designs.

1. See above, p. 150. See also below, pp 425-6.
2. E.g. Château de Saint-Martin-Saint-Paulzo (near Nevers) by Lussy, 1840, in L. M. Normand, Paris moderne, Paris, 1837-57, pl. 115 -20; and a few houses in early issues of MDA (a journal which Bryce subscribed to): "Maison de campagne dans le style gothique", MDA, IV, 1849, pl. 40-1; ditto, MDA, XII, 15 July 1852, pl. 133. The quantity of this sort of design increased greatly in MDA in the late 1860s and '70s.
for Meikleour. There is quite a strong resemblance between his
87B Challain-la-Potherie (1846-54) and Fettes: but that is more likely
to be coincidental than that Bryce actually saw the French house
1.

The dominant mood of the college is that of a north French
71B (even Belgian or German) town hall, with its profusion of tiny
72A lucarnes in the roofs2. The central tower bears a close similarity
to that of the Hôtel de Ville at Compiègne which also contributes
to this mood. Yet there are motifs from the Loire chateaux, from
the Tuileries, and from Scottish architecture in this mixture as
well. It is the steep spire associated with the angle tourelles
and the sumptuously canopied dormer window which especially recall
Compiègne, a building well known and liked by the Victorians3; even

1. Hodé's work did get publicity in Baron de Wismes, Le Maine et
l'Anjou historiques, archéologiques et pittoresques, Paris, 1862,
II. See also L'Oeuvre de René Hodé, 1840-1870: architecture d'hier:
grandes demeures angevines au XIXe siècle (catalogue of an exhibition
held at the Hôtel de Sully), Paris, La Caisse nationale des monuments
2. An earlier commission, contemporary with his work at Kinnaird
had been the Dundee Royal Exchange (1853-6) in a "Fleming sixteenth-
century burghal" style - with spiky dormers, ogee arches, and colon-
ettes flanking the windows in a rather French way. Two perspective
views are held at the Dundee City Art Galleries. Illus. in Fiddes
and Rowan, Op. cit., p. 103 & pl. 52; Neil Jackson, "David Bryce,
R.S.A. (1803-1877)", SF, Sep. 1973, pp 30-1. See also Building
Chronicle, 1 Jly. 1854.
3. In EN, 1 Mar. 1861, p. 182, the Hôtel de Ville at Compiègne was
(with some other French buildings) said to be "familiar", apropos
of its appearance in the book, A. Verdier and F. Cattois, Architecture
civile et domestique, Paris, 1855, I,p. 172. It was also illus. in
J. Pellassy de Dousle, Histoire du palais de Compiègne, Paris, 1862;
MDA, XXXI, 15 Sep. 1855, pl. 361; ILN, 21 Apr. 1860, p. 369; and
(much later) EN, 18 Nov. 1887, p. 752, where it was noted accurately
that E. W. Godwin had used it a lot (e.g. Congleton Town Hall).
so, the tower cannot be seen as a straight-forward debt to Compiègne, for there was a number of Scottish, even English precedents for this sort of arrangement, too. Pinkie House and Wollaton Hall, Nottingham, sources for Fonthill and Panmure could have been influential at Fettes too, with their towers and corner turrets. Closer was the Canongate Tolbooth with corner turrets and central spire as well. The lower part of the Fettes tower is distinguished by a Fyvie arch.

There were more certain debts to French architecture than this hint of Compiègne. To each side of the tower were imitations of Delorme's stair tourelles at the Tuileries, long since demolished, but recorded in the *Grand Marot*. Just above the main entrance is a quaint little balcony with a pair of corbelled bulges looking a bit like the under-corbelling of the Scottish bartizan but which in fact Bryce borrowed from Chenonceaux, by way, one might have imagined, of the new book by Victor Petit, *Châteaux de la Vallée de la Loire* (of which he had a copy)\(^1\) were it not for the fact that he had used the device already, over the entrance at Craigends, Renfrewshire, back in 1857: there, interestingly, in a composition which (apart from a quantity of roof cresting) is strongly Scottish in mood\(^2\).

Another sharply observed detail was the elaboration of the Blois towers (one at each end of the entrance front) with spiral-patterned shafts down the angles - a detail of the original which he had ignored at Kinnaird and Eastburgh, as did other users of this sort

---

1. *Châteaux de la Vallée de la Loire des XVe, XVIe, et XVIIe siècles*, Paris, 1861, pp 51-2. E. M. Barry was to use this balcony too (see below, p. 365).
of tower. Add to this display of archaeology (not approached in England for nearly ten years more), a Château d’O oriel, arcading from Rosslyn chapel or the Cathedral at Durham, a phalanx of Flamboyant dormers from Blois, and (pièce de résistance) a chapel like a baby Sainte Chapelle, and one begins to realise what an academic jigsaw Fettes College is. Crow-steps and Franco-Scottish tourrelles there are aplenty too, lest we forget the historic link. The whole is a triumph of Victorian decoration and eclecticism, while achieving at the same time a remarkably homogeneous effect vindicating the theoretical foundations of the Franco-Scottish style¹.

The resemblance to the Compiègne Hôtel de Ville seen at Fettes was if anything stronger at the New Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh (1870-9), the final building by Bryce for consideration here. This is because the tower was associated (as centre-piece) with the greater compactness of the administration block with only three bays to each side. The effect of this is partly spoiled now by the raising one floor higher of the low corridor with which it was joined to the symmetrically arranged wings containing the wards.

These latter, with their paired round bastions at their extremities, are as usual ambiguous in their origins. Especially in this arrangement the towers recall Holyrood; but the Holyrood battlementing is not there, and at least one contemporary commentator thought of France:

"... these circular corner towers rising from the foundation of the building, of a diameter in plan greater than the average Scotch turret, are thoroughly French, and common to many of the old military chateaux."

It is a composition not dissimilar to that already seen at Rhianva and Wynnstay.

Even if we feel that this is hardly necessary, we must admit the French origins of the pavilion plan. The aim of this arrangement (with surgical and medical wards separated by the administration block) was

"to avoid large or closely-packed masses of buildings, and to take care that each block should be exposed on all sides to the free action of the atmosphere."

A similar objective had induced Bryce to select an H-shaped plan for Fettes eight years earlier; but a concern for this issue went back a little further still. John Robertson, a Manchester surgeon,

1. BA, 31 Oct. 1879, p. 171.
2. BA, 12 May 1876, p. 248. The history of the building of the New Infirmary was fraught with wrangles over site, plan, hygiene, noxious vapours, and whether poor Bryce was competent to cope with it all: see A. Logan Turner, The Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh Bicentenary year, 1729-1929, Edinburgh, 1929; also his The story of a great hospital: The Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, 1729-1929, Edinburgh, 1937; Peter H. R. Blythe, David Bryce, R.S.A., architect (1803-1876): a consideration of his work in Edinburgh, Thesis (Dip. Hist. Art), University of Edinburgh, 1975.
3. RIBA Trans, 1st series, XV, 1864-5, appendix, i-iii.
read a paper in 1856 to the Statistical Society of Manchester on the planning of hospitals, stressing the necessity for the free circulation of the atmosphere\(^1\). Whereas British hospitals tended to be constructed after the plan of a hotel, warrens of inadequately ventilated passages and staircases, French hospitals were built according to the wing or pavilion arrangement. While indicating that a tradition of such planning stretched back to Durand and hospital designs in his *Parallèle des édifices*, Robertson gave special praise to Bordeaux Hospital (which he illustrated) and to some new hospitals in Paris (Beaujon and Lariboisière) which employed this system. Three years after Robertson's address *The Builder* published an article which included the plan of the Lariboisière Hospital\(^2\). Much of the credit, however, must go to Florence Nightingale who campaigned vigorously for the adoption of the French planning system for hospitals. One of her triumphs was the acceptance of the pavilion system at the new St. Thomas's Hospital, Lambeth, planned by Henry Currey. Designed in 1865 and built 1868-71, this much publicised building clearly influenced Bryce's plan considerably. He visited it in June 1871\(^3\).

The Edinburgh Infirmary was Bryce's last work. He did not live to see its completion, which was left to his nephew John. Bryce's influence on Scottish architecture was considerable: for ten years or so before his death the younger generation had been working in the Franco-Scottish style which he had done so much to promote. Most notable amongst his pupils was Charles Kinnear. Another skilled exponent of the style was James Maitland Wardrop who may have spent some time in Bryce's office. In the 1870s members of the Glasgow school were showing an interest in the Brycean style. The Loire style was making progress in England too, however, and this seems to have brought about a shift of emphasis in the Scottish approach to French architecture. Some deliberately Franco-Scottish work continued to appear, but there was a tendency for the two historic types to separate out - neo Scottish Baronial houses to be more Scottish, French Renaissance ones more French.

Charles Kinnear and his partner, J. Dick Peddie, usually added just an occasional bit of French roofing to their Scottish Baronial houses - perhaps an octagonal cone turret and some roof cresting as at Kinnettles House, Angus (1865-7). At Auchmore Perthshire (1873), on the other hand, they indulged in a rather spiritless exercise,

part seventeenth-century French, part Palladian, with no suggestion of Scottish Baronial to it\(^1\). To bigger, urban institutions, like the Aberdeen Municipal Buildings (1868) or the Morgan Hospital, Dundee (1863-71), they usually lent a touch of Bryce's north French \(hôtel de ville\) style with the Compiègne-cum-Canongate Tolbooth tower, a strong favourite along with crow-steps, dormers, cresting and tourelles. In preliminary drawings for the Aberdeen buildings these latter show the spiral rake of the stairs, in the French manner\(^2\).

Most stunning of all experiments with the French Renaissance styles by Peddie and Kinnear (or anyone else in Scotland for that matter, outdoing even Fettes) was a scheme for the remodelling of St Martin's Abbey, Perthshire. Sadly, it was never executed. There had been a plain Georgian house on the site since 1791 to which David Bryce had made additions (1860), not at all in a French manner. In 1869 Col. William McDonald McDonald called in Peddie and Kinnear to

---

1. For 7th Earl of Breadalbane. Originally an irregular Georgian house of 1802. Drawings exist at Dick Peddie & McKay, architects, Edinburgh (ref. 229) for: first, small-scale alterations, dated May 1872 (new service wing plus two cone-topped turrets, one octagonal on garden front); and second, a more extensive transformation of the front (œil-de-boeuf and Palladian windows, tall tower, huge conservatory). When shown at R.S.A., 1873, it was called a "stately chateau" (**Bldr**, 8 Mar. 1873, p. 180). Another (unspecified) house in Forfarshire shown at R.S.A., 1871 (no. 921), was said by **Bldr** (25 Mar. 1871, p. 221) to be "of the Early French Renaissance chateau style".

2. Not in the finished building, however. Four drawings are held by Dick Peddie & McKay (copies at NMRS, ABD/448/1-4). For illus. see **BN**, 27 Mar. 1868, pp 210, 213; **Bldr**, 6 Jun. 1868, pp 410-1; 14 May 1898. For the Morgan Hospital see **Bldr**, 29 Apr. 1871, pp 317-8, 326-7; 31 Mar. 1877, pp 321-3. Here there are colonnettes inset at the angle of the centre tower, like the shafts at Fettes à la Blois. Another Peddie and Kinnear building of this type was the court house, Greenock (**Bldr**, 19 Jan. 1867, pp 44-5).
draw up plans for further extensions and embellishments which, if executed, would have transformed the house beyond recognition. The expense would have been prodigious: its abandonment is no surprise. Luckily the drawings survive to record this fantastic flight of the romantic imagination. To the L-shaped plan (which Bryce had left) was to be added a wing making the third side of a rectangle. Across the fourth (on the north, entrance front) a lowish range, only two floors high, was to enclose the courtyard completely in a way reminiscent of a Parisian hôtel particulier. Behind this, the embellished corps de logis of the old house towered upwards reaching in the central part at least nine storeys. The whole is a masterpiece of High Victorian design with its basic pyramidal mass building up, turret by pinnacle, to the central focus of tower and lantern. Some debts to Scottish architecture may be detected (the bell-like turret roofs, the squared Pinkie bartizans on the south facade) and rather more to Jacobethan design (some dormer shapes and much of the fenestration of the main apartments); but the overall feeling has come from Chambord: the multiplicity of chimneys, lanterns, dormers and tourelles; and also the treatment of the huge central bastion with its reticulated surface of window strips intersecting with horizontal banding, more accurately handled than in most other British examples. To aid him here, Kinnear would almost certainly have made use of Adolphe Berty's meticulous drawings of Chambord.

1. One perspective view of the entrance (north) front; one elevation of the south front; both dated Feb. 1869, both in the possession of the present owner of the house, Mr David Methven. Illus. in Fiddes and Rowan, Op. cit., pl. 47.

Chambord was again the inspiration for a very different, severer building by another of Bryce's pupils. This was the Hydropathic Establishment at Peebles (1878-81) by John Starforth. Its life was short: it was destroyed by fire in 1905. Its arrangement of bastions, rather more spread out than at St Martin's Abbey, but still with the strongest emphasis in the middle, is like that of Chambord, as are the roof lanterns of the bastions. At the same time the grouping of them in pairs reminds us (as at Bryce's Infirmary) of Holyrood Palace. Like the similar ones at the Cannon Street Hotel, the central domes have strayed somewhat from French precedent; and the treatment of the attic dormers is in the Scottish sixteenth-century manner with simulated rather than actual pediments. Yet the chateau feeling predominates.

The French chateau vogue might almost (in Scotland at least) have been re-named the 'Hydropathic style', for establishments furthering this newly fashionable water treatment sprang up all over the country, showing, like more conventional hotels, a distinct

---

1. For Chambord see vol. II, pl. 1-17. Probably too recently published to be of use to Kinnear was Auguste Millot's *Les grands édifices de la Renaissance: Le Château de Chambord*, Paris, 1868. Chambord was to appear also in Eyriès and Perret, *Les châteaux historiques de la France*, 1877-81, II. See also J. Mariette, *Vues des plus beaux bâtiments de France*, 1685. For its appearance in nineteenth-century building journals see Appendix B. In the late 1860s British journals gave some attention, too, to the newly completed, very Chambordish and extravagant renovations to Schloss Schwerin, Mecklenburg, Germany, begun 1844 by G. A. Demmler, completed by F. A. Stüler, 1865 (see *Bldr*, 4 Jan. & 1 Aug. 1868, pp 9-11, 570-2. In *EN*, 31 Aug. 1883, p. 326, it was called "an important work of the first character"; see also Hitchcock, *ANTC*, p. 165).
preference for the French architectural styles. Peddie and Kinnear
produced a bulging Louvre-domed specimen at Callander, Perthshire,
1879, with tower and steep wedge roof over the entrance. More
spectacular was the Moffat Hydropathic Hotel, Dumfriesshire (1876-8)
by F. T. Pilkington and J. Murray Bell. Here, within a symmetrical
composition, a varied skyline is achieved combining Classical
mansards and oeil-de-boeuf dormers (as well as a very steep central
pavilion mansard) with a pair of round Franco-Scottish bastions.

The use of early Renaissance towers in a strictly Classical
composition (as was seen also in the various schemes for the
Meikleour entrance front) received grand handling at Callendar House,
Falkirk, by J. M. Wardrop. The history of Callendar is highly
complex. After its acquisition by the Forbes family in 1780 the
original seventeenth-century tower house had been expanded by James
Craig into a long, symmetrical barracks of a place, with two tall
polygonal towers, as can be appreciated in a view of it by Alexander
Nasmyth. In the late 1820s David Hamilton concocted some designs
for lavish alterations but these were not carried out. Wardrop's

1. Two sets of drawings exist at Dick Peddie & McKay's (ref. 599):
1) 13 drawings for a modest hotel with Louvre domes but no tower;
2) 20 drawings, dated 2 Dec. 1879, showing an expansion of the ground
plan and addition of the tower. The hotel was burned down.
was burned down in 1921.
3. Original coloured engraving drawn by Nasmyth, engraved by F. C.
Lewis, is in the possession of Mr J. G. Dunbar, Carlops (copy
at NMRS). Craig's and Hamilton's drawings are at S.R.O., Charlotte
Square, Edinburgh.
remodelling of the house in the manner of a French chateau for the third William Forbes of Callendar was done in two stages. An extensive collection of relevant drawings which are preserved at the Callendar Estate Office, Falkirk, enables the evolution of the house through these two stages to be pieced together fairly clearly.¹

The first stage was undertaken in 1869 shortly after Forbes's remarriage, and during Wardrop's partnership with Thomas Brown. The chief centre of attention was the south garden front. What this facade was like when Brown and Wardrop began work is not absolutely clear. Craig's plan indicates an undifferentiated wall the entire length of the house; but Wardrop's designs repeatedly show that a slender, round stair-turret pre-dated his activity there. When exactly this was added we do not know. Wardrop's 1869 work involved rendering the facade symmetrical and generally livening it up by means of additions to the skyline and by the movement afforded by the use of pavilions and towers. The original house had consisted of a high block-like corps de logis with low extensions at each end. To these extensions Wardrop added dormer windows and truncated pyramid roofs. The mystery turret at the western extremity of the main block, he matched to the east, though making his new one both slightly higher and bigger in diameter, to better harmonise with the two bowed pavilions with which he emphasised the centre of the composition.

On top of these, and also just towards the centre from the two round

¹. Copies of the drawings can be seen at NMRS (STD/73/4-56). The first set is dated Sept. – Oct. 1869; the second, Feb. 1876, with revisions in March 1877.
turrets, he placed steep, hipped roofs. Corbelled tourelles in the
centre, an Italianate terrace and steps, copious finials and diamond-
panelled chimneys completed the picture.

At the same time the appearance of the entrance front was
altered, it seems, only to the extent that the hipped roofs and
accompanying dormers could be seen rising behind - unless Brown and
Wardrop were responsible for the introduction of a central porte
cochère and a double-flight staircase ascending from the entrance
hall to the main apartments on the floor above. On the 1869 plans,
however, they are not given the darker shading with which the
architects indicated their alterations. Perhaps the author of the
mystery turret on the garden side also did the stair. In Craig's
day the main stair was well away from the front door.

The work on the garden front having been completed in 1870,
it was soon realised that the entrance side made a sad contrast. In
1876, therefore, Wardrop (now senior partner of the firm Wardrop
and Reid) was at work again. Craig's over-fenestrated octagonal
turrets were found to be old-fashioned, and were replaced by a
further pair of (surely unnecessary) staircases, making three to-
gether across the centre front. Bartizans rose from the angles of
the squared centre pavilion which the introduction of the stairs
had created; a balustrade was run the full length of the main
block; and a pair of turrets were placed at the extremities, like

1. Not intended to begin with: STD/73/31 (NMR) shows no bartizans;
STD/73/40 (possibly an alternative flap originally stuck to No. 31)
shows the bartizans.
those on the garden front, to mask the awkward junction with the lower service extensions. These latter were given truncated pyramid roofs to match those on the other front. By 1878 the work was completed.

Both facades are similar in spirit to those of the Cour du Cheval Blanc at Fontainebleau and the Château de Madrid, the most Classical of Francis I's palaces, with their combinations of pavilion symmetry and a picturesque silhouette. Callendar's detailing (which is crisp and scholarly) derives from other chateaux, however. The diamond-panelled chimneys and the Chenonceaux dormers are familiar.

Less so is the large dormer window in the centre of the main front. This is like a grand version of the Chenonceaux variety with colonnettes and flanking pilasters linked by tiny flying buttresses.

The source of this is the Hôtel d'Ecoville, received by way of Claude Sauvageot's book of Palais. The fact that another architect had already copied the dormer type straight out of Sauvageot had caused some commotion in 1873; and certainly the Ecoville dormer enjoyed great popularity in the 1870s and '80s, as will be seen in due course.

At Callendar Bryce's academic approach was continued, but little survived of the Franco-Scottish liaison which he had promoted.

There are hints of Scottish architecture at Callendar - in the corbelled treatment of the upper parts of the garden-front pavilions, for instance, and some decorative panels which break the string course on the same facade (not to mention the usual ambiguity of the turrets) - but on the whole the mood is very French. The Franco-Scottish flirtation was nearly over. French Renaissance work in Scotland fell into line with that of England, which was only to be expected when the Loire chateau style caught on south of the border as well. As a background to all this the Louvre mode continued strongly in urban architecture in Scotland as in England. Country-house owners in both countries were tricking out their mansions with incongruous sets of pavilion roofs. There was no concern for historic connections between France and Scotland here.

During the final decades of the nineteenth century a few Scottish architects continued to work occasionally in Bryce's Franco-Scottish style; but the crusading spirit had gone out of it. Habit only prevailed. Auchindennan House on the banks of Loch Lomond (1873) by the older John Burnet was one example; the Dunfermline Corporation Buildings (1878) by J. C. Walker, another. Small suburban bungalows perpetuated the idea too, with quite inventive

1. The house is now being restored; its ultimate fate is uncertain. On Callendar see Bldr, 3 Jan. 1885, pp 8-9; J. S. Fleming, Ancient castles and mansions of the Stirling nobility, Paisley, 1902, pp 295-302; Thomas Hannen, Famous Scottish houses: the Lowlands, London, 1928, pp 49-52; Callender House: its place in Scottish history (reprinted from Falkirk Herald) 1878-9. Elsewhere Wardrop restricted himself to only an occasional French motif, e.g. Lochinch Castle, Wigtownshire (1867); Alloa County Buildings (1863).

2. For George Martin. Illus. Archt, 22 Mar. 1873, p. 154; Archt, 4 Apr. 1902, where it is said to be by A. W. Paterson.

French-Scottish roof types popping up in areas like Marchmont in Edinburgh. One of the most competent and imaginative architects of the Glasgow school to use the Franco-Scottish mode was William Leiper.

The two modest villas, Cairndhu at Helensburgh for the Lord Provost of Glasgow, John Ure, and Cornhill House, near Biggar, Lanarks., for Alexander Kay (both ca. 1871) are the most French-looking of his houses though there were many by Leiper, in and around Helensburgh in particular, which included the odd French motif. The bowed pavilion to the left on Cairndhu looks like a debt to Chambord, but The Builder thought the design had "all the picturesqueness without the sternness of the Scottish Baronial residence."^2

Paradoxically, when the style was waning amongst the Scots, two late Franco-Baronial essays were thought up by English architects. Anthony Salvin, with his life-long dabblings in French architecture behind him, added steep conical roofs to the towers at Inveraray Castle for the Duke of Argyll, 1879 - all that was done of a more extensive Franco-Scottish scheme proposed and abandoned because of expense^3. The other example by an English architect was a good deal more French than Scottish and was built in Bournemouth, a far cry

---

1. Bryce's terrace houses on the Marchmont Estate, 1869-76, include many an ambiguously Franco-Scottish roof-shape too.
3. There had been a fire. Jill Allibone's thesis, *Salvin*, refers to a set of drawings at the castle which are quite French. Rather less so are drawings at RIBAD (W8/23 (1-7)). See also Archt, 30 Nov. 1878, p. 304.
from the Highlands. Sir Merton Russell-Cotes, some-time publican, and mayor of the town, built East Cliff Hall on the cliffs above Bournemouth as an offering of "love and affection" to his wife. This lady came from Scotland, so Sir Merton

"made up (his) mind to construct it architecturally to combine the Renaissance with Italian and old Scottish Baronial styles."¹

With its quantity of French, crested roofing, Italianate terraces and step-ways, a fat conservatory, and candy-striped awnings, it is a highly bizarre confection to which a pair of cone-shaped turrets can lend little taste of the Scottish glens. Sir Merton's biography supplies a much more likely source in an illustration of the house of a Mrs Boyd "whom we visited at San Francisco", a marvel of Second Empire villa-architecture constructed

"entirely of wood as were all the best houses in the most aristocratic quarter of that town."²

In Scotland itself, mixtures of the French and the Scottish were increasingly rare. Leiper's later work was either one thing or the other, but rarely a combination of both; likewise that of George Washington Browne and firms such as Campbell Douglas and

¹ Sir M. Russell-Cotes, Home and abroad; an autobiography of an octogenarian, Bournemouth, 1921, i, p. 217 (privately printed). His architect, J. F. Fogerty of Bournemouth, probably had little say.
Sellars, and Sydney Mitchell and Wilson. Apart from an unpublicised design of 1909 by Sir Robert Lorimer for Kinneil House (a West Lothian property of the Duke of Hamilton) which proposed that a *dix-huitième* mansarded range be slung across between two dour, crow-stepped blocks (a scheme which had nothing to do with ideas of historic stylistic links, and which was abandoned as soon as it was thought of), it was left to Hippolyte Blanc, who despite his name had shown little interest in the French Renaissance Revival, to give a last flutter to the Auld Alliance in his competition design for the Scottish National Memorial to King Edward VII at Holyrood. By 1912 steep, wedge-shaped roofs and Scottish bartizans seemed rather out of date.

---

1. For works of these architects see ch. 8.
2. Plans in Hamilton Collection, Lennoxlove (copy at NMRS WLD/23/3). As has been mentioned above Lorimer rejected the chance to be Franco-Scottish in his restorations at Dunrobin, choosing clearly Scottish roof types. For his Marchmont House see below, pp 282-3.
Scotland's early and enthusiastic adoption of the Loire-chateau style had not been matched in England. As has been seen, sober French Classicism was more the taste of the 1850s, or if the house were Gothic, then little more than an occasional steep, wedge roof. Even so, there had been Rhianva on Anglesey as early as 1850, and G. H. Stokes had shown his interest on paper in the Loire-chateau type in 1856, taking his chance to put these ideas into practice at Battlesden, early in the following decade. Wynnstay in less far-flung Wales than Rhianva, and also Montagu House in the capital itself, showed in their detailing a growing interest in the era of Francis I. The Loire-cum-Scotch Baronial style of David Bryce attracted some attention in the south when in 1857 Eastburgh was built in Hertfordshire.

This trend towards wider acceptance of the Loire style throughout Britain continued to gain ground steadily during the 1860s. By 1870 it was the favoured type. It must not be thought, however, that it was the only variety of French architecture built at that time, or even that only the older generation continued to employ the New Louvre style which had had its first impact ten years previously. Student work simultaneously reflected the old and new types: W. Hilton Nash, for instance, won the Soane Medallion in 1875 with a design for a "London Residence" which harked back to Montagu House 1, while

1. EN, 16 Apr. 1875, p. 428.
P. Auld's design for a mansion, shown at the Royal Academy the preceding year, attracted some notice with its combination of Loiresque towers and "Aesthetic" detailing. This difference probably indicated the continuing attitude that the formality of the Louvre was, amongst French styles, the one pre-eminently suitable for urban architecture. Auld's mansion would have been most appropriate in the suburbs, for it most resembles, amongst houses that were built, Leiper's Cairndhu in Helensburgh, and the rather later Westwood House by J. L. Pearson situated in green and hilly Sydenham. Whatever the link between styles and environment, it is clear that in the late Victorian decades new modes added to rather than replaced the range of styles which were at an architect's disposal.

Before dealing with the upsurge of the Loire style in England, it will be as well to look at some of the houses of the later 1860s and the 1870s which continued the fashions established in earlier years. The Louvre and the Whitehall competition were exerting a slight influence on country houses while Gothic and High Victorian eclectic mansions continued to dabble, in a cursory fashion, with French motifs, particularly in relation to detailing of their roofs. Increasingly common was the tendency to include details from Loire chateaux (dormer designs, diamond patterns on the chimneys, etc.) while still avoiding an over-all chateau aspect.

1. See below, p. 299n.
2. Auld did apply this design for a town house, however (see Archt, 4 Sep. 1875). The difference lies simply in the restricted site allowing for less picturesque effect. It relates therefore to the "Mayfair style" of Ernest George et al. (see below, pp 349-52).
The 1860s were the high-water mark of the continental influence upon the Gothic Revival. Robert Kerr's example in The Gentleman's House of the "mediaeval or Gothic style" had the usual scattering of French pyramid or wedge roofs, tourelles and metal ridge-cresting. William Wilkinson's book called English country houses, published in 1870, is full of such designs.

Perhaps the most stunning example of all Gothic houses in these High Victorian years was Waterhouse's Eaton Hall in Cheshire. It was late for this sort of thing, almost an anachronism, but it seemed to embody all that its predecessors had striven for. Like Kerr's and Wilkinson's houses, built or otherwise, most of its Gothic details were definitely mediaeval, even ecclesiastical in parts (such as the immense, triple-arched porch and arcading across the garden front inherited from the old house, and corridor and staircase vaults inside), yet its array of thorough-going French roofs (tall hips and cone-spired tourelles) and also the symmetry of its corps de logis related it to the other mock Renaissance chateaux of the day more closely than had been the case with Kerr's and Wilkinson's more random and isolated usage of French detailing. Their mode of dabbling with French motifs as an aid to picturesqueness and variety,

2. English country houses, London, 1870. See also his house at Lake Zug, Switzerland, for M. ch de Gouyenbach Escher (BN, 13 Aug. 1875, p. 166); and a pair of houses, Banbury for W. J. Douglas and a Mr Coleman (BN, 8 Dec. 1866, pp 904-5, reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 195). These have high French roofs and finials, a Loiresque angle tourelle with unfaceted cone roof; also much polychromy.
as opposed to a more conscious desire to imitate the French chateaux, was in fact Waterhouse's more usual approach and can be seen at houses such as Coldhayes, Hants. (1869), and Iwerne Minster House, Dorset (1878). The different approach at Eaton Hall was partly dictated by the earlier house and partly by the taste of the client. The latter was the 3rd Marquess (from 1874 1st Duke) of Westminster, who in 1869 had had Clutton add the French Classical stables at Cliveden, not to mention his interest in the French styles for his London estates. As for the earlier house, this (by Porden, 1803, slightly altered by Burn, 1845-50) had been one of the most fantastic examples of late Georgian frilly Gothick and had been symmetrical to start with. Waterhouse's activities at Eaton had begun as small-scale alterations but turned rapidly into a near total recasing of the house, lasting till 1883. The duke is supposed not

---

1. Iwerne Minster House is now the Clayesmore School, Iwerne Minster built for the 2nd Lord Wolverton. Cone-roofed tourelle to right of entrance, and a much more French lodge with steep wedge and tourelles. See Newman and Pevsner, Dorset, pp 239-40. For Coldhayes, see Pevsner and Lloyd, Hampshire, pp 51-2, 610.

2. Steep Hipped roofs and round-headed dormers. The clock-tower also by Clutton was probably done 1861 for the duke's mother-in-law, 2nd Duchess of Sutherland of Stafford House fame. This owes a lot to Trentham but the clocks are set into Fontainebleau cartouches and the stair is an exposed spiral à la Chambord and Blois.
to have liked the result. Its mood was certainly at variance with the light, elegantly decorative work of John Douglas with which he was sufficiently well-pleased to keep ordering more until his death in 1899. One suspects that the Eaton remodelling was embarked on just too soon, when the serious-minded approach of High-Victorianism had not quite run its course. A few years later the duke might have been quite happy with his inheritance, but in the late 1860s it was hard to palate such frivolity. Whatever the case, we may concur with Lord Clark that where Porden's building, "spiky as Milan Cathedral, surprised with a fine excess", Waterhouse's surprised no more. Grand it was (it is now, sadly, demolished), but surprising, no; for it was very much Manchester Waterhouse in the country, vast, solid, dependable.

1. See Gervas Huxley, Victorian Duke, London, 1967, p. 134. A preliminary drawing of the garden front (1869) held at Eaton Estate Office shows slight differences from what was built: shoulder-headed rather than pointed arches to the verandah; a pyramid roof in the centre (or perhaps it is hipped with the axis at right angles to the facade) rather than the hipped roof with axis parallel to facade which was built. There were other minor differences of fenestration. The stables, designed 1880, indicate Waterhouse's increased interest in the Loire style; one of the cone-roofed towers flanking the entrance shows the rake of the stair (very similar to National Liberal Club).


Eaton Hall was perhaps the last and largest manifestation of the High Victorian mood amongst country-houses, but the 1860s had produced a number of others in varying degrees Gothic, or of mixed style, which shared Eaton's aggressive ebullience, its severity of forms, and its Frenchness.

Not far from Eaton, and begun in the same year, was Oakmere Hall. This was the first major domestic commission of John Douglas. Already at that stage he had commenced his long and fruitful association with the Grosvenors of Eaton which was to lead ultimately to one of the most charming of all buildings of the French Renaissance Revival, The Paddocks, nearly twenty years later in the Loire style. Oakmere was less overtly French. Now the Oakmere Rehabilitation Centre, Sandiway, Cheshire, it was begun in 1867, but building continued on throughout the 1870s. The client was John Higson of Higson Breweries, Liverpool. As Pevsner and Hubbard put it, it belongs to the years when Douglas "still believed in the massiveness and the gross effects of the High Victorian style", a typical example of the type of "muscular" Gothic which was better seen at houses like Teulon's Elvetham and Shadwell, or William

Footnote continued from page 237
Stuart A. Smith, Alfred Waterhouse, Thesis (Ph. D.), University of London, 1970. Building accounts are at Cheshire County Record Office, Chester; further material at Eaton Estate Office.
2. The date is on a shield on the N.E. tower over the service quarters. Oakmere was illus., Archt, 20 May 1904; 17 Apr. 1908, but ignored by contemporary press.
3. Pevsner & Hubbard, Cheshire, p. 35. See also p. 333.
White's Humewood Castle. Ruskin's Lamp of Power \(^1\) illuminated the design. The roughly dressed masonry gives the impression of having been hewn from a cliff. There is great length and height, bold, geometric forms piling up upon each other, both functionally expressive and awesome. Seemingly random fenestration at the south end gives emphasis to bold expanses of bare wall.

The stylistic sources are wide-ranging. As at Humewood, heavy battlemented towers combine with crow-stepped gables and faceted cone roofs. But there were more continental features at Oakmere than was usual in Gothic houses of the day. In light of Douglas's later interest in Germanic architecture it is probably fair to attribute the steep hipped roof over the south end of the house to Germany rather than to France, especially as the use of tiny lucarnes high in the roof was more a Germanic than a French feature \(^2\), but one cannot overlook the Frenchness of many of the other motifs. The steep wedge over the porte cochère, the cradled stair-tourelle, and particularly the truncated pyramid roof on the north-east tower, were, as we have seen, by 1867 the stock-in-trade of the French Renaissance Revival. Besides, single-minded interest in Germany would, in the 1860s, have been unlikely. Only in the following decade, even the 1880s, was Germany beginning to outbid France for the attention of architects determined on being picturesque \(^3\).

---

2. In any case, such a choice would have been made in the same spirit and with the same aims as was the case with architects employing less equivocally French roofs, viz., the response to Ruskin's and Scott's plea for steep roofs. See Ruskin's Lecture on architecture and painting, 1854 (lectures given in 1853); and, Scott's Remarks, p. 173.
3. Occasionally Germanic buildings were illustrated in the
Undoubtedly Douglas's interest in Germany was a precocious one, and his mature work (when not of the Shaw/Nesfield "Old English" type, and with the exception of The Paddocks and a design for an unidentified house in Cheshire) was predominantly influenced from Germany and the Low Countries rather than from France; but Oakmere shows that, as with Thomas Worthington, another Midlands architect early in the field, Douglas's interest in Germany grew out of an earlier influence from France which was, after all, well nigh universal (whether of the mediaeval or the Renaissance variety) amongst architects of the day. It is significant, too, that contemporaries took some of his most obviously Germanic work, such as the 118A Eccleston Hill Lodge on the Eaton Estate, as French, despite its obvious debt to the famous gates of Prague. 

Also clearly French and looking back perhaps to nearby Wynn-stay and to Rhianva are the twin corner bastions at the south end of Oakmere. These have cone roofs of parti-coloured slate, a pierced parapet encircling the entire southern section. The symmetrical

Footnote continued from page 239

architectural press of the 1860s and '70s, but in quantity they amounted to only a fraction as much as the French material published. The real flood of German illus. began about 1879.

1. Its plan is close to Oakmere's. See below, p.302.
2. BN, 11 May 1883, p. 617, said a French character pervaded the design (shown at R.A.) It was illus. BN, 29 Jun. 1883, p. 908; Archt, 1 May 1908. BA, 18 Jan. 1884, p. 25, singled out Douglas as an architect likely to appreciate their illustration of the Château de Josselin. Likewise the very central-European looking Rosehaugh House, Ross & Cromarty, by William Flockhart (1893) was described as "after the French chateau type" (BN, 1 May 1896, p. 627). Often French and German characteristics were blended in the one building e.g. Charles Fitzroy Doll's Russell Hotel, Russell Square (1897-8).
view created by these two bastions which one gets on approaching from the south was, as was mentioned in relation to Rhianva, a popular device amongst contemporary French architects, who seem to have been more attracted to compact composition than were their English counterparts with their greater love of picturesque effects. By the mid-1860s, however, César Daly's *L'architecture privée au XIXe siècle sous Napoléon III* (the first volumes of which appeared in 1864) was helping publicize this sort of arrangement in Britain, for it contains several designs of this type: a villa at St. Maur, for example, by P. Manguin, and another at Jouy-en-Josas by E. Petit. Possible sources for all these seem likely to have been Azay-le-Rideau, Chenonceaux, or the lesser known Château de Martainville. To some extent, therefore, by employing this motif in 1867 Douglas was not only looking back to the Welsh examples, but at the same time anticipating the rise of the Loire-chateau taste of the 1870s. E. M. Barry in particular was to use this twin bastion device in a modified way in his chateau-style buildings, and certainly it is the style of Azay or Chenonceaux which contributes the over-all mood of Douglas's later house, The Paddocks, with its two towers very much as at Oakmere, even if much of its detailing

1. Daly, *Op. cit.*, Ier Série, III, is devoted to "villas suburbaines"; St. Maur is Exemple A1; Jouy is C1. St. Maur received special attention in a lecture read by W. H. Picton to the Liverpool Architectural Society, inspired by Daly's book (See *BN*, 12 Aug. 1870, pp 113-4; 19 Aug. 1870, pp 131-2; *Bldr*, 2 Apr. 1870, p. 261) This was reprinted in pamphlet form, French suburban villas, Liverpool, 1872.

remains Gothic. Where Oakmere is concerned this ratio is reversed; it is the mood which is Gothic and some of the details from the Loire.

With a group of other contemporary houses the situation is rather similar. With their vigorous and sculptural massing the feeling is High Victorian Gothic, though actual detailing in some cases is hardly mediaeval and occasionally is derived from the Loire chateaux. Cranfield Court, near Newport Pagnall, Beds., for instance, is Gothic in feeling though its gables are Jacobean and flanked by urns. Most of the window openings are made up of trefoil-headed lancets in round- or square-headed groupings. All the trappings of High Victorianism are there: strident polychrome brick-work, heavy quoins, lush sculpture, and, like Oakmere, a principal facade of great length which at the same time builds up around the entrance to a towering geometric grouping, dramatically picturesque. And, of course, it is from France that the picturesque roofs derived - a whole range of angular pyramids and cones, some truncated, some not. It was the work of the Nottingham architect, Thomas Hine (who had shown an early interest in the French style as we have seen) and the client the Rev. George Gardener Harter. Dating from ca. 1862-6\(^1\), it was earlier than Oakmere and three other houses of this type. Of these, Normanhurst in Sussex, 1865-71,

---

\(^1\) It first appeared in Kelly's POD, Beds., 1864, p. 319. It was illus. BA, 4 & 18 Dec. 1874, pp 350, 379. See also Victoria History of the County of Bedford, (ed. by William Page), III, 1912, p. 276. Photo of garden front at BCRO. Now largely demol.
(more Classical in detailing) had a very similar array of angular French roofs to begin with, but because of its more overt Loire-chateau characteristics will be better discussed elsewhere. The other two begun in 1867 were suburban houses: Gallowhill, near Glasgow, and The Towers on the outskirts of Manchester. Gallowhill was built to designs of James Salmon and Son for Peter Kerr of Paisley. It was a duller affair than Cranfield, but, like it, it was Gothic in feeling if not in many of its details. Its window-heads were mostly rounded or angular rather than pointed and there was a plentiful assortment of bow windows. It was a typical tight High Victorian composition achieving something of the massiveness and sculptural form of Cranfield and Oakmere, but its skyline was less adventurous: a steep-pitched and crested roof achieved some variety as it broke forward over the bowed projections (and there was the separate cone of the oriel) but a regular height was maintained apart from a tower over the entrance and a smaller one at the back, with truncated pyramid and perfect pyramid roofs respectively.

A good deal more Gothic in its detailing was Thomas Worthington's house, The Towers, in Didsbury, Manchester. It was built for John Edward Taylor, proprietor and editor of the Manchester Guardian. Pevsner calls it "grossly picturesque" and the "grandest of all Manchester

---

2. Now the Shirley Institute (textiles research).
mansions."\(^1\) It is much less gross and muscular than Oakmere, however, with a greater decorativeness of detail, which is more overtly French, particularly in the fenestration. A row of Loire-derived gabled dormers rises above a parapet along the entrance front,\(^2\), which terminates on the left with a tall, thin, octagonal turret with cone roof, and on the right an octagonal, spire-roofed oriel, closely similar to those at Tyntesfield and Hardwick's French houses, except for the presence of craning French gargoyles. The windows of the oriel and also of the octagonal, corner bow in the morning room overlooking the garden have rounded angles in the French way. Like the severer detailed round towers at Oakmere, these corner oriels and towers provide charming sunny nooks in which to sit, and picturesque extensions of the internal spatial arrangement. Also like Oakmere is the Blois-like expression (but by means of Early English lancets) of the rise of the staircase. Early English also is the porte cochère with angle turrets like those on the towered equivalent at Oakmere, but with delicate blind tracery and a balustrade. This and the tower with its steep wedge roof which rises above the entrance are placed off-centre. It is a picturesque building, somewhat Waterhousian in feeling. Its proportions are modest as befits its suburban situation, though it is lent an air of greater size than it has by its multiplicity of steep roofs when

---

2. There is perhaps a debt to the Louis XII wing at Blois in this facade, (also in the S.E. wedge-roofed tower). The red brick and light stone trim add to this effect.
seen from the south-east, as in the architect’s perspective view. This, with the contract drawings, is preserved by the firm of Thomas Worthington and Sons, Manchester. It would in fact have presented a larger aspect still had an enormous conservatory, which had been contemplated from the outset, actually been built.

The houses just discussed were High Victorian edifices, Gothic of a sort, and to varying degrees French in their detailing. Only The Towers showed much concern to really look like a chateau, however. Wyfold Court in Oxfordshire, begun 1873, and the last in this line of French Gothic houses, was rather different. It was a complex and ambiguous design. Not since Minley Manor had there been anything which owed such a lot as did the entrance front at

---

1. Contract drawings numbered to 22 and ranging in date from August 1866 to May 1867.
2. Contract drawing, no. 1, dated 15 Jan. 1867: block plan of house with conservatory extension in pencil. Interrupted mouldings on other drawings and other evidence show it was not a late addition. To be 100' long, and to include a glazed corridor, sculpture gallery, and billiard room. Taylor hardly lived in the house and sold it in 1875, so it is not surprising he lost interest. The Towers was illus. EN, 29 Aug. 1873, pp 222, 228-30; 26 Dec. 1873; BA, 2 Jan. 1874, p. 9 (photo reversed); Archt, 22 May 1880, p. 355. For interiors see Shirley Institute Memoirs, I, 1922, pp 79-83. For Worthington’s Manchester Assize competition design (Louvreque) see pp 102n, 133n, 249. His Manchester Town Hall design (1868) is Franco-German (see EN, 29 May & 18 Sep. 1868, pp 362-3, 637) drawings at Worthington & Sons). His Glasgow Town Hall design (1882) was Louvreque (see BA, 13 Oct. 1882. See also Anthony Pass, "Thomas Worthington; practical idealist", AR, CLV, May 1974, pp 268-74.
3. Last except perhaps for Friar Park, Henley, Oxon., by Sir Frank Crisp, eccentric solicitor, for himself, 1896, though the French Flamboyant element seems to be rather less predominant (judging by photographs at NMR) than is suggested by Jennifer Sherwood and N. Pevsner, Oxfordshire, Harmondsworth, 1974, pp 403, 639.
Wyfold to the French Gothic of the proto-Renaissance period; yet the garden front was largely Tudor. It was a building at once curiously old-fashioned and yet in one way in particular very much of its own time. That it was Gothic at all was hardly progressive (the 1870s saw a sharp fall in the number of Gothic Houses built) but the paradox arose as a result of the reaction which was occurring at that time against the hardness of High Victorian muscularity, manifesting itself in a return to decorativeness, somewhat akin to that of early Victorian architecture. The fact that the architect, George Somers Clarke, had spent some years of his training in the office of Sir Charles Barry, working on drawings for the Houses of Parliament, makes it an open question just how far he was being old-fashioned and how far he was up to the mark. Certainly the conservatism of the design in matters of composition and planning seems to outweigh the novelty. Even the fussy treatment of detail created a garden facade which reminds one more of the lacy surfaces of Aldermaston in the 1840s than of the approach of Clarke's contemporaries. Yet we cannot be too dismissive. Commentators of the day were universally impressed by Wyfold, and Paul Sédille, a perceptive critic, chose to include it in his survey of modern

1. *BN*, 16 May 1873, p. 571, called it "a good brick mansion, pleasingly treated and well shown", and added significantly that it was "a design which, though Gothic, is thoroughly modern also". *Archt*, 17 May 1873, p. 259, called it "an important mansion now building ... a very picturesquely grouped building of late Gothic character with some good and delicate detail". *Bldr*, 11 May 1872, p. 358, said "there can be no question that ... it is a very striking and picturesquely grouped mansion".
British architecture. He might have done rather better to have illustrated instead another house upon which Clarke was working at the same time, Maresfield Rectory, Sussex. From this house we can get a better idea of what Clarke was really aiming at at Wyfold but which eluded him on account of its rambling size and perhaps also because of the extremity of the French element. Maresfield is a reticent and elegant red brick house, combining a few late French (or possibly even German) Gothic roof motifs with a touch of the newly fashionable "Old English" half-timbering, in a way which is not at all dissimilar to the work of John Douglas in the 1870s, also (significantly) favoured by Sédille. The bailiff's house at Wyfold was in this vernacular mode of brick and half-timbering too, with little that was French about it. Probably Wyfold's closest affinities are with Douglas's Paddocks and J. L. Pearson's Westwood House which combined in their different ways overt French influence (more the Loire type in their cases) with the red-brick, vernacular style. Certainly, at Wyfold the carving was in tune with the 1870s, crisp and delicate after the grossness of Knowlesian vegetation in the preceding decade; and the high, canopied dormer windows on the tower above the luggage

1. "L'Architecture moderne en Angleterre", GBA, 2e période, XXXIII, 1886, p. 97 (commentary in XXXIV, 1886, pp 97-8, where it is described as "un important manoir caractérisant le gothique appliqué à l'habitation moderne anglaise"). This five-part series of articles was reprinted in book form with extra chapter and same title, Paris, 1890. For Wyfold see pp 11, 44.
3. BN, 6 Jly. 1877, p. 6.
entrance surpassed for decorativeness anything of this kind that had been seen before in Britain. A commentary on the house in The Architect declared that L. T. Carter, who did the carving, had been sent expressly to France "to obtain casts and make studies of the best flamboyant work in that country". This, presumably, would have applied to the multitude of gargoyles, crockets, and perhaps the dormers as well. For larger features, the composition of towers and so forth, Clarke would have relied on the various painstaking pattern-books of French chateaux which were being published in France at the time, such as Sauvageot's Palais. The canopied dormers were no doubt indebted to the Hôtel de Cluny in Paris, or the Rouen Palais de Justice, buildings which had been largely ignored since the 1820s and '30s when so many travelling sketchers had found them attractive. As was seen with Minley Manor, the tendency in the High Victorian period had been to simplify dormer windows down to their basic geometric shapes; the '50s and '60s saw little that even approached Wyfold for flamboyant decorativeness. After all, Pugin had insisted on Middle Pointed. Spiky crockets had appeared on the dormers in Hardwick's drawings for Addington, but as built they were less fussy; Tennyson's Sussex home, Aldworth House, by the younger Knowles, was actually built with dormers with richly crocketed finials and heraldic emblems. But, canopied dormers comparable with those on

1. Archt., 3 Jan. 1874, p. 8. Plans and the garden front as built were illustrated here also (reproduced in Sedille, Op. cit.).
2. Cotman, A. C. Pugin, Coney, etc.
3. Near Haslemere. "The style of architecture doesn't carry
the Wyfold tower seem to have appeared earlier only at Fettes College, and in occasional unexecuted designs such as those by Thomas Worthington for the Manchester Assize and the Manchester Town Hall. Gothic on the whole might have been on the wane, but what there was was more likely to be of the Flamboyant kind.

E. W. Pugin's Carlton Towers, with its lavish late Gothic doorway, was built 1873-5; John Douglas put rich, crocketed ogee arches and Flamboyant tracery round some of the windows at The Paddocks in the '80s whereas at Oakmere geometrical simplicity had been the keynote; Flamboyant detailing was used in the west wing at Waddesdon, built 1888; and Destailleur's other English commission, the mausoleum for Napoleon III built the preceding year at Farnborough, Hants., is a very lavish exercise in late Gothic.

Footnote continued from page 248.

us back to the days of Arthur, nor have we ... any strong reminders even of the age of the knights of chivalry" (Bldr, 15 Jan. 1870, p. 42). Tudor Gothic elevation but with urban French roof and dormers: an unsatisfactory compromise between country and urban architecture on lovely site. Additions to the back in same style. See Nairn and Pevsner, Sussex, p. 106; Metcalf, The rise of James Knowles, p. 369 ff; Joseph Ernest Morris, Guide to Haslemere, Hindhead and neighbourhood, Haslemere, 1903, pp 42-4 (illus.)

1. Illus. BJAR, 25 Dec. 1901, p. 326; Pevsner, Hampshire, pl.91, pp 58, 229-30. For Waddesdon see below. Other showy examples of Flamboyant Gothic built or designed after Wyfold include: Designs by Lee and Smith of London for Hastings Town Hall competition (Archt, 6 Nov. 1875, p. 256; EN, 28 May 1875, p. 593); Messrs Round and Green's Bank, Colchester, by Ernest C. Lee (EN, 11 Apr. 1879, p. 380); South Villa, Regents Park, for T. J. Walker, by Horace Gundy (EN, 25 Apr. 1879); Design for a West End club by G. H. Shackle, 3rd prize Soane Medallion Competition 1881 (EN, 14 Apr. 1882); Workers' houses, Port Sunlight, by Grayson and Guld (see H. Muthesius, Die englische Baukunst der Gegenwart, Berlin, 1900, II, pl. 47); Middlesex Guildhall, Parliament Square, London, with its Art Nouveau interpretation of Flamboyant Gothic, by J. S. Gibson,
Wyfold is a house where details are more convincing than the total effect. The greatest concentration of French chateau features is to be found on the entrance front, but even these fantastic clusters of towers cannot blind us to the poverty of the composition as a whole. The main parts of the house on this north front are arranged around three sides of a court; but the corridor range running east-west which links the other two wings is both too low and too simple to ensure a successful grouping. The pair of piled-up tower sections which it separates (one over the luggage entrance, the other above the main porch) remain isolated units when the house is viewed from the centre of the court. Only when seen from an oblique angle do they mass together in any way successfully.

Then indeed it must be admitted that the view is impressive, and the combination of French turrets with Tudor bow by the entrance front is harmonious enough. The garden elevation is a different story. Here we are aware most strongly of the conservatism of the design and compositionally it is an anticlimax after the entrance towers. It is a long and conventional Tudor Gothic affair in diapered red brick with a succession of gables and bay windows looking out from the principal apartments which are ranged along its length. Only some French Flamboyant decoration applied to the gables, plus an octagonal cone-roofed oriel, like those at The

Footnote continued from page 242
Towers and Addington, remind us that this is a mock-chateau. The dullness of this facade cannot be attributed entirely to the fact that the client, Edward Hermon, a cotton-mill millionaire from Preston, was said to have scrapped a total of six bedrooms from the upper parts of the house after the contract had been signed. This may be judged from the hardly more impressive perspective view of the original scheme, probably dating from 1871, which is held at the house, and also from the fact that the discarded rooms had not been part of the garden range anyway, but had been extracted from the north-south range running back behind it. Certainly, however, the reduction of the "family wing" (as the north-south range was originally called) and its associated gable to a height scarcely more than the others has increased the monotony of that range; nor was this counteracted by the introduction of an extra room at both ground and first floor levels overlooking the garden, and another gable at the western extremity; but at the same time the tower over the luggage entrance was reduced in size and its proportions altered to its advantage. The rather lean and ecclesiastical spire of the first scheme and the bulky and shapeless tower it was to have adorned were abandoned in favour of the more elegant and harmonious steep wedge roof with its canopied dormers which the building has now.

It is curious that Hermon decided to retrench on sleeping

2. Mr Hermon's office, called the "magistrate's room", and Mrs Hermon's resited dressing-room.
accommodation, for the new scheme of 1872 (which was illustrated in The Architect at the same time as the reference was made to the cut back) indicated in most other areas an extension of the original plan. The most significant changes were (with the addition of the extra room on each floor along the garden front, already referred to) the deletion of a bedroom in the east wing above the centre of the gallery so that the latter might be skylit, and the addition of a whole extra wing on the west. Clearly it had been realised that the service quarters in the earlier plan had been under-estimated. Where the first scheme had shown a relatively simple L-shaped service wing extending north and west from the luggage entrance, the final version acquired an extra branch to the west. With this alteration came also a tightening up of sexual segregation in the service quarters, of which Burn and Kerr would have approved. A stout

1. I am assuming that the cut-back took place in the 1872 scheme, since that represents the house as it was built (or did Hermon change his mind again and keep the rooms?). Ten drawings are held at RIBAD (U14/28 (1-10)). Drawings 1 & 2 are on paper watermarked 1870 and relate to the 1871 scheme; 3-10 are sections and plans on tracing paper, dated 1872. U14/28(1) (1871 plan of ground floor) was illus. in Peter Howell, "Wyfold Court, Oxfordshire", in The Country seat, edited by Howard Colvin and John Harris, London, 1970, p. 246. U14/28(2) shows that the whole north-south corridor was to be a family wing in the 1871 scheme.

2. The better to inspect Mr Hermon's collection of doubtful Victorian paintings (see below, p. 472n).

3. Kerr was full of praise in The Gentleman's House for the Burnian system of planning in general (3rd ed. p. 449) and on privacy in particular (p. 67-9): the sleeping rooms of the ordinary servants should be in a separate quarter from those of the housemaids, approached by a "special stair", he declared (p. 250). Even Stevenson in 1880, in House architecture, II, pp 78-9, stressed this.
wall safe-guarded morality and each sex was equipped with its own staircase. Here was altruism, for under the new arrangement where the family apartments had withdrawn back into the south-west corner, the stair above the luggage entrance, formerly for family use only, was renamed the service stair. Doubtless the family used it just the same for the alternative was the grand stair at the other end of the house; but, what had been a Burnian family wing had been reduced to a family corner and it seems doubtful if Burn would have approved Clarke's plan as a whole. It is unnecessarily sprawling, without achieving the neat series of interlocking sections, each fully equipped for utmost convenience, which was typical of Burn's own plans. But by the 1870s the Burnian plan had had its day.1

The compartmentalizing system of planning excelled in by William Burn had first begun to proliferate in the 1830s but enjoyed a great reputation into the '60s, associated as it was with the earnest days of the Gothic Revival. Robert Kerr, as has been seen, boosted the type, both in his book and in his building: Bearwood (1865-74) is an extreme case of this mode of planning. But by the mid '60s, signs of the Classical backlash which was to follow were already apparent. Sprawling and irregular, functionally-expressive composition was on its way out. Centrifugal planning had already given place to a centripetal tendency, a tighter massing of parts in much High Gothic design of the late 1850s and early '60s, a

---

1. For more on Wyfold see Jennifer Sherwood and N. Pevsner, Oxfordshire, pp 403, 738; Girouard, VCH, pl. 5; the grand stair is illus. in BN, 28 Jun. 1878, p. 648. Wyfold is now the Borocourt Mental Hospital.
piling up of elements around a central, or not quite central focus, instead of a strung-out ribbon effect. Symmetry or partial symmetry was regaining popularity: even so Gothic a house as Eaton Hall was symmetrical. An important group of houses in the French taste, particularly those by E. M. Barry, dating from the years around 1870, demonstrate the trend: they are compact, symmetrical or nearly so on at least one facade, and they are in many cases smaller than had been characteristic of earlier Victorian country-houses. The trend naturally had its effect on internal planning. It was a reaction against labyrinthine, out-sized buildings which decreasingly suited the changing social patterns; yet to some extent this simply reflected a return to popularity of the Classical plan with centralised hall which had never completely gone out of fashion. Like the Burnian type it had also received some attention from Professor Kerr: the plans of Blylahaugh, Mentmore, Llywn, for instance, descendants of the Palladian villa plan appeared in his book. But this was only part of the story. Influence was being felt from other quarters as well. Norman Shaw and W. E. Nesfield, both architects trained in the Gothic tradition, were in the 1860s revolutionizing the use of the Gothic Great Hall, which had been championed by Pugin, and which early Victorian society had considered

1. This perhaps reflected the increasing bourgeois clientele whose lifestyle did not require vast suites of state rooms and huge staffs of servants. The 1870s were the most prolific decade for the building of country-houses. See Mark Girouard's graph, showing chronological dispersion of Victorian country houses (VCH, p. 6).
2. Gentleman's House, 1st ed., pl. 32, 39, 16 respectively; 3rd ed., pl. 26, 33, 16 respectively. Blylahaugh and Mentmore were culled from Bldr., 1852 and 1857 respectively. For Llywn see below, pp 284-5.
indispensable for the fulfilling of the seigniorial duties incumbent upon the typical land-owner of the day\(^1\). Changing customs had made the grand displays of entertainment and patronage witnessed in such halls as those at Bayons Manor and Scarisbrick Hall decreasingly part of the social life by the mid- and late-Victorian years even of the old aristocracy, let alone of the newly rich. Scott, while nostalgically sympathising with the Puginesque idea of the Great Hall was sufficiently aware of current trends (as early as 1857) to suggest that such a room might also make "a delightful sitting-room, particularly in summer\(^2\). This is in fact the idea which was promoted by Nesfield and Shaw. In a central position, such a hall might not only provide access to other rooms of more specific purpose, in lieu of corridors, but be itself a general purpose living-room, equipped with ingle-nook and the usual array of furniture. J. J. Stevenson paid lip service to the old idea of compartmentalization when he wrote of the English love of seclusion, asserting that "a room loses its value to us if it is a passage to another"\(^3\). But, on the next page he was declaring that passages were a waste of space and that "if a number of rooms can be made to enter out of one hall, it is better than having a separate passage to each". Elsewhere his description of such a hall comes very close to those by Shaw\(^4\). The typical

\(^{1}\) For this I am much indebted to Mark Girouard's VCH, particularly pp 27-9, 48-50.


\(^{4}\) Ibid., II, p. 65. Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, writing in 1897, provides an indication in his Red Book (privately printed
Shaw plan was more sprawling and irregular than the Classical sort, but in each the Burnian corridor system was avoided as much as possible. The trend towards spacious living, which both of these new plan types reflected, probably owed a good deal to a third source of influence: France. Kerr, in his belief in the compartmentalizing system, had declared that England had little to learn from France "in respect of home comfort", but the compactness of the typical Parisian suburban villa plan, which was widely discussed following the publication of the first parts of Daly's *L'Architecture privée*, would not have been without influence. Traditional English dislike of the French en suite arrangement of the principal rooms was to some extent challenged by a growing taste for the visual and spatial effects which such a system allowed. The French particularly favoured the use of interlocking rooms of irregular shapes (of which something has already been noted at Elvetham), or the demarcation of one area from another by screens

Footnote continued from page 255

memoir dated 1 Nov. 1897) p. 9, of how popular the central hall had become by the 1880s. He had been, he declared, very much against the idea of a central hall when Waddesdon Manor was first planned, 1877, for such a room was, in his opinion, "fatal to all comfort; or if made into a cozy and liveable apartment condemns every other sitting-room to complete solitude. But, " he continued, "a hall is ... an indispensable feature in a country-house of any size, and the want of a large room where my friends could all meet, and read and write without disturbing each other, was so much felt, that in 1889 I built one of this kind, which, though not in a central position, has to some extent at least redeemed the error I had made." For further promotion of the central hall see William Young, *Town and country mansions and suburban houses*, p. 18.

1. Kerr, *Op. cit.*, 3rd ed., p. 455. This was provoked by a particularly draughty plan which he had managed to ferret out in Daly ("an elaborate serial work now current") which he reproduced pl. 39: of three sitting rooms across the garden-front none had
of columns rather than solid walls and doors, thus encouraging an easy spatial flow from one area to the next and the opening up of striking vistas as one progressed through the house. Wrest Park and Stafford House had experimented with the French enfilade of rooms back in the 1830s.

A number of houses of the French Renaissance Revival from the 1860s onwards began to experiment to a greater or lesser degree with these ideas. One town house to employ a neat en suite arrangement and rounded room-shapes in the French manner was that at No. 5 Hamilton Place, Hyde Park, by W. R. Rogers for Leo de Rothschild.

Amongst country houses, Shabden, a small house built at Chipstead, Surrey, 1871-3, by E. M. Barry for John Cattley, was a somewhat amateurish attempt in this direction. After entering the outer hall one passed into the hall proper which, as well as leading to the garden entrance at the far end, gave access to a

Footnote continued from page 256
less than five doors; one had seven. Edmund Beckett (Op. cit., p. 73) disapproved for similar reasons of Paul's house plan in Viollet-le-Duc's Histoire d'une maison, Paris, 1873, p. 22 (translated by Benjamin Bucknell as How to build a house: an architectural novelette, London, 1874, p. 22). See also forty years earlier, W. H. Leeds, "An English version of a French plan", AM, III, 1836, pp 573-81, railing against dining rooms which opened upon baths, vestibules upon kitchens, etc. The British fad for privacy was emerging with the Victorian era. Robert Adam, by contrast, freely conceded that French planning was "best calculated for the convenience and elegance of life". (The works in architecture of Robert and James Adam, 1773-9 (Reprint edited by Robert Oresko, London, 1975, p. 59.)

1. EN, 12 May 1882, p. 572. The staircase is particularly French, splaying out at the bottom. "The walls of the two principal drawing rooms (on the first floor) are fitted with old, French, carved panelling, painted in very light tints." The house itself is Italianate but fitted with French Rococo iron balconies. Rogers was probably the architect of Alfred Charles de Rothschild's opulent exercise in French Classicism, Halton House, Bucks. See below, p. 493.
suite of rooms (library, garden-room and drawing room) on the left, and to the billiard and dining rooms on the right with staircase between them. Thus it was not merely an avenue for entering and quitting the house but an essential means of communication between the major apartments, and as such was wainscoted and floored with wood for extra warmth, so as to be available as a reception or sitting room as The Builder pointed out. It was equipped with a fire-place in one corner and seats in a nook at the foot of the stairs. In addition to this Barry emulated French taste by employing interlocking, odd-shaped rooms, but his inexperience led him into a set of only moderately eye-catching vistas and a tangle of wasted space, particularly around the billiard room. Further, for some reason not apparent, he placed the "gentlemen's room" up amongst the service quarters on the opposite side of the house. It can hardly have been used as such.

A similar but far better handled arrangement was to be seen at St. Leonard's Hill, near Windsor, Berkshire; better perhaps because it compromised between the French interlocking rooms set-up and a more conventional corridor plan. This house was built about 1875 for Sir Francis Tress Barry; the architect was C. H. Howell. A plan published in The Building News that year shows that again three rooms were placed en suite to the left of the hall on entering, and again they were shaped in the French manner. The hall itself had to be traversed for access to the corridor-arrangement of library,

1. Bldr, 9 Aug. 1873, pp 624-7. This notice includes also a perspective view from the south-east and the plan.
garden-room and gentlemen's quarter, and certainly indicates a concern on the part of the architect to achieve striking visual effects and spatial progressions, as is indicated by a contemporary photograph taken by Bedford Lemere\(^1\), but its grandeur and its open-galleried mezzanine supported on marble columns suggest that it would have been less suitable for sitting in than its equivalent at Shabden. Actually, it is hard to believe that the Shabden hall was much used for sitting in either, being small and dark, and English attitudes prevented architects from allocating to rooms in this central position the functions they would have been given in France. Villas illustrated by César Daly, such as that at Villepinte by M. Bigle or that in the Boulevart d'Argenson by M. Hue\(^2\), have central rooms positioned very much as are the ones at Shabden and St Leonard's Hill, but designated as dining room or Grand Salon, and were skylit. Few English wished to have the main entrance leading directly into the dining room, so the central room was called a hall, and its function remained ambiguous. Nor could the English resist having their stair leading from it which instantly ensured that it would be given over to draughts.

Grand visual effects rather than living space were also uppermost in the architects' minds when large, centrally-placed halls were employed at Normanhurst, and at Kensington House in London, though in both cases these halls did serve as the only route of

---

1. NMR, reproduced in Girouard, VCH, pl. 271. The use of glass between the hall and the "Floral vestibule" with its statuary and plants allowed for picturesque spatial extension.
2. Daly, Op. cit., Ier série, III, Exemples D2, pl. 3 & E2, pl. 2.
communication between some of the rooms. Planning at Normanhurst, which was by Habershon, Brock and Webb for Thomas Brassey, 1867, accomplished a number of spectacular internal vistas. Once into the hall the visitor was surprised by a magnificent double-return staircase on the left, and to the right a view down a wide, glass corridor, right into the conservatory. Library and drawing room were separated only by a screen of columns, so that a picturesque spatial flow was achieved without break from one to the next (the decor was the same) and when in the latter another sweeping view could be had across the conservatory corridor into the billiards room. Similarly, at Kensington House (1872-5, by J. T. Knowles, the younger, for Baron Grant) a series of vistas was unfolded to the visitor as he progressed into the hallway. Directly ahead was a vast conservatory, by means of which the Great Hall was lit and which with its wall of glass was, according to the critic in The Builder, "designed expressly to give an effect of brilliant colours from the groups of flowers, lighting up, as it were, the whole house from the first moment of entering it". From the centre of the hall, spectacular transverse views, framed by caryatids, were obtained to both right and left down opulent marble corridors in the resolutely symmetrical layout. These two houses developed the centralised hall plan and a subtle spatial integration to a sumptuous degree which quite lost sight of Daly's villas, even

---

1. Plan published in Bldr, 8 June 1867, p. 410, plus perspective view.
2. Bldr, 8 Jly, 1876, pp 653-4. As no plans are extant the very full descriptions given here and in Archt, 26 May 1877, p. 388, are crucial to our knowledge of the plan and interior.
though, externally, Kensington House was one of the closest British equivalents to Daly's subject-matter.

Much closer to Daly's examples internally as well as externally, and achieving on a small scale the spatial flow of Normanhurst without its awesome opulence, was Impney Hall, later known as Chateau Impney, near Droitwich, Worcestershire, built 1869-75. There the main rooms flow, one into the next, across the south front with, as at Normanhurst, only a screen of columns by way of partition between the western-most pair; irregularly-shaped rooms interlock with hardly any recourse to passage-ways at all and little waste of space. Its similarity to contemporary Parisian planning is not surprising for the architect was a Frenchman, Auguste Tronquois, added to which the executant architect was Phené Spiers with a Parisian training behind him, and the client, John Corbett, a salt-mine millionaire with a French wife.

Two other houses were built in England in the 1870s to the designs of Frenchmen, and likewise demonstrate more precisely the French approach to planning than was usual in these mock chateaux. These were the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, Durham (1869-78), by Jules Pellechet (executant architect, J. E. Watson of Newcastle) and Waddesdon Manor, Bucks., (1877-ca. 1895) by Gabriel-Hippolyte Destailleur. Both of them draw upon historic French country-house planning, particularly of the eighteenth century, rather than upon the contemporary suburban villa practice which had influenced the houses discussed above. Apart from these two, only Wrest Park in the history of the French Renaissance Revival showed any attempt to emulate a French Classical plan and that had been in the end very
much a compromise with Georgian precedent. Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, for whom Waddesdon was built, rejected an early scheme as too ambitious: Destailleur had remonstrated, "You will regret your decision, one always builds too small," and he was right.

The additions of a twenty-year period modified more than was originally intended the basic symmetry of the corps de logis. "Though more picturesque (and we may add more English) the building is less effective," wrote the baron, "and while spreading over as much ground it is less compact and commodious". The Bowes Museum had, by contrast, a French three-pavilion plan of perfect symmetry.

In this it was unique in Britain amongst houses of the French Renaissance Revival. But so was its function, for it was intended partly as a museum from the start. Where Ferdinand de Rothschild collected French objets d'art to fill his house, Mr and Mrs John Bowes built their house to house their collection. Living quarters were secondary considerations; but this had less effect upon the treatment of a French Classical plan than might have been expected - room shapes were the same; it was the functions assigned to them which were different. The state apartments were on the first and second floors, as was common in French planning, the ground floor being devoted to service quarters apart from the grand entrance hall. The upper floors have a double pile plan with apartments en

---

1. The Red Book, p. 4. The Baron wrote: "He prophesied truly. After I had lived in the house for a while I was compelled to add first one wing and then another; a greater outlay was eventually incurred than had the original plan been carried out, not to speak of the discomfort and inconvenience caused by the presence of workmen in the house."

2. Plan and entrance elevations were published, Bldr., 14 Jan. 1871, pp 27-9, along with description.
suite and without corridors, just as it would be in a French chateau. The difference lies in the fact that the three rooms which overlook the garden from the first floor were not drawing and dining rooms, as in the closely similar arrangement at Waddesdon, but instead were devoted to the display of sculpture. On the second floor the equivalent apartments were intended for the painting collection and were lit from the roof. The living rooms had to be arranged along the entrance front on both floors, but in the event this was never called for. A grand reception room was to be on the second floor above the entrance hall, the two linked by the main stair on the left, these and the galleries presenting an array of formal splendour in polished stone.

At Waddesdon it is all reversed. As has been said, the dining room and two drawing rooms (and two smaller cabinets, one the conservatory, one the small library) overlooked the garden (at ground level) in the more usual and comfortable way in both English and French planning, while two galleries (as much for social purposes as for art display) took up most of the entrance front. The vestibule is small compared with that at the Bowes Museum and oval in shape with niches for sculpture, recalling the similarly shaped vestibule at Wrest Park and many examples in French Rococo design. There are no corridors. The positioning of the stairs away from the entrance was not uncommon in designs by Blondel and his contemporaries, but the use of cork-screw stairs owes more to the sixteenth century than the eighteenth which had inspired the rest of the plan; and certainly their situation at the re-entrant angles of the main front and the whole external aspect of these
stair tourelles, especially the outward expression of the inner spiral, suggests that the source was the courtyard stairs at Chambord. The choice of this spiral sort for the main staircase of a country house had few precedents in nineteenth-century Britain (though there had been the austerely mediaeval St Marie's Grange). Professor Donaldson, talking about the Hôtel du Louvre to the R.I.B.A. in 1855, had remarked that though spiral stairs were not much used in this country they were liked in France and were economical of space. Their use at Waddesdon would have been dictated by francophilia rather than economy or austerity of any sort, but whatever the reason the baron must have had second thoughts about their suitability when the Prince of Wales slipped on the way down and fractured his left knee-cap.

But to return to the Bowes Museum: if the interior was much

1. The baron (Red Book, p. 3) declared the source of the stairs to be Blois. The similarity to the Chambord ones is much greater however: the dimensions, the fact that they are enclosed rather than open, the small domed roofs. Amongst country houses Waddesdon seems to have been one of few to employ a spiral stair. More surprisingly the double corkscrew of the so-called "Leonardo" stair also at Chambord was ignored despite the chance to include both main and service stairs in the one construction. In the previous century the Earl-Bishop of Derry had planned one for Ickworth, Suff. ("I cannot forbear reminding you of the plan of the stair-case at Chambord which you was so good as to promise me - pray send it by the post," wrote the bishop (1788) to Messrs Peregeaux of Paris; see Peter Rankin, Irish building ventures of the Earl Bishop of Derry, 1730-1803, Belfast, 1972, p. 52). His other house, Ballyscullion, seems to have had one. Alistair Rowan tells me the Bloomsbury Square car-park is designed on the same principles: car-ramps instead of stairs.
3. Cecil Roth, The magnificent Rothschilds, London, 1939, p. 194. But perhaps the stairs should not be blamed for the prince was wearing a new pair of boots "upon the soles of which the maker's polish remained" (LBQ, 26 July, 1898, p. 7).
indebted to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French Classical planning, the exterior was equally so to Second Empire France. The Building News announced in 1870 that "portions and details ... are taken from the Tuileries in Paris; the Hôtel-de-Ville, Havre; and other public buildings in France." The building is indeed very like Brunet-Debaine's Hôtel de Ville at Le Havre, built 1855, which in turn owed a good deal to the Tuileries. The choice of the French architect, Pellechet, is explained by the fact that the Bowes had lived until 1862 just outside Paris in the Château de Louveciennes (sometime gift of Louis XV to Mme. du Barry) for the remodelling of the interiors of which they had employed A.-J. Pellechet, father of the designer of the house at Barnard Castle. Indeed, Mrs Bowes was herself French-born and a star of the Théâtre des Variétés, which fact she had however no intention of letting inhibit her progress in English society. She bought herself the title, Countess of Montalbo. It was Mr Bowes who had the money (coal mines in the north left him by the 10th Earl of Strathmore whose natural son he was) but it was Mrs Bowes who spent it. Repeatedly the journals referred to the mansion which Mrs Bowes was building at Barnard Castle. She was also credited with amassing the huge collection of painting, furniture and objets d'art

1. BN, 19 Aug. 1870, p. 140.
3. Bldr., 14 Jan. 1871, pp 27-9; 6 Aug. 1870, p. 629; 21 Feb. 1874, p. 158; 2 Feb. 1878, p. 119. Correspondence between Watson and Bowes at DGRO indicates that it was very much Mrs Bowes's museum and that she made the decisions in matters of taste.
which the house was designed to hold. The style of the house no doubt reflected her taste to no small degree, as emerges from the following speech made by Watson, the executant architect, to the assembled workmen at the dinner to celebrate the placing of the first roof timbers:

"he had never," reported The Builder, "in the whole course of his experience met with a lady like Mrs Bowes, and when he took into account the good and excellent ideas of buildings which that lady possessed, he declared that he never met her equal. They must know that she not only understood plans and elevations, but she thoroughly understood details, and it was under a sense of obligation that he remarked that she had given him many a practical and useful hint, and had helped to no inconsiderable extent the progress of the work."

It was at her instigation that Watson altered the form of the pavilion roofs as originally conceived by Pellechert, for she found them too squat. One is inclined to agree with her. A drawing which survives at the museum indicates a second scheme with more elaborate roofs decorated with ceil-de-boeuf lucarnes, a sculpture group in the middle of the central roof, higher chimneys and a serrated skyline exactly like Cundy's one for Grosvenor Place.

In the event, what was built was a compromise between the two. The truncated pyramids over the corner pavilions of the entrance front are higher than in the 1871 version, and are studded with round-headed lucarnes; the central dome which suggested Delorme's

1. Bldr, 21 Feb. 1874, p. 158, at which stage the work was "two-thirds completed". Work had been held up by delays in procuring stone of the requisite dimensions for "the numerous massive columns and entablatures". The foundation stone had been laid, 27 Nov. 1869 (See Bldr, 14 Jan. 1871, p. 27). Work was completed 1876.
Tuileries has been squared as in the second scheme and has acquired dormer windows around it in closer conformity with the New Louvre fashion. At the back there are steep wedge roofs. The three pavilions of the symmetrical entrance front advance two bays in front of the rest of the facade, and have been given more plastic, stepped treatment than was typical in this sort of building, relating them to the experiments in urban architecture, such as Kerr's Whitehall design, noted previously. The fenestration is remorselessly regular and of the Italian Renaissance variety often favoured by the Second Empire. It is essentially an urban structure and is rather incongruous in its English country setting. Of all British houses it is the one most closely related to Second Empire Paris, and its closest kin are the Whitehall competition designs of 1857 and the monster hotels by Knowles and Barry.

More appropriate were the urban-Paris origins of Baron Grant's Kensington House, which, barring the royal palaces, was said

1. Although Pellechet visited the museum to inspect the progress, 1874 (DGRO letters, Watson to Bowes, 6 & 14 Mar., 6 Apr. 1874; Pellechet to Bowes, 27 Mar. 1874 (D/St 151 1874D)) and 1876 (Watson to Bowes, 3 Mar. 1876 (D/St 151 1876D)), Watson certainly very much altered the designs in accordance with Mrs Bowes' instructions: "I quite understand Mrs Bowes requiring in Roofs considerably higher than shewn on the Elevations. I can make a fresh drawing of it to submit to her before anything is done" (Watson to Bowes, 4 Feb. 1873; the new drawing was sent 11 Aug. 1873 (D/St 151 1873D)). Many other letters indicate that Watson altered Pellechet's designs for Mrs Bowes. Also held at the museum is a "Transverse section through staircase" by Watson, January 1872. Watson was entirely responsible for a very stodgy hotel opposite the railway station at Newcastle, which does its best to mimic the Bowes Museum (triple pavilions, central one pedimented and with cupola). See Bldr, 24 Jun. 1876, pp 612, 615, 617.
to be the largest private house in London. Certainly its interiors, as we have seen, were palatial. But it did not last: it was built and demolished, all in the space of ten years. A seven acre property was bought by Albert Grant on the south side of Kensington Road facing the palace in 1872, following a slum clearance there. Building probably commenced the following year. Grant had met Knowles, the architect, through the Stanford Estate development at Hove: Grant probably supplied the finance behind this housing venture which was carried out in the Knowlesian Grosvenor style for a William Morris of Blackheath. Knowles was chiefly an urban architect: his house for Tennyson in rural Surrey had lacked assurance. Kensington House on the other hand was nothing if not assured, and well it suited the client. It was part of the outward strength concealing the inner weakness of a financier who speculated too recklessly with the savings of the "clergy, widows and other small yet sanguine investors". The baron overstepped the mark and crashed. Knowles's supervision of the building stopped in 1875 and work slowly ground to a halt, probably owing to non-payment of suppliers' bills and the architect's fees. By June 1877 eighty-

1. According to ILN, 31 Jly. 1880, p. 102, it began Aug. 1872, but The Graphic (30 Jun. 1877, p. 610 + illus. on p. 625) declared it had been four years in the building. Bldr, 19 Apr. 1873, p. 300, refers only to Grant's clearance of a "plague spot" and makes no mention of the house. The earliest report of progress was in BA, 11 Sep. 1874, p. 171. Metcalf, Op. cit., says the property was bought 1872; DNB, XXII, Supp., 1909, p. 763, says 1873.
3. See BN, 28 Jan. 1876, p. 107 & 31 Mar. 1876, p. 336, re law-suit, Walker v. Yates (i.e. the contractor v. the marble merchant) concerning non-payment for marble columns because they had lacked the architect's certification.
nine law suits against him were pending. Grant got no chance
to live in the mansion whose structure alone had cost in excess of
£165,000. Appurtenances included, the total outlay was in the
realms of £300,000 to £350,000, according to The Illustrated London
News. The picture collection which was to have hung in the vast
gallery in Kensington House had to be sold for a low sum at
Christies in April 1877. After much speculation as to likely
buyers of the building itself, and efforts to sell it in 1877 and'
'79 had failed owing to lack of bidders, it went in 1880 to a
"committee of gentlemen connected with two of the fashionable re-
creation clubs"; enjoyed a brief flutter as venue for the
Bachelor's Ball and some "bazaars and fancy fairs in aid of charity";
and was demolished in 1882.

In some ways it resembled Montagu House, that other conspicuously
French private palace built and now demolished in London - the heavy,
rusticated bands at the corners and the flat-topped and crested
pavilion roofs which refer back to the New Louvre, but which, by
the 1870s were sufficiently absorbed into British building fashions

1. DNB, XXII Supp., 1909, p. 764: "Grant pleaded his own cause
in a very long, cynical and conspicuously able speech."
2. ILN, 31 Jly. 1880, p. 102.
3. Archit, 5 May 1877, pp 294-6.
4. ILN, 31 Jly. 1880, p. 102 For earlier sale bids see Graphic,
1141. The London Journal, 19 Aug. 1876, p. 120, insinuated that
the 8th Duke of Northumberland, newly deprived of Northumberland
House, Charing Cross, would snap it up, but perhaps it was not his
style.
5. For final sales and demolition see Eldr, 1 Apr. 1882, p. 406;
to have required no special study of the Parisian building. Indeed, though this type of roof was still common enough in urban architecture in the '70s (Verity's Criterion was a much published example) it showed no advance on such buildings as the Westminster Palace Hotel, or Longman's in Paternoster Row. By the 1870s the more adventurous urban exponents of the French style had gone all-out for the Loire chateaux, or if still adhering to the more Classical pavilion arrangement of the Louvre at least took their note from the bulging domes of the Grosvenor Hotel. These must have been the special invention of Knowles senior, for the son never reproduced their like, even though he collaborated closely with his father at the hotel. Then had been the time when he, like his contemporaries, made a study of the Louvre, and while the Grosvenor was building produced his own version of the style, but without the domes, at the Cedars Estate at Clapham Common. William Burn's Montagu House had been the contemporary of these ventures. Kensington House, more than a decade later, showed little advance on any of them in its treatment of roofs. The dormer windows over the wings are more ostentatious, with their three lights, than those at Montagu House, but represent the same half-hearted concern with sixteenth-century French detailing. The rest of the fenestration is Grosvenor-hotel type (with Ruskinian carved foliage in the spandrels), Palladian on the wings, or simple rectangular openings. There are stock Victorian bows overlooking the garden, and the whole thing is rigidly symmetrical. Symmetry was rarely as exact as this even in the late Victorian period. At Kensington House this and also the compact height of the central block suggest again the urban villas
of Cesar Daly\(^1\). The sprawling wings, even if symmetrical, were not a French feature, however, and one suspects an attempt to cash in on the smart, new Parisian formalism, without altogether sacrificing the English tradition of the picturesque. Its details and roofs might have been old-fashioned, but certainly the building had a bold confidence which suited the spirit of the age. Also up to the mark, as was usually the case with these ostentatious houses of the new rich, were both the technical sophistication of the fittings to ensure comfort and safety, and the outdoor recreation facilities to guard against boredom. The interior was an array of fire-proofed construction, central heating by hot-water pipes under brazen gratings, and hot and cold baths aplenty in the bedroom suites "so as to avoid the daily necessity of setting out pans and cans"\(^2\). The dining room was divided into two by a pair of doors "which rose at will"\(^3\). Outdoors in the garden of near-rustic seclusion the house-parties (had there been any) might have desported themselves at the American bowling alley or the Swiss Chalet, gone boating on the artificial lake or inspected in the sub-tropical garden the tank for the Victoria Regia lily. If these were not enough there was always the open-air skating rink "to meet the new furore"\(^4\).

---

\(^1\) Daly, Op. cit., 1er série, III, exemples D1, by Azemar at St Cloud; A2 by A. Salmon, Ave de l’Impératrice; C2, by Hermant, Ave de l’Impératrice; D2, by A. Hue, Bt. d’Argenson. Cf. also London town-house designs such as Cornwall Mansion, nr. Queens Gate, S. Kensington, by J. T. Smith. (Bldr, 22 Apr. 1882, p. 482).

\(^2\) Bldr, 8 Jly. 1876, p. 653.

\(^3\) To make a single huge room (Archt, 26 May, 1877, p. 338).

\(^4\) London Journal, 19 Aug. 1876, p. 120.
If Knowles the younger forebore to reproduce the bulging domes of the Grosvenor Hotel on his houses of the '60s and '70s, Knowles the elder did not. Hedsor House, built between 1865 and '8 for the 4th Lord Boston, was like a baby Grosvenor in the Buckinghamshire countryside 1. Light-coloured brick is the principal facing material at both house and hotel (with Bath stone on the ground floor of the latter); pierced stone hoods, densely carved with naturalistic foliage were inserted (like eyelids) in the window openings at both buildings, as also at Kensington House: it was virtually a Knowles family hall-mark. These have now been removed at both Hedsor and the hotel, as has the entire porte cochère at the former with its clusters of fleshy oak and ivy leaves in the spandrels. At both buildings there is a coarse foliated frieze with flaring cornice and balustrade above, but the medallion heads which punctuate the hotel's frieze have their counterpart at Hedsor in roundels worked into the balcony balustrades on the tops of the porte cochère and the bow windows at third floor level. Large composite chimneys after the French manner again with flaring cornices, are common to both buildings, as are dormer windows with segmental pediments, and of course those distinctive Franco-Indian hybrid domes. But they are gone now too 2. Actually there

1. There had been a house on the site since that built by the 2nd Lord Boston in 1778. This, which had been largely rebuilt, 1825-40 was dynamited in 1865 to make way for the new house. It belongs now to the Shephard family but has been leased to International Computers Ltd, as a training centre, since 1968.

2. Domes, eyelids, porte cochère, were all removed after the house had been sold in 1923 by the 6th Lord Boston to Darcy Baker. He altered much of the Victorian decor and seems to have had a bathroom fad, installing six which remain the house's greatest luxuries; sunken baths, onyx and mosaicked walls.
is a difference between the domes at Hedsor and those at the Grosvenor, it is true, but they are of a family: at Hedsor a low pyramid replaces the Grosvenor's upper dome, and there is no attempt to link the lower parts of two domes as at the hotel. The Grosvenor's doubled domes were the direct result of the hotel's situation in relation to adjacent buildings, allowing it only one major facade. Hedsor, on the other hand, has three facades of equal significance and accordingly a square plan with distinct pavilions at each corner. Perhaps Knowles was influenced by this sort of arrangement at French chateaux like Ecouen or Ancy-le-Franc (his central skylit hall occupying the position of their much larger courtyards) but he could as well have got the idea from the plans of Banks and Barry's Bylaugh Hall or Paxton's Mentmore, published as we have seen by Kerr in 1864.

Park Place, Remenham, Berks., near Henley-on-Thames, shows a similar affinity with city architecture in the treatment of its French roofs. The architect responsible for their addition was Thomas Cundy, best known for his work on the Grosvenor Estate, hard by Knowle's hotel. The result seems to owe something to both projects. The mansard roof is interrupted at various points around the house by pavilion mansards which rise higher than the rest of the roof and which, along with their Classical *ceil-de-boeuf* lucarnes, recall Cundy's own roofing to the terraced mansions of the Grosvenor Estate; on the other hand, in two places (the west and the south fronts), two of these taller mansards are linked to make a single, broader roof mass in the same way as is to be seen at the Grosvenor Hotel. A third variant is found at Park Place
over the north-east corner: a mansarded octagon, an example of the urge in the 1860s to vary the basic types inherited from the Louvre which were by then becoming over-worked.

There had been a house on the site for 150 years, and amongst its owners had been Frederick Lewis, the Prince of Wales. From 1824-67 the property, by then rebuilt by Henry Holland, was in the hands of the Fuller-Maitland family, from whom it was bought as a speculation by Charles Easton of White Knight's Park, Reading, with the intention of cutting the estate up into a number of smaller properties. He also did some alterations to the house, presumably about 1868-9, before leasing the property to J. Noble of Noble's Paints and Varnishes in 1869. Noble bought the place outright in 1870 "to prevent other barbarisms". For, as his son, Percy Noble, declared, the house had been "badly modernised in every way, and many of the chief features destroyed". There is no indication as to the architect employed by Easton. Cundy's work at Park Place was done for the Nobles, 1872-4. A fire shortly after Noble had bought the house had destroyed part of the interior, and on its being realised how badly the earlier alterations had been done, it was decided to undertake a thorough re-building programme. But the skeleton of the house as altered by Easton is still very apparent, and the arrangement of the rooms was not affected. Percy Noble's book on the house includes a series of useful photographs which make

1. Percy Noble, Park Place, Berkshire; a short history of the place and an account of the owners and their guests, London, 1905 (for private circulation only), p. 182.
2. Ibid., p. 183.
clear the house's progress from the Classical edifice by Henry Holland to the bold exercise in the Grosvenor Estate style which survives today. In 1866, a rather grand facade overlooked the grounds to the south: solid square pavilions, rusticated at basement level, flanked a huge, central, hexastyle portico, with giant-order, unfluted, Corinthian columns, rising to a balustrade above the entablature, and above that again a heavy cornice, which broke forward at intervals to support statues. At the top were a broad pediment and urns. Easton did away with the pediment, the cornice and statues, but preserved the columns; he added a bowed projection from ground to roof at the south-east corner in place of a low, jumbly conservatory and a more angular bow of slightly different position, which had been there before. He also altered the fenestration details of much of the house to the forms which they still retain, except for the bow windows of the garden front which were Cundy's additions. On top of it all Easton placed a rather insipid, but distinctly French, roof in place of the barely visible covering of the former Neo-Classical house. Cundy's contribution, therefore, was very much controlled, fire or no fire, by the house as it was after Easton had finished with it; even the twinned mansards overlooking the garden were partly influenced by the fact that in the earlier arrangement there had been a broad but distinct section of roof directly over the columned portico, like a failed attempt at a central pavilion roof of a three-pavilion chateau plan. But in fact, pavilioned symmetry is only hinted at on this facade. Thomas Cundy might have favoured symmetry in
the great blocks of town-mansions which he erected near Victoria Station, but he still favoured a controlled irregularity in a country house. He made no attempt to change the large bow at the east end of the garden front which prevents the completion of the triple-pavilion composition that might have been¹, though the pavilion roof over it, required to complete the threesome, is suggested, almost burlesqued, by the use of a curious, open-work spire, which is now removed. A Barryesque tower, with very steep pavilion mansard, to the left further upsets the symmetry of this front, as it does of the west-facing entrance front. These corner towers and bows give to the house as a whole a sculptural unity as one progresses round it. The substitution of the columned portico by two bows on the garden front, rising only two floors in height, was dictated also by the characteristic Victorian desire for plastic and sculptural effects. Despite its dating from the early '70s, Cundy's design is still very much imbued with the spirit of High Victorianism. We may doubt (especially now that it is disfigured by fire-escapes and has lost the elaborate finials from its roofs) that Cundy's creation is an improvement upon the effects of Henry Holland; but compared with the house as Easton left it it is like meringues to a bread-and-butter pudding².

¹. This is not surprising for it plays an important role in the view of the house from the back (north-east), harmonising with the rounded shapes of the conservatory roof, a canted bay with octagonal mansard roof at the north-east corner, and a small oriel facing east.

². It is now a residential school for Senior Delicate Boys; within the London Borough of Hillingdon. Pevsner, Berkshire, Harmondsworth, 1966, p. 192, dismisses it as "rather dreary".
Almost contemporary with Cundy's activity at Park Place was the re-styling of Stevenstone, near Torrington, North Devon, for the Hon. Mark Rolle, by the firm of Banks and Barry, who as has been seen, had made some rather half-hearted use of French Renaissance motifs in a number of urban schemes, from the Whitehall competition of 1857 onwards. Half-hearted was again the approach at Stevenstone, for although individual features refer back to France the over-all feeling has little to do with that country. This is perhaps partly attributable to the decision to simply remodel the existing house rather than build afresh, after the architects had furnished drawings for both possibilities. The old house had been "a long, low, insignificant structure - quite devoid of any architectural character or importance", according to The Building News; and its plan had been a complicated one owing to the uneven terrain on which it was built. Entrance had been effected on the two-storeyed north side, but the principal stair led directly, between a pair of internal courts, to the main apartments which opened directly on to the garden terrace. The bedrooms were half a level higher still, on the north side. Banks and Barry retained this basic arrangement, while adding square bay windows to the drawing rooms, between which doors opened on to the terrace. They also slung a new wing northwards at the western angle to create a roughly

1. According to BN, 19 Nov. 1875, p. 558, which issue also published a perspective view of the garden front, plus plan. This view was based on that shown at the R.A. (Entry 1078) in 1874 (See Archt., 16 May 1874, p. 275 for review) and is now held at RIBAD (C6/24). The house is now partly demolished.
L-shaped plan. On top of the whole building was added an attic floor for still more accommodation, with a relentless row of wavy-pedimented dormer windows peering out of a low mansard roof. This dreary arrangement is punctuated by a pair of square towers at either end of the garden front, which have more the proportions of those on an Elizabethan house than of the pavilions of a French chateau. Conservatively, they are topped by mean little truncated and crested pyramid roofs such as the architects had employed more than ten years previously on their Whitehall offices design. They are too isolated from each other and from the higher, part-French, part-Scottish tower which rises up beyond at the north-east corner, sole other gesture in the direction of picturesque building.

The symmetry of Banks and Barry's urban forays into the Paris style allowed a hint of grandeur but they failed miserably in this half-hearted attempt at a picturesque country house. Actually it appears to have been Robert Richardson Banks rather than the younger Charles Barry who was chiefly involved with the project at Stevenstone, as a number of letters in the Rolle family papers indicate. Barry

1. In fact an old-fashioned labyrinth with more than three-quarters of a mile of corridors according to the BN, 22 Nov. 1872, pp 400-1.

2. The tower housed the smoking room. Surprisingly Stevenstone received considerable praise from the press, particularly from BN (22 Nov. 1872, pp 400-1) though that notice probably depended largely upon a report from the sycophantic, local North Devon Harald. Archt, 16 May 1874, p. 275, found the dormers and terminal towers "poor in design", but thought the general effect "bold". The fullest account of the alterations was in BN, 19 Nov. 1875, p. 558: "Stevenstone now takes its place as one of the most beautiful and complete residences in the county". See also Archt, 23 Jly. 1870, p. 56.
took over supervision of the work in its last stages after Banks's death in December 1872, but it was the latter who paid repeated visits to the house from February 1869 when the contract was signed until at least well into 1871. There are no references to Barry at all.

Stevenstone, Park Place and Hedsor House, though full-scale building programmes, or nearly so, were French virtually only in the details of their roofs; and in each case it was a roof-type which, prior to 1865 had been chiefly associated with urban architecture under the influence of the New Louvre and the Paris Hôtel de Ville. In the years after 1865, and indeed for the rest of the century and into the present one, a great many country-house owners who did not wish to embark on the complete rebuilding of their houses were to have recourse to this range of French roof types,

1. BN, 22 May 1874, p. 549, comments on Barry's drawing of Stevenstone, exhibited at the R.A., as "a mansion by his late partner Mr. Banks". The Devon Recom Office holds an unsigned specification for the alterations, dated January 1869 (96M/104/20) dealing with rights, duties and responsibilities rather than details of the structure. There are also three agents' letter books, 1862-72 (96M/11/12) and bundles of agents' letters, 1869-73 (96M/13/13-19). The earliest reference to the project is in a letter (96M/13/14) from William Endacott, clerk, to Henry Drew, agent, dated 1 Oct. 1868: "Someone from Banks's office in London here yesterday". Visits by Banks himself are reported by Endacott, 2 & 3 Feb. 1869 (96M/13/14); 13 Jly. & 21 Sep. 1869 (96M/13/13); 29 Sep. 1870 (96M/13/15); 24 & 26 Jan. 1871 (96M/13/16); 11 & 12 Apr., & 28 Jun. 1871 (96M/13/17). Rolle himself on 27 Sep. 1870, while grouse-shooting at Pitlochry, wrote to Drew (96M/13/15) to check with Banks on progress. Things were probably quite far advanced by then for a man had fallen from the new roof in November 1869 (Endacott to Drew, 10 Nov. 1869 (96M/13/13)). By 13 May 1872 (96M/13/18) the ornamental plastering was "nearly concluded", so little remained for Barry to cope with after Banks's death.
either to be in the fashion or simply as a cheap means of gaining more accommodation. One or even two extra storeys could be added to the top of a house without the expense of heightening the masonry. The dullest method of accomplishing this was by the addition of a simple and continuous steep roof with flat top, or a double-sloped mansard with flat top, stretching the length of the building, as at Stevenstone, and bristling with an unbroken line of dormers. The results of this, as seen at houses like Balreggan House, Wigtownshire, and Garendon Park, Leics., make one suspect that extra accommodation was the only concern, for there is little indication of interest in the picturesque potential of the French style and the incongruity of the added roofs is jarring and tasteless in both cases. Yet where Garendon is concerned it is worth remembering that the client, Ambrose Mark Phillipps, had been a close friend of Pugin, and his additions to Garendon (done by Pugin's son, E. Welby Pugin) are reminiscent of those made by that other dedicated Goth, Beresford-Hope, when in the similar predicament of owning a resolutely Classical house: short of building a new one, the addition of flat mansards for extra height seems the most that either man dared to undertake in his bid to alleviate the intolerable dullness of a Georgian Classical house.

1. Balreggan was a house by William Adam and appears in his Vitruvius Scoticus, ca. 1808, pl. 128. The architect and date of the alterations are not clear.

2. Garendon, near Loughborough, was an early eighteenth-century house by the amateur architect, Ambrose Phillipps, for himself. His descendant's horrible additions date from 1866, along with a few other changes (See Pevsner, Leicestershire and Rutland, Harmondsworth, 1960, p. 106). For illus. see Mark Girouard, "Ambrose Phillipps
Of similar type, but lent more of the plasticity of which the style was capable by the pavilions and bows of the houses which they covered, were the steep, flat-topped roofs added to two other Scottish houses - Crimonmogate, Aberdeenshire, and Kailzie, Perthshire. The result is a good deal less discordant in the latter house, a modest late Georgian place with large central bow on the garden front, like Oxon Hoath. There is a similar bow at Crimonmogate, but such roofs are not an appropriate combination with the gaunt Classical portico which the house also boasts. Even the dormers, more Classical than those used at Balreggan and Garendon, are of little avail in tying the composition into a satisfactory whole. A need for extra nursery space was expected at the time, which explains the new roofs to some extent, yet we may guess that there was some concern for the picturesque as well. Further

Footnote continued from page 280

of Garendon, AH, VIII, 1965, pp 25-38, pl. 6. For original house see also J. Throsby, New copper plate magazine containing select views of noblemen's and gentlemen's seats in England, 1792. E. W. Pugin seems to have tried his hand at nearly the full range of French Renaissance types. After the dull, flat-roofed type at Garendon he became bolder: he used truncated pyramids and high, crested hip roofs on a mansion in Leamington for Major Seel, illus. BN, 22 Nov. 1872, pp 404, 407; Some details of Carlton Towers, Yorks., (1875-5) for 9th Lord Beaumont, are French (tower roof; Flamboyant ogee arch over door); finally, just before his death, Archt, 15 May 1875, p. 290, published an illustration of a water gate in a most extreme Loire-chateau style. This was to be built in Denmark for the Count Kuth.

1. Kailzie (now demolished) was built 1802. The roofs were probably added at the end of the nineteenth century according to the Royal Commission on the ancient and historical monuments of Scotland, Peeblesshire; an inventory of the ancient monuments, II, 1967, no. 568, pp 294-6. Crimonmogate, Lonmay, was built by Archibald Simpson, ca. 1825. Roofs apparently added some time between 1863 and 1875 for Sir Alexander Bannerman, 9th Bt.;
houses to acquire this sort of low, French roof late last century and early in this one, and more clearly demonstrating a deliberately French concern, were Jardine Hall, Dumfriesshire; Luton Hoo, Beds.; Ickworth, Suff.; and Marchmont House, Berwicks. The very extensive wings added to the first of these by E. J. May in 1893 suggest that the extra space to be gained by a mansard over the old, central portion was not the only reason for its use; besides, the new drawing room was a very gaudy and coarse example of the fin de siècle resurgence of the French Rococo taste. Luton Hoo's roofs were the work of the Beaux Arts trained Mewès and Davis; those on the east wing at Ickworth were by Reginald Blomfield who was dedicated to French Classicism; while the elegant Marchmont
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architect unknown. Drawings by various different hands for a number of similar schemes are held by the present owner, Major R. A. Carnegie, great grandson of Sir Alexander (as also incidentally of the 9th Earl of Southesk, adder of French details to Kinnaird). Copies at NMRS are numbered ABD/87/1-12, 18-19. As well as the new roofs a dining and billiard room extension was added at this time, indicating a readiness to build outwards as well as upwards. Photos of work in progress held at house (copies NMRS). See also "Buchan illustrated", p. 15, bound with 123 views of "Royal Deeside", Aberdeen, Aberdeen Daily Journal and Evening Express, ca. 1904.

1. Jardine Hall, Lockerbie, was built 1818. Additions for Capt. Cunningham-Jardine, immediately following the death of Sir Alexander Jardine, 8th Bt., 1893, include a very modest mansard and dormers which are not disagreeable. Seven drawings for this scheme are held at NMRS (DFD/74/1-7). They were illus. copiously: Bldr., 12 & 19 May, 1894, pp 370, 383 (reproduced in Statham, Modern architecture, pp 192-3); BA, 10 Dec. 1897; Bldr., 4 Jun. 1898, p. 546; AR, XI, 1902, pp 104-6.

2. 1903 for the diamond magnate, Sir Julius Wernher. For original house, by Robert Adam, see Neale's Views of seats, 1819. See also CL, 5 May 1950, pp 1282-5; Pevsner, Bedfordshire, pp 120-2. See also below, p. 502.

transformation (the work of Robert Lorimer as late as 1914-19) strikes a reticently French eighteenth-century note.1

This sort of dormer-studded and flat-topped French roofing was very much like that which adorns the house in the "French" style with which Robert Kerr had illustrated the appropriate chapter in The Gentleman's house.2 It was a type, Kerr declared, which was "never picturesque - indeed essentially very much the reverse of such a thing", and ran the risk in English hands of becoming "insipid to the last degree". He did not expect it "to be adopted or even imitated in this country unless (as it has already been, and by no means successfully) in very exceptional cases". This was in his first edition of 1864. By the third edition, seven years later, he felt obliged to append a footnote to the effect that "It seems now more probable that the ultimate leaning of English Classicism may be very decidedly towards the French school. Fashion cannot rest, and it is certain that France has exhibited in the so-called Italian style that originality which is the sole title to leadership in art."3


2. Part IV, Ch. VII. 1st ed., pl. 28. In 3rd ed. (p. 362) the chapter is renamed "French-Italian style".

3. Ibid., 1st ed., pp 378-9; 3rd ed., p. 363. The 3rd ed. more than once indicates that in the years since the 1st ed.'s publication Kerr had observed a marked upsurge in the French taste. Compare the following: 1st ed., p. 397, "But recently ... a certain continental, if not especially French, spirit has been imported into English-Italian (architecture) which has caused the term Renaissance to be used a good deal," and, 3rd ed., p. 364, "But recently a certain French spirit has been imported ..."
It is curious, however, that it was in relation to this particular type (which certainly was insipid) that he chose to acknowledge the growth of architectural inspiration from France, for though the 1870s did indeed mark the high-point of the French vogue, it was predominantly manifested in the more showy variety of roofs which he had deviously described as the "English Renaissance style" in his first edition. Here were the separate pavilion roofs whose variety of sky-line and plasticity of form were making them irresistible to renovators of old houses and builders of new ones alike. The insipid, flat and continuous sort of his "French" chapter, and of Garendon, Balreggan, and the rest, was less characteristic of the age, and rarely appeared on new houses. Some use of towers or pavilions to punctuate the uniformity of the mass was fairly universal. Houses like Stevenstone and Gallowhill were not exciting but they did have towers; Llwyn House, near Oswestry, was another with this sort of roof, but again there was a tower to

1. "Renaissance", being a French word meant for Kerr "French Renaissance" unless otherwise stated: "The term Renaissance may be understood to indicate the modern adaptation of Classicism (primarily Italian) received wherever it may happen to be, through a French channel." (1st ed., p. 379, 3rd ed. p. 364). Hence, when he called the manifestly Second-Empire illustration to Part IV, ch. 8, "English Renaissance style", he intended a paradox: "If this new mode be called by the French name and yet identified with English practice the complex phrase may be more expressive of the facts of the case than any other." (1st ed., pp 379-80 - omitted from the 3rd ed., when he altered the title to "Renaissance style"). He saw that the English approach to the Second Empire style was different from that of its model in many respects.

2. Cf. also Marton Hall, Middlesbrough. Classical house of ca. 1853-6, remodelled ca. 1867-75 possibly by Charles J. Adams for Henry W. F. Bolckow (iron-master millionaire from Germany). Steep hipped and crested roof to old part of the house. New wing given lower mansard, crown of cresting, and oeil-de-boeuf dormers. Tower
one side and picturesque use of chimneys. Llwyn, incidentally probably had a considerable influence upon Kerr. It looks very much as if this house provided the frame-work for the basic composition which he uses with a simple variation of details for all the illustrations to his section on style: Kerr's model has the Llwyn layout (it will be remembered he published its plan in an earlier section of his book); and further, Llwyn's details are shared out between Kerr's "French" and "Renaissance" models.

Llwyn's modest hipped roofs and dormers are not dissimilar to Kerr's "French" model, but it is to the "Renaissance" one that its side tower with pyramid roofing is most akin. Details are not exact but there are enough likenesses to suggest more than coincidence. Be that as it may, the roof-types seen both in Kerr's
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1. The plan was published as pl. 16 in Kerr’s 1st and 3rd editions, discussed in 3rd edition, pp 56, 430. Llwyn was designed by James Blake and was illus. BN, 23 Mar. 1860. It was shown at the Architectural Exhibition, 1859 (see Bldr, 2 Apr. 1859, pp 230-1; BN, 25 Mar. 1859, p. 282). It was well received. Its composition is close to Kerr's model: two pavilions flank a central, recessed bit overlooking the garden; a tower or porte cochère on the side is the main entrance to the house. The drawing for the "French" (3rd ed. "French-Italian") style has Llwyn's ground-floor rustication, modest roof and dormer type; the "English Renaissance" (3rd ed. "Renaissance") style has Llwyn's arcading across the front and tower details. If Kerr was indebted to Llwyn for this schema, others were in turn indebted to Kerr, e.g. Stanmore, nr. Bridgnorth, Salop. by J. W. Hugall for John Pritchard (Bldr, 1 Oct. 1870, pp 784-7); House at Chislehurst, Sy, by S. R. Eglinton (Archt, 15 Nov. 1879, p. 287); Bryn Ivor Hall, Castletown, Monmouthshire, by A. C. Watkins for John Davies (Archt, 20 Sep. 1879, p. 159).
"Renaissance" style and on the side tower at Llwyn, truncated pyramids and squared domes, were far more popular on both new houses and remodelled old ones than was the less picturesque sort seen at Garendon and in Kerr's "French" model. We have already seen that these roof-types were urban in origin, first brought to the notice of a wide public by the Louvre project and the Whitehall competition. Thereafter they had spread to the field of the country house, and we have observed their use in large-scale reconstructions or in new houses such as Hedsor, Stevenstone and the Bowes Museum. Most commonly, however, they were applied to old, usually Classical, houses which remained otherwise unchanged. It was a short-cut to high fashion. After all, Kerr had said that the chief characteristic of the (French) Renaissance style was its high pitched roofs and that

"though it is not usual for a single feature to produce a modification of style ... in this instance it is certainly the case to a very considerable extent."

They were a convenient way, it was felt, to add spark and dash to a dowdy Georgian inheritance and were a good deal more picturesque and plastic than the continuous flat-topped roofs employed at Garendon.

An early case was Grange Hall, Forres, Morayshire, seat of James Grant-Peterkin. It was an early nineteenth-century house with a large Classical portico and pediment. Four bulky pyramid roofs with liberal metal cresting and dormer windows were slapped over
the corners of the house, as at Hedsor, but more incongruously because of the portico. The date must be some time before 1868\(^1\).

Another north Scottish house acquired both this sort of separate pavilion roof and the more continuous variety, hipped rather than flat-topped, and richly crested. This was Guisachan House, Inverness-shire, country residence of Sir Dudley Marjoribanks\(^2\). Similar was the fate of many other Classical houses on into the twentieth century with hardly a change to indicate the widely divergent dates.

There was one variation, however, which it is tempting to see as a later development; yet even it, recurring as it did over a period of decades is no clear indication of date. This was the pavilion mansard (already encountered at Park Place) as opposed to the truncated pyramid or the squared dome. Certainly the Paris Hôtel de Ville had pavilion mansards and they were used occasionally in Britain in the 1850s and '60s - quite prominently in fact by

---

\(^1\) Architect unknown. J. and W. Watson, Morayshire described: being a guide to visitors, Elgin, 1868, pp 89-90, indicates that the attic storey was already in existence.  
\(^2\) A photo at NMRS copied from an album in possession of Sir Richard Cotterell, Bt., of Hereford is dated ca. 1880, and shows the French roofs. Described by BA, 2 Jan. 1874, p. 5, as "a Classic building designed by Messrs A. & W. Reid of Elgin and Inverness", in a list of Scottish buildings either recently erected or in progress, but this does not necessarily mean the roofs, which are almost certainly not original. A truncated pyramid roof is over what looks like an added wing, behind which is a quite stunning conservatory; the rest of the roofing is hipped and crested. Marjoribanks, had had T. H. Wyatt design him a London house of rather French flavour in the '70s (see above, p. 91).
Rhode Hawkins at the Royal Victoria Patriotic Asylum, Wandsworth (1857), for instance— but usually cresting concealed the upper slope. From the end of the 1860s onwards they began to replace truncated pyramids and to display their double slope quite frankly.

At the Alexandra Palace, Muswell Hill, they towered to a quite preposterous height above an alien elevation. Cundy’s use of them at the Grosvenor Estate in the late '60s and shortly afterwards at Park Place seems to mark their rise to fashion. Yet one finds both them and truncated pyramids reappearing throughout the final decades of the century. New variants might arise, but the old died harder, which is perhaps what one should expect within a fashion which was essentially conservative. New developments only added to the battery of motifs at the disposal of the Victorian architect.

In the field of the country house T. H. Wyatt put both truncated pyramids and pavilion mansards on Newnham Paddox, Warwicks., for the 8th Earl of Denbigh in 1875, and Cherkley Court, Leatherhead, underwent a very similar transformation twenty years later with the aid of pavilion mansards.

4. The ridges between the two roof slopes have pronounced acroteria at the corners, a feature commoner in late examples. A fire in 1893 had necessitated rebuilding of the original house in Italianate style. Illus. CL, 28 Apr. 1900, p. 528. The owner at that time was A. Dixon. It was bought, 1910, by Wm. M. Aitken, later 1st Lord Beaverbrook, and remains in that family.
In Berwickshire in the latter years of the century, Manderston House, Duns, briefly enjoyed a set of pavilion roofs - a combination of the continuous flat-topped variety and truncated pyramids; while Longformacus House acquired more permanently a single, central, pavilion mansard. As late as 1901-2 it is the truncated pyramid sort, albeit rimmed with a balustrade rather than with metal cresting that one finds being employed by David Barclay in a remodelling of Gartmore House, Perthshire, for Sir Charles Cayzer, Bt. By this stage this sort of roof was certainly fairly exceptional and at Gartmore probably reflected the long-standing taste of the new owner who had during the '90s remodelled his other

1. A photo in the collection of Brig. J. Swinton ("Houses of Berwickshire, 1875" - a copy at NMRS) shows the original Georgian house. Another (NMRS copy from one in collection of A. Brown & Co., Lanark) shows it transformed by an unknown hand, presumably for Sir William Miller, Bt., some time between 1875 and his death in 1887, into a not unpleasing arrangement with high pavilion roofs. Sir William's son, Sir James, 2nd Bt., had the French roofs removed again. For illus. of French roof see Clive Aslet, "Manderston, Berwickshire"; CL, 15 Feb. 1979, p. 390. Sir James had his dining room at No. 45 Grosvenor Square decorated in a Régence mode, 1897 (illus. Nicholas Cooper, The opulent eye, London, 1976, pl. 90).

2. A William Adam house (Vitruvius Scoticus, pl. 99). In photo from Brig. J. Swinton's "Houses of Berwickshire, 1875" collection (see NMRS copy) the house has acquired small recessed dormers. Later these were built outwards, a wing to the right added with dormer windows and the pavilion mansard built in the centre back. Architect not clear.

3. Another William Adam house (Vitruvius Scoticus, pl. 83). Barclay gave it a machicolated tower and battlemented tourelle over the centre of the entrance front, and high pavilion roofs at each end of that facade with small bartizans of Scotch rather than French proportions (now gone): another case where the two styles were seen as not incompatible. The garden front, with high roofs over terminal bowed pavilions reminds one of Bedgebury Park, a transformation then half a century old. The building is now St Ninian's School. See J. F. Hendry, "The real Captain Brassbound", SF, Nov. 1958, pp 40-2.
house, Ralston, in Renfrewshire, in a French mode which partly
looked back to Second Empire Paris, and partly reflected the fin
de siècle return to Classicism.

Despite the late use of truncated pyramids at Gartmore,
support can be found in the alterations which took place at
Normanhurst in Sussex, some time in the late nineteenth century,
for the argument that pavilion mansards were the more fashionable
form in later decades, and were found (because of their extra
height) to blend better with the Loire style which was more popular
at that time. As has already been said in relation to its plan,
this house was designed by Habershon, Brock and Webb for Thomas
Brassey and built, 1865-71. Pictures published between 1867
and 1906 show it with truncated and crested pyramid roofs over a
symmetrical, central block to which were appended on the right of
the entrance a conservatory and also a tall tower with associated
tourelle, both with octagonal cone roofs; to the left was a square,
flat-topped tower of an Elizabethan variety, recalling Barry's
Highclere. The service wing straggled off farther to the left,
sporting a group of faceted cone roofs, one markedly concave.
Photographs of uncertain date and pictures published at the time
of a disastrous fire in 1908 show that a considerable change had
taken place. When this took place is not clear, but the view of
the house in its original state in a local guide book, 1906, cannot
be regarded as reliable evidence for dating of the alterations for

2. Son of the railway magnate. Raised to the peerage as Baron
Brassey of Bulkley, 1886 and Earl Brassey, 1911.
it was a standard illustration reappearing in each edition. Whatever the date, pavilion mansards replaced the old-fashioned crested pyramid roofs; the tower to the right acquired a bigger roof with lantern, like those at Chambord (at the sacrifice of some windows in the upper tower room); the tourelle acquired an unfaceted cone roof, and the Highclere tower a steep wedge. Another wedge, and a steep cone-roofed tourelle had been added to the picturesque display of the service wing. This transformation reflects the change in taste which was already beginning when the house was first built. From being very much a vigorous and rather hard, High Victorian mansion, still in the shadow of the New Louvre and with only a few hints of influence from the Loire chateaux to its fenestration and in the tower and tourelle, it became far more thoroughly chateau-like in its general effect.

1. J. Davis, Hastings and St Leonards Visitors' Guide. The view of Normanhurst appears in the 1882, 1897, 1906 editions. It is the same view which was published in Bldr, 8 Jun. 1867, p. 411 (reproduced also in Girouard, VCH, pl. 267). For other early views and descriptions see Morris, Seats, VI, p. 51; various views held by the Hastings Area Library, Brassey Institute, Hastings, some being in a book of photographs called "Views of the British Isles" (mostly Hastings); S. Whiteman, Guide to Hastings, St Leonards and the neighbourhood, 1871, pp 85-6.

2. Photos at Brassey Institute; see also W. T. Pike's Sussex in the Twentieth Century, 1910, p. 88. (This is the source of the dating, 1865-71). For the fire see The Hastings and St Leonards Pictorial Advertiser and Visitors' List, 6 Aug. 1908, pp 1, 20.

The house was rebuilt in the same manner: see advertisement for forthcoming sale, Hastings and St Leonards Observer, 19 Jun. 1920, p. 6; sale catalogue, dated 24 Jun. 1920, held at Brassey Institute; Strong, DCH, pl. 188 (it was demol. 1951).

3. The original Blois- and Chambord-type dormers plus truncated pyramid roofs, relate it to Montagu House. Round-angled windows with (as at Château de Bury in Du Cerceau) lozenge decoration between. The Loiresque transformation included (curiously) hipped and tiled dormers of Old English look.
We may return at this point to the earlier discussion of the trend in the 1870s away from High Victorian muscularity towards a more delicate and decorative style of building. Where the 1860s had experimented with hard, angular, or heavy bulging forms, wringing every variation out of the basic shapes inherited from the New Louvre, the '70s sought a greater elegance and decorativeness in smooth curves or spiky pinnacles. Knowles had swelled out the square Louvre domes at the Grosvenor Hotel and Hedsor House; Brodrick at the Scarborough Hotel had squeezed the same shape up into a top-knot taller than it was broad; an amazing conglomeration of forms, both bulging and angular, jostled for position at Carbet Castle in suburban Dundee. One recalls also the angular and truncated cones and pyramids at houses like Cranfield Court and Oakmere. Muscular Victorianism had demanded these hard, geometric forms. The decades which followed and which marked the progress of


2. Another fantastic house with French features of this type is Caldecote Towers, Bushey, Herts., now the Rosary Priory High School. Late Georgian, ca. 1832, the house of W. J. Marjoribanks Loftus Otway, and originally called Otway Towers. Italianate towers and French roofs with oeil-de-boeuf windows and one Chambordish turret on garden front suggest renovations ca. 1868. See Pevsner, Hertfordshire, 2nd ed., rev. by Bridget Cherry, Harmondsworth, 1977, p. 122. I am indebted to Mr Nigel Chadwick for showing me this house.
Aestheticism, marked also both the beginnings of a Classical reaction against the pervasiveness of the Gothic Revival and a return in architecture to an elegant refinement and a greater delicacy of detail, already noted in relation to decoration at Wyfold Court. Amongst houses inspired from France, the angularity of forms gave way to rounded shapes, more graceful and if anything steeper than ever: perfect cones replaced octagonal and truncated versions, as round towers replaced rectangular ones; high wedges and perfect pyramids replaced the chunkier forms of Louvre and Whitehall inspiration. These more elegant forms were derived from the chateaux of the reign of Francis I, in particular the less regular and more romantic early ones such as Azay-le-Rideau, Chenonceaux and Chaumont-sur-Loire, hitherto regarded as suitable for emulation only in remote and wild parts of the country, like Scotland and Wales. As a total composition only Stokes's Battlesden had approached it in England. The fact that the Loire had been the inspiration for innumerable provincial mansions built in France itself during the reign of Louis Philippe and the Second Empire had had little impact in England. The Angevin chateaux of René Hodé had received no publicity in England, nor had other early examples of the Loire style, whether in France or elsewhere until the late 1860s.

Inspiration had been overwhelmingly from urban France and had gone

---

1. The Loire chateaux were much illus. in the building journals, often from sketches by travelling students, though sometimes taken from French journals. Sheer numbers indicate their popularity. See appendix B.
2. For Hodé et al., see above, pp 215-6.
out to provincial England from the metropolis. But by 1870 the intellectual climate had changed.

The earlier Loire chateaux, then, supplied the favourite motifs for use in the 1870s, with their cone-roofed towers, sprocketed at the eaves to achieve a concave profile; heavy machicolation or cornice around the tops of these bastions; pronounced horizontal banding and vertical window-strips together creating a geometric grid upon the wall surface; and elegantly Classical interpretations of the essentially Gothic feature, the dormer window. The typical composition of the Loire-inspired house of the 1870s owed more, however, to the maturer years of François Premier architecture, to the more exact symmetries of planning at Chambord, Madrid, and to a lesser extent the Cour du Cheval Blanc at Fontainebleau. Granted, there was in the Victorian imitations nearly always some asymmetrical element, usually a tower to one side, which we do not see at Chambord or Madrid nor in contemporary French equivalents, but as a rule the rest of the house would be rigidly complementary on all points, even of fenestration, which conversely the French models did not bother about. With them, an effect of symmetry was gained without a concern for exactitude of detail. But the favoured Victorian game had long been to affect irregularity while actually employing sub-sections of exact symmetry. By the 1870s the sub-sections had become nearly the whole house. In this way the houses of the French Renaissance Revival displayed a major difference from those of that other new fashion, the Queen Anne taste, with which they otherwise had some close ties. The two styles emerged simultaneously around the year 1870 in response to the same set of
circumstances. Both offered solutions to the perennial problem of Gothic versus Classic, and both reacted against muscular Gothic; but where the Queen Anne style was, as Goodhart-Rendel put it, "a Gothic game played with Classical counters," the new chateau vogue was for the most part a Classical game played with mixed Gothic and Classic counters. The Gothic counters were mostly amongst the roofs, and even then they were treated with symmetry. The irregularities of the Loire-chateau plan, unpredictability of fenestration, and so forth, were typically ironed out and regularised.

On the whole, the romance of the models like Azay and Chenonceaux was held in check. The motifs only were taken. To some extent this is surprising since, as well as the role of compromise which it played in "the Battle of the Styles", the response to the Loire chateaux at this time was related to the artistic mood which was producing The Princess of Tennyson and Burne Jones's Briar Rose. Neo-mediaevalism was no longer dominated by the moral earnestness of Ruskin and Pugin. Where Pugin, in Contrasts, drew a pious array of steeples and church towers in his ideal Catholic town of 1440, the mediaeval town of the 1870 imagination would have

1. H. S. Goodhart-Rendel, English architecture since the Regency, London, 1953, p. 171 ("not very different from the game that had been played all over Europe three centuries before", he continued).
2. For contrasting attitude of the Queen Anne movement to this very point, see below, pp. 329-30.
3. Archt, 2 Jly, 1886, p. 1, said that the Chambord-like Royal Holloway College was "the nearest approach to a realisation of Lord Tennyson's vision in 'The Princess'". When Bernard E. Smith exhibited a sketch of Chenonceaux at the R.A. in 1878, Bldr, 11 May 1878, p. 480, called it "wildly abnormal, a building of one's dreams." In 1858, W. R. Beverley, set-designer of Meyerbeer's Les Huguenots at Covent Garden (inauguration production of the new opera house), chose a backdrop of Chenonceaux for Act 1, Scene 2 (Bldr, 29 May 1858, p. 378).
been more like something out of *Les Très Riches Heures du Duc de Berri*. Its nearest equivalent amongst actual buildings of the day would have been Burges's fantastic, gaunt and impractical Castell Coch (1872-9) in South Wales; for Burges moved in Aesthetic rather than architectural circles, and had an essentially visual and romantic approach to architecture. His client, Lord Bute, was another Ludwig of Bavaria, without the problems of a crown. But houses inspired by massive mediaeval cities like Carcassonne or Pierrefonds (or Viollet-le-Duc's restorations of same), as was probably the case at Castell Coch, were only for eccentrics. The Loire chateaux were far more satisfactory for nineteenth-century adaptation. There was greater refinement and elegance of detailing as well as the security of symmetry. The business-man country-house builders of the 1870s had their imaginations under tighter rein than did the Marquess of Bute. It was all very well for Walter Crane to have the hero in *Beauty and the Beast* (1873) reside in something that looked startlingly like the complete Chenonceaux

---

with its mélange of styles, but for bankers and railway kings a
degree of control was called for. Consequently, in the field of
domestic architecture of the 1870s and '80s, nothing came so close
to recapturing the appearance of the early Loire chateaux as did
a design by E. W. Pugin for a water gate attached to a chateau;
the site was to be in Denmark, still hardly parted in the Victorian
mind from Vikings and Elsinore¹.

Nearly as convincing, however, was a very late design for
a country house by Horace A. Appelbee, published in The Architect
in 1889. Here too Chenonceaux had contributed a great deal. The
house was never built². Amongst those that were (and on English
soil) the only house to have for its over-all conception the
subdued irregularity of Azay, in preference to the symmetry of
Chambord, was The Paddocks by John Douglas. This is not surprising
since, of the architects who worked in the style, it was Douglas
who was interested (where the others with the exception of J. L.
Pearson were not) in the vernacular revival inaugurated by Webb,
Nesfield and Shaw³. The Paddocks itself betrays something of
this interest, as does Pearson's Westwood House, though that is

¹. See above, p. 281n.
². Archt, 20 Dec. 1889, p. 361. The description includes the
now familiar argument about the role of compromise between Gothic
and Classic of the "Francois I style".
³. Though some of the lodges at Chateau Impney (presumably by
Phené Spiers) and stables there (certainly by Spiers, see drawing
at V & A, E2433 - 1918) are in brick and half-timbering (as had
been the case at the Wyfold bailiff's cottage), while others of
the lodges are mini-chateaux.
(surprisingly) a very nearly symmetrical building\(^1\). The Paddocks was built, 1881-3, for the agent of the Duke of Westminster, at Eccleston, Cheshire, on the duke's Eaton Estate\(^2\).

Westwood House, on the other hand, was a suburban villa in Westwood Hill, Sydenham, built ca. 1878. The client was Henry Littleton, proprietor of Novello's, the music publishers. The red brick employed at both these houses is alone almost enough to associate them at this date with the Aesthetic-Vernacular movement in architecture, but at both there are details of fenestration which establish the link as well. At each house on the garden elevation the treatment of window-strips in pairs, surmounted by a single wide dormer-pediment or gable, has an affinity with the wide gables used by Norman Shaw at the Albert Hall Mansions, for instance, or his houses in Cadogan Square: a motif taken up with a will by (amongst others)

---

1. But it was a remodelling of an earlier house, the plan remaining largely unaltered.
2. It still houses the Eaton Estate agent, Mr R. M. C. Jones. The original agent for whom the house was built was the Hon. Cecil Thomas Parker, second son of the 6th Earl of Macclesfield, and nephew of the Duke of Westminster, himself. Two drawings of The Paddocks are held at the Eaton Estate Office (EEO ref. nos. 02279, 02280). References to the house appear in a notebook, compiled for the 1st Duke of Westminster, listing building operations carried out on the estate (amongst the personal papers of the 1st Duke at EEO); also letters (unrevealing as to questions of style) between Parker and Douglas follow the building operations through (EEO Letter books, vol. 690 (1881-3), pp 52-3, 93, 132, 182, 196, 427, 495, 523-4, 594, 602, 631, 640, 868, 909, 924, 969, 978; vol. 691 (1883-5), pp 56, 647, 766; vol. 692 (1885-7), p. 909.) The complete sequence is transcribed by Edward H. Hubbard, as an appendix to his thesis, *The work of John Douglas (1830-1911)*, (see also pp 131-3). Old photographs of the house are also at EEO in a volume called "Eaton Estate photographs 1869 to 1899", vol. I.
the firm of George and Peto. Their source was Holland or Germany and not France, though the motif does occur in a rare example at Azay which is perhaps significant where The Paddocks is concerned. But Douglas had himself, at the nearby Green Paddocks farmhouse, employed highly original, broad, wavy dormers of a rather Netherlandish type, as early as 1872. The dormers in question at Westwood House were of the Jacobean variety which resemble Dutch gables and were par
gotted. They prompted The Builder to describe the whole design as of the "Late Elizabethan type" overlooking the strong French note. Drawings at the R.I.B.A., however, show that variant windows were considered, clearly indebted to Chenonceaux, but given the size and width of a gable. Other "Aesthetic" or Queen Anne detailing at Westwood included panels with incised patterns of arabesques and oval niches, not only with a Gibbs surround, but each

1. The Builder, 78 May, 1878, p. 501 (R.A. entry 1108). Critics were perplexed: Archt, 11 May 1878, p. 280, described the design carefully, hazarded the label "Late domestic Italian", but ended, "the style might be a little puzzling to determine, but excellence of general result is undeniable." B.N., 10 May, 1878, p. 465 was more accurate.

2. Drawings for main and garden elevations at RIBAD (U9/141-2). The house as built, with Jacobean dormers, was illus. B.N., 24 Dec. 1880, p. 732; A.R., I, 1896-7, p. 81; B.J., 17 Mar. 1897, p. 73; B.N., 22 Sep. 1899 (on occasion of its opening as the Passmore Edwards Orphanage). Photographs of the interior, taken shortly before the house was demolished in 1957, are held at the Archives and Local History Dept. of the Lewisham Public Library. These show much use of wood panelling in a sixteenth-century, rather French manner. Pearson was to create this sort of interior again, more clearly Francois Premier, at Cliveden, ca. 1895, for J. J. (later Lord) Astor.

3. Cfr."Design for a mansion" by P. Auld (Archt, 22 Aug. 1874, p. 94). This design, though obviously Loireseque in its major forms, (the big, cone-roofed, round tower, with associated ogee-domed tourelle, are probably from Chambord), treats the French motifs with even more freedom than does Westwood House - the very wide
holding also a sculptural bust, as if taken from some seventeenth-century house like Honington Hall or Coleshill. At The Paddocks the link with Aestheticism was to be found also in details like the use of tiny, lead-mullioned windows, but more importantly in a pervading sophistication in the handling of volumes, which, particularly in the gatehouse to the stable court, establishes a clear link with Shaw and even Godwin. Apart, however, from this shared affinity with the Aesthetic Movement, The Paddocks and Westwood House were vastly different, except in so far as they both displayed the smoother, perfect geometric forms amongst their roofs which were referred to above as being associated with the Loire style, as opposed to the angular and chunky forms beloved by the High Victorians. Thus, most of the towers at The Paddocks have smooth cones (true, one of the three at the service end of the house, now demolished, was octagonal, but not truncated), and there is a pyramid over the gate-house, while Westwood House boasted a profuse array of steep, but perfect, cones, and un-truncated pyramids. Otherwise The Paddocks stresses very much the Gothic aspects of the Loire châteaux while Westwood House is more Classical.

"C'est un petit château," crowed Sédille enthusiastically about

Footnote continued from page 299
dormers in particular - and with even more profuse "Aesthetic" ornamentation, incised or sculpted, and very likely to have been done in terra-cotta. The copious fenestration and use of loggias also resembles the Sydenham house.
1. See below, p. 332.
The Paddocks. And so it is. Its hints of Aestheticism make it an original and interesting house, and the use of Flamboyant wall-panelling and simple Gothic dormers, are at variance with Francois Premier practice; yet The Paddocks captures more faithfully the atmosphere of the early Loire chateaux such as Azay than any other house built in Britain. It is of course the irregular arrangement of steep, hipped roofs and conical sprocketed spires, which are chiefly responsible; but also the horizontal banding and vertical window-strips, rising from ground to dormer finials, on the narrow east end between the corner bastions, were more archaeologically accurate than was the case elsewhere. This may be contrasted with Pearson's suggestion of window-strips at Westwood House. Taking his cue from this historic motif, Pearson has produced something more modern and appropriate to the contemporary life-style. The windows are arranged in strips so closely aligned on the entrance front, and so abnormally wide overlooking the garden, that the effect is thoroughly of the nineteenth century: sunshine and airiness rather than archaeology were the objects. A further Loire touch (convincing if not archaeologically accurate) is achieved at The Paddocks by the abandonment of the Gothic parapet employed at Oakmere in favour of a reticent cusped corbel-table below the eaves, which reminds one of the heavier machicolation at Azay or

1. GBA XXXV, 1887, p. 274; and L'architecture moderne en Angleterre, 1890, p. 88. He actually said this of the duke's secretary's house but since that (Eccleston Hill) is not like a chateau, he clearly meant the agent's house.
Chaumont-sur-Loire. And then there is the corbelled stair-turret too, cradled in the angle to the right of the main door: one of the most recurrent of all French motifs in the nineteenth-century revival, and probably derived from the most famous of many examples in France, Louis XII’s Blois. More than twenty years later Douglas returned to this sort of design. Described by The British Architect simply as a "Design for a hillside house, Cheshire", this very picturesque and very out-of-date house was "to be shortly commenced". Whether it was actually built or not (and this is not clear), it must have been the very last of British dabblings for domestic architecture in the styles of the picturesque French chateaux. Though, as the critic pointed out, it was inspired by the chateaux of Brittany (Josselin without a doubt) rather than those of the Loire, and in its austere massiveness is closest ally to Castell Coch, it was the culmination of John Douglas's life-long interest in the chateaux of France which stretched back forty years to Oakmere.

If The Paddocks most clearly resembled Azay, it is to the Châteaux of Chambord and Madrid that Westwood owed its greatest debts. The symmetrical arrangement of high hips and pyramids amongst the roofs resembles the latter palace, and the penchant for round-arched loggias with richly decorative spandrels also, though their use in threes at ground level is actually a closer echo of Chambord.

---

7. There were two alternative schemes, see BA, 20 Dec. 1907, p. 440; 3 Jan. 1908, p. 3 (with plan). Josselin was illus. in Eyriès and Perret, Les châteaux historiques, I. See also Appendix B.
Furthermore the bowed projections of the entrance front are rather like over-fenestrated versions of the two bastions on the same facade at Chambord. In addition to these features there are thin, cone-roofed turrets perhaps from Chenonceaux on the garden front and (for just a hint of asymmetry) a tower to one side which looks back to Pearson's own Quar Wood of the late 1850s and to much more mediaeval originals. It is a highly decorative house - perhaps too decorative - with its profusion of diamond- and circle-panelled pilasters, balustrades and urns, and copious superficial sculptured and incised arabesque work, which the simplicity of the side tower is not altogether strong enough to combat; but the overall effect is richly sculptural and picturesque with its rounded bows, its towers, and the chiaroscuro of its loggias.

In discussing Westwood House and The Paddocks first, we have actually begun the Loire Revival at the end. By 1890 this vogue was well-nigh over even in the field of public and commercial building. In the field of the private house the tide had already turned in the direction of a less equivocal Classicism by the early 1880s amongst the few that were much concerned with France\(^1\): by then the Vernacular Revival ruled supreme.

One of the earliest and most persistent exponents of the Loire chateau style, both in country houses, and later urban, architecture, was E. M. Barry. In his thirteenth lecture on architecture

---

\(^1\) Except for the popularity amongst Queen Anne/Aesthetic Movement houses of certain details which have their origins in François Premier architecture. See Chapter 7.
to the Royal Academy he accorded the Loire château style special praise for the "flexibility" which allowed it "to offer solutions of many difficulties in our modern architecture". Drawings for three houses by Barry in this style appeared in a row at the Royal Academy exhibition of 1872, for work was advancing upon them simultaneously. It was as well for Barry therefore that they were grouped closely in the Home Counties; and here is another clue to the acceptance of the Loire taste in England at last; Surrey and Sussex heathlands, as Pevsner points out, bore a convenient similarity to the rolling Scottish landscape, hitherto deemed necessary for the style. These houses were Cobham Park and Shabden, both in Surrey, and Wykehurst Park at Bolney, Sussex. The press reception they experienced at the exhibition was mixed, and certainly they vary in quality. Neither Cobham nor Shabden is particularly

2. I. Nairn and N. Pevsner, Surrey, 2nd ed., rev. by Bridget Cherry, Harmondsworth, 1971, p. 164. But very quickly such considerations were abandoned as the Loire style became popular even for urban architecture.
3. Cobham was built, 1870-3, for Charles Combe whose father, Charles James Fox Combe (new money from brewing, but old Surrey family) had brought up his numerous offspring in Honfleur for some years which perhaps accounts for the French taste. (Information from present owner Mr Charles H. C. Combe of Cobham Court.) The house is now let to a private company. Shabden was built 1871-3 for John Cattley, a city merchant. In recent years it has been a private geriatric hospital, but is now disused, its fate undecided.
4. BN, 17 May, 1872, p. 401, thought all of them "spoiled by an excessive prominence of the roofs. This defect is not relieved in the case of his Cobham Park by any features which raise the design above a very commonplace level. The architectural features of Wykehurst are less pretentious, and the effect is better ...
impressive, despite the efforts of the latter to be avant garde and Parisian in its planning. Wykehurst is more exciting. Built in 1871-4 for Henry Huth, important bibliophile and son of a city banker, it was at first to have been a very dull house, really quite like Cobham, judging by a preliminary design held at the R.I.B.A., and dated 17th June 1871, but even more like the neo-Jacobean Crewe Hall, for which Barry had been making drawings only a few months earlier. There was to have been a markedly Jacobean central portico, and a pair of small symmetrically-placed towers, again rather Jacobean in their roofing; but the high hipped roof behind, and the broad pedimented dormers rising above a balustrade are French and very similar to Cobham. Further, the use of pyramids over advancing bays indicates an interest in the architecture of France. The Builder, surprisingly, found Cobham "too much broken

Footnote continued from page 304
Shobden (sic) ... is really good ... The style, one which is eminently suited for use in English mansions, is that of Francis I's time, and is extremely well followed in this building." Significantly this last appraisal is made in relation to the soberest of the three. Eldr, 11 May 1872, p. 355; 16 May 1874 p. 409; BN, 22 May 1874, p. 549, all liked Wykehurst. See also Archit, 16 May 1874, p. 275; 4 May 1876, p. 262. Wykehurst was illus. Eldr, 20 Jly 1872, pp 565-7 (reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 261-2); BN, 19 Feb., 5 & 12 Mar. 1875, pp 206, 262, 288; W. T. Pike, Sussex in the Twentieth Century, p. 93; Girouard, VCH, pl. 272-3. See also Nairn and Pevsner, Sussex, p. 422. Shabden was illus. Eldr, 9 Aug. 1873, pp 624-7 (reproduced in Girouard, VCH, pl. 410). For Shabden and Cobham see also Nairn & Pevsner, Surrey, pp 164, 451.

1. After falling into a ruinous state, Wykehurst was recently restored to its original conditions by Mr James Doyle, who then sold the property (Dec. 1977).

2. RIBAD, C4/20, cf. Crewe Hall design (RIBAD, C4/19) dated March 1871. This combination recalls again Hardwick's Great Western Hotel and other Franco-Elizabethan designs.
up with small pinnacles, many and various pedimented dormers, &c."

True, its great fault is fussiness of detail (pierced balcony rails with clusters of obelisks being especially excessive) but what the massing of the house requires is to be more broken up than it is. Chimneys and finials are prominent features (they are not conspicuous at Shabden or Wykehurst), but the roof-ridge is horizontal and unvaried, and though certain details are undeniably derived from sixteenth-century France there are none of the turrets and bastions which are the distinctive features of the Loire chateaux. At Shabden the roof line is not markedly broken up either, but richer, more plastic effects have been achieved by deeper, projecting hips over bays and pavilions, and one suspects that some specific chateau of the Francis I period or later sixteenth century lies behind its quiet but forceful lines - the châtelet at Tanlay or the Hôtel de Vogüé at Dijon perhaps.

An even more plastic arrangement of hipped roofs at Wykehurst is complemented by a steep, wedge roof over a separate tower-mass on the left of the main front and by cone-roofed tourelles - big and with open loggias at the top on the entrance front, miniature overlocking the garden. Where it had seemed at Cobham, at least, that his first interest was for the English rather than the French Renaissance (a notion which is belied by his hotel work of the previous decade), at Wykehurst he at last struck out whole-heartedly and with considerable success into the style of the Loire chateaux.

2. Both were illus. in Sauvageot, Op. cit., I. See also Appendix B.
Chenonceaux (its fairly regular entrance front) is the immediate source for the entrance front at Wykehurst. Not only does the central, steep hip-roofed section with three dormer windows flanked by a pair of tourelles closely resemble that chateau, but the stair windows to the left of the main door, looking as if they should be a chapel, echo the chapel at Chenonceaux which is in the same position (though oriented differently). In addition to these obvious compositional similarities, there were above the entrance the pretty little corbelled twin balconies taken from Chenonceaux which Bryce had liked so much and which Barry was to use again at his later Temple Garden Buildings. At Wykehurst the swelling balustrades continued the horizontal accent of the string course which is only slightly less pronounced than were the horizontal bands so characteristic of the Loire chateaux. With these motifs and the much more sculptural treatment of form, Barry has produced a house vastly more picturesque than the other two, and more competent in every way. The closeness of their dates makes the difference startling. One might have supposed that some time in 1871 or '2 Barry had experienced fresh inspiration from the Loire, either from travel or from one of the many books being published in France, were it not for the fact that the Star and Garter Hotel at Richmond had displayed as early as 1864 the germ of Wykehurst in many of its details.¹ Tentative he was in embracing the Loire style

---

¹. See above, pp 116-8.
for his country houses, but he had clearly shown a precocious interest in it for some time, which makes the dullness of Cobham more surprising than the sudden daring of Wykehurst. That the client, Henry Huth, had anything to do with the revised scheme seems unlikely, since his library, one of the most impressive collections of the day, indicates little interest in architecture of any kind, and none at all in the French Renaissance variety. 

Despite the advance that Wykehurst is upon the other two houses, a strong family likeness runs through all three, motifs recurring from house to house. Thus the straight- and segmental-pedimented dormer windows at Cobham were used in the first scheme for Wykehurst, while the round-headed dormers with ball finials seen to the left (or west) of the main entrance at Cobham were used throughout at Shabden, and in the less important positions at Wykehurst - the more prominent places at that house having fancier Chenonceaux derivatives, or the shell-pedimented type from the Maison de Diane de Poitiers at Rouen. Another feature on the western extension at Cobham on the garden front was to recur too. This was the square bay or oriel, held out on chunky brackets: this un-French feature is virtually replicated at Shabden to the right of the main door. Most important similarity, however, was the tendency towards symmetry on at least one facade and in much the same way: a pair of canted bows projects on the garden fronts at Cobham and Shabden, while at Wykehurst they have become fully

rounded like over-windowed bastions with a look very much like the sixteenth century seen through César Daly's eyes. Wykehurst might have owed many details to Chenonceaux, but by no means its ruling mood.

The similarities of these houses do not stop outside. The attempt at Parisian planning at Shabden has already been discussed; the other two respected the English fad for privacy more zealously by avoiding en suite arrangements, but contrived still in their closely similar plans to keep corridor space to a minimum. In both, entrance is effected by way of a broad hall (wood panelled at Cobham, suggesting the extension-of-living-space idea as seen at Shabden, but of chill stone at Wykehurst); to the left a triple-arched wooden screen led through to a stairway and service quarters, while straight ahead, ranged across the garden front and all accessible from the hall, were the three principal apartments. A fourth room, in each case on the entrance side, opened off a small

---

1. Other similarities include the use in all three houses of small oval windows, usually in pairs; Fontainesbleau cartouches in panels on the outside walls at Shabden (back garden (west) wall bearing the inscription "J'espère", and a smaller one, with the date 1871, to the left of the main door) and on the side of the east tower-block at Wykehurst. Interlocking 'C's (for Combe) make up balcony balustrades at Cobham, and appear also (for Cattley) less conspicuously by the front door at Shabden. Tall, round-headed openings with a roundel above, and grouped in twos at least, were a favourite Barry device, both inside and out: interior wooden screens in all three houses, and the chapel-like projection marking the stair landing at Wykehurst. The paired, round-headed arches appear also (without the roundels) in the open loggia on the west side of Wykehurst and in the elaborate chimney at the east end of Cobham.
passage on the right. The favoured decor in all three houses looked mostly to the sixteenth century, either of France or England, though there was some Palladian decor as well.

Barry continued through the 1870s, the last decade of his life, to use the Loire chateau style. At the same exhibition as the three houses just discussed he also showed drawings for the Sick Children's Hospital in Great Ormonde Street, London, which seems to owe something to the Château de Madrid, while at the Temple Garden Buildings he further explored the boldly plastic forms he had used at Wykehurst¹. In the field of domestic architecture, there was one final exercise - perhaps two - in this mode. The one which is certainly by Barry was the West Lodge at Stancliffe Hall, near Matlock, Derbyshire, seat of Sir Joseph Whitworth, armaments manufacturer. It is a charming little building, but adds nothing to the Barry approach already worked out elsewhere. The lodge dates from 1879 and is almost exactly as if the western half of the Wykehurst garden front had been sliced off and transported to Derbyshire. The detailing is simplified, befitting the more modest situation, but the composition is the same - the bulging bowed projection; steep, hipped roof sweeping round it, studded with round-headed dormers with ball finials. Details of fenestration are virtually identical as well². The possible case of Barry using the

¹ For these buildings see below, pp 363-6, 390-1.
² The Lodge is now the property of Mr S. Irving. A plan (no. 12 in a series) with elevations and sections, is held by Mr Irving. I have a copy. The lodge as built has more dormers than are shown on the plan. The same dormer-type is to be seen on the house as well; and a chimney there recalls the one at the east end
French style in his last years was a rather forbidding urban villa, at No. 66 Ennismore Gardens, Knightsbridge, called Moncorvo House.

It was almost too late in fact to be by Barry as it appears to have been built about 1880, the year of his death, but it has all the hall-marks of the E. M. Barry style: the bow from ground to high hipped roof, the simplified Chenonceaux dormers, the ball finials at the gate, all recall Wykehurst; the crisp cornice and the string-course which breaks upward in the centre of the pavilions around small carved panels, recall Shabden; the simple, geometric unpedimented fenestration of the ground and first floors recalls all three of Barry's French houses. The only new feature is the way squared pavilions are made to project diagonally at the corners, almost certainly a debt to the villa at Juy-en-Josas by E. Petit, illustrated by Daly. This allowed a more sculptural quality to the house, but the effect was still rather severe.

Footnote continued from page 310 of Cobham. So one is forced to suppose that Barry was responsible for what little work was done to the house, itself, in the French style, and that schemes for it by T. R. Smith were never executed. In 1867, the latter had exhibited designs at the R.A. and the Architectural Exhibition (see BN, 17 May 1867, p. 334; Bldr, 1 Jun. 1867, p. 385) and at the International Exhibition, 1872, when it was described as "Francois Premier" by Archt, 25 May 1872, p. 269, and given much praise (T. R. Smith was the editor). The house is now a school, owned by the headmaster, Mr A. K. Wareham. There is little French about it. The porch was probably by E. M. Barry.

1. Daly, Op. cit., 1er série, III, Exemple C1. Moncorvo is now demolished. The client was Albert George Sandeman, of the Spanish and Portuguese wines family, and Governor of the Bank of England, 1895-7. His wife was a daughter of the Portuguese Ambassador to London, Visconde de Torre de Moncorvo. POD, London, 1885, p. 309, lists Moncorvo House as Sandeman's residence; it appears in earlier PODs beginning with 1881, p. 306, as simply No. 66, Ennismore Gardens. Prior to 1881 Sandeman had lived at No. 5 in the same street.
When E. M. Barry designed Wykehurst he probably knew Chenonceaux and other French chateaux at first hand. The crisp detailing of the Chenonceaux balcony at Wykehurst would have required a closer acquaintance with the original than could have been gained from the sketchy illustrations in Victor Petit's *Châteaux de la Vallée de la Loire*. More meticulously detailed books on French Renaissance architecture were reaching Britain from France in the 1860s and '70s, however; and with houses like Wykehurst and Normanhurst was beginning the new tendency towards archaeological accuracy already noted in relation to urban architecture. No longer did building "in the French style" simply mean the application of a French roof to a house which was, whether old or new, not very different from the generality of Classic or Gothic mansions up and down the country.

Of the (French) "Renaissance" style Kerr had remarked that

"the Cost ... would no doubt be greater than that of the Rural-Italian, in proportion to the degree to which ornament is added; although it must be repeated that the difference goes no further than the exterior shell, which does not by any means represent so large a portion of the whole outlay as many are apt to suppose."

Certainly the interiors remained largely unaffected by the shift in taste to the Loire chateau style, but as architects began to pore over the plates in new books like Sauvageot's *Palais*, and Daly's *Motifs historiques d'architecture*², the degree to which

---

ornament was added to the exteriors of French-style houses undoubtedly increased and so did the cost. Perhaps it was the expense that accounts for there being only a handful of houses built in the later 1870s which were inspired by French sixteenth-century architecture; but those that there were were spectacular.

Daly, Sauvageot, and even to some extent Petit, had chosen to illustrate many of the less well-known chateaux of France.

There also seemed to be some emphasis given to late sixteenth-century and early seventeenth-century architecture. While more Classical in much of their detailing than the Loire chateaux of Francis I's reign, they were often just as picturesque. Brockenhurst, St Leonard's Hill, Impney Hall and Waddesdon, all combined features of the early Loire chateaux with hints of the more Mannered architecture of late sixteenth-century France.

Brockenhurst Park, Hants., was the home of John Morant, which T. H. Wyatt remodelled about 1869. Much of the house remained Georgian but the entrance front was given a Jacobean tower and porch, a cone-roofed turret and diamond-panelled chimneys from the Loire, and a curly Baroque pediment which jutted up into the roof for no very good reason, two storeys above the porch. This and the contrast of pronounced stone quoins and polychrome brickwork induced The Builder to label it "Henri Quatre".

St Leonard's Hill's chief source, one suspects, was the Château of Angerville-Bailleul, a mid sixteenth-century house which Blomfield likened to the work of Delorme\(^1\). It was illustrated in Sauvageot\(^2\). Both houses were characterised by clusters of unusually steep pavilion mansards; but St Leonard's Hill (ca. 1875), Berkshire seat of Sir Francis Tress Barry, Bt, allowed itself the British whim of only partial symmetry, achieving a dramatically picturesque silhouette with the aid of elaborate chimneys and a high Italianate tower. A sensuous plasticity was given to the entrance front by a bowed projection (which, like the chimneys, looks as if it owed something to E. M. Barry) and the adoption of diagonally jutting pavilions on either side of the door recalling again Daly's villa at Jouy. Above these tower the Angerville roofs. There are decorative sixteenth-century dormers, a window strip, and loads of pilasters. It is all very lavish, excessive and jumbled, but succeeds, one feels, from sheer cheek. The architect was C. H. Howell\(^3\).

The last two houses for discussion here must be counted amongst the best; certainly the most authentic. This is not

---

surprising as they were designed by Frenchmen. These were Impney Hall and Waddesdon Manor, both of which like St Leonard's Hill, have been discussed already in relation to their plans. Impney represents the sort of tight Parisian planning and composition which Barry had probably been aiming at, for Tronquois's design, erected under the supervision of Phéné Spiers has, particularly on its garden front, the aspect of a Second Empire suburban villa. Yet even here symmetry is not perfect. One wonders if Spiers still had his feet set sufficiently firmly on English soil to have added the single bay extension on the left. This is unlikely, however, for the house was published under Tronquois's name in the Parisian journal, Le Moniteur des architectes, with only the slightest of differences from the house as it was built, none of them compositional.

1. Now the Chateau Impney Hotel, a somewhat ostentatious establishment, but the exterior is well preserved, except for a phalanx of international flags at the plate glass entrance - replacing the protruding vestibule and porte cochère.
2. MDA, Nouv. Sér., XII, no. 3, Mar. 1878, pp 47, 79, 128, 158; pl. 15, 21, 37-8, 49. The drawings had been shown at the Exposition universelle. A plan was promised for future publication (p. 158) but does not seem to have materialised. The house is not named, nor even stated to have been built in England, but there is no doubt as to its identity. According to Pevsner (Worcestershire, Harmondsworth, 1968, pp 137-8) and Girouard (VCH, p. 133) it was begun in 1869. The date 1875 is on a panel in one of the dormer pediments. It was exhibited at R.A., 1877 (see BN, 18 May 1877, p. 486). Differences between Tronquois's drawing in MDA and house as built include: replacement of oeil-de-boeuf attic windows by round-headed ones; the north-west tower in drawing has an octagonal cone roof with Gothic lucarnes, while at the house the tower roof is a pure cone with round lights; chimney decoration has been simplified; a difference in balcony decoration; also various details of the garden front, for which see below, p. 320. Spiers was presumably responsible for these minor changes; also for the lodges (see above, p. 297n). Illus. also in
Waddesdon, on the other hand, ended up as quite a sprawling house once Baron de Rothschild had been obliged to make the additions which Destailleur had predicted. The original, rejected scheme had been prepared in 1875-6; the revised version was ready by 1877 and the foundation stone was laid that August. An extensive set of drawings held now in Berlin illuminates the planning history of the next two decades. The main apartments were contained in a symmetrical corps de logis laid out, as has been seen, according to French eighteenth-century fashion; yet, extending eastwards from this there was from the start a wing housing the service

Footnote continued from page 315

Archit, 31 Mar. 1893. This view was said to show alterations by J. R. Nicholls, provoking an irate Spiers to inquire exactly what Nicholls had done for the view showed only what he and Tronquis had done twelve (!) years previously (Archit, 7 Apr. 1893, p. 236). Nicholls had worked on the interiors (illus. Archit, 3 Nov. 1893).

1. 113 drawings are held at the Kunstrictbibliothek, Staatliche Museen, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, (Ref. no. O2 107). They are listed by E. Berckenhagen in Die französischen Zeichnungen der Kunstrictbibliothek Berlin, 1970, pp 436, 443-457. Some are illus. and discussed by Dr Berckenhagen in his catalogue (pp 115-54) for the exhibition entitled, Fünf Architekten aus fünf Jahrhunderten, held at the Kunstrictbibliothek, 1976. A selection of them was closely analysed by Sir Anthony Blunt in his article, "Destailleur at Waddesdon", Apollo, June 1977, pp 409-15. I am entirely dependent upon this article for my knowledge of the drawings. The other major source of information is The Red Book, (see above, p. 255n ) a copy of which is held at the house. See also CL, 20 Aug. 1898, pp 208-11; 20 Dec. 1902, pp 808-14; Girouard, "Waddesdon Manor, Buckinghamshire; a treasure house of 18th century art", CL, 20 Aug. 1959, pp 66-9; Pevsner, Buckinghamshire, Harmondsworth, 1960, pp 38, 275-6. Waddesdon now belongs to the National Trust.
quarters and, on the upper floor, the gentlemen's apartments. The transition from the corps de logis to this "Bachelors' Wing", as it was called, was facilitated by the introduction of a large, round, cone-roofed bastion with lantern and heavy machicolation, as at Chaumont. This section of the house was in fact the first to be completed, for the baron recorded that he spent his first night at Waddesdon in the Bachelors' Wing, in 1880. This wing was altered in the 1890s, however, to introduce a smoking room. In the meantime, an elaborate scheme to provide a grand hall or ballroom on the south side of this wing had been contemplated and rejected, and a whole wing added to the other end of the house instead. This contained a large "morning room" in lieu of the hall. This new wing was designed in 1887 and built the following year. Although the rest of the house is highly eclectic, drawing motifs freely from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century France, this new wing strikes an earlier note still with its fifteenth-century Flamboyant Gothic decoration, particularly on the south side; and if Destailleur had had his way it would have been even more Gothic, presumably in a desire to contrive the impression of a house which had evolved slowly over the centuries, this new wing.

1. Red Book, p. 9. The main part was habitable by 1883.
2. Destailleur being old, this was done by his son, André d'Estallieur.
3. See above, p. 256n; also Blunt, "Destailleur ...", p. 410, and drawing at Berlin, dated 1886. Blunt says it involved demolition of conservatory and construction of corridor from corps de logis to a room labelled "Salle de Bal" and a big domed room (perhaps the hall?) between Bachelors' quarters and the corridor.
to seem, paradoxically, the oldest ¹.

Baron Ferdinand explained his choice of style as the result of
a trip he had made to Touraine, on which occasion he had been much
impressed by the architecture of the region ². Many details do, of
course, derive from the Loire chateaux, but there is a surprising
amount which does not. The house is in fact a highly academic
jig-saw puzzle, indicating that both architect and client had

¹. The baron demanded urns instead of finials; diamond-patterned
pilasters instead of blind Flamboyant tracery; Chambord rather
than Flamboyant Gothic dormers. However the oriel and garden-door
on the south are dainty late Gothic. Though Rothschild said there
had not been the smallest difference between architect and patron
in eighteen years, he said also that Destailleur was dilatory,
unpractical, and "had not the faintest conception of the needs of
a large establishment, sacrificed the most urgent household re-
quirements to external architectural features, and had the most
supreme contempt for ventilation, light, air and all internal
conveniences ..." (Red Book, p. 3). On the other hand, the
architect's grandson, Philippe d'Estailleur-Chanteraine in
"Le Baron Ferdinand et son architecte à Waddesdon", GBA, Jly-
Aug. 1959, pp 13-6 quotes Destailleur as having written to his
family thus:

"Le Baron est, comme vous le savez, fort intelligent, mais
il voudrait réaliser toutes ses idées personnelles
quelques autres en même temps, et dans les mêmes lieux.
Je dois essayer de simplifier tout cela et d'éviter des
apports trop disparates dans un ensemble qui est suffisamment
charge".

Destailleur worked on the Empress Eugénie's house at Farnborough and
built the mausoleum there for Napoleon III (see above, p. 249).

². Red Book, pp 2-3. He chose his architect because he thought a
Frenchman would naturally be more capable of reproducing this sort
of chateau than would an Englishman. Destailleur had earned for
himself a reputation as one of the foremost restorers of old chateaux
as well as designer of new ones. The baron had been especially
impressed by Destailleur's "intelligent and successful" restoration
of the chateau of the Duc de Mouchy. D'Estailleur-Chanteraine
suggests also that the connection might have been established
through family circles, as Destailleur was working in Vienna for
Baron Albert de Rothschild (Ferdinand's brother) in 1876.
delved deeply in their extensive collections of literature on the subject. Dormers, chimneys, steep hipped roofs and big round towers are traceable to the Loire chateaux, in slightly modified forms, and the spiral stairs on the entrance front are replicas of those at Chambord. The famous gate at Anet was plundered for the top part of the central pavilion on the entrance front; Bullant's drawings for the Tuileries had been culled from Marot for the unexecuted eastern extension; and further academic trickery had been indulged in the trompe from Delorme on the re-entrant angle of the south-east wing. Yet there is a good deal of the house which derives from seventeenth-century sources, not least the symmetrical three pavilion-composition of both facades. Two storeys plus attic, three pavilions and three bays between, and the central pavilion itself triple arched, as is to be found on the garden front, is a composition which could have derived from any number of designs published from Marot to Blondel. The central pavilion of the Waddesdon garden front is surmounted by a squared

1. Destailleur had a prodigious collection of books on French architecture. See Catalogue de livres et estampes relatifs aux beaux-arts... provenant de la bibliothèque de feu M. Hippolyte Destailleur (with "Notice sur M. Hippolyte Destailleur" by G. Duplessis), Paris, 1895. His Du Cerceau collection alone takes 13 pages (pp 59-72). He had, himself, published a book of facsimiles of designs for interior decorations culled from sixteenth- to eighteenth-century pattern books (Recueil d'estampes relatives à l'ornementation des appartements aux XVIe, XVIIe, et XVIIIe siècles, Paris, 1863). The baron's library of French architectural books was also quite extensive: see Catalogue des livres français de la bibliothèque du Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild à Waddesdon, London, 1897, which includes works by Berain, Blondel, Briseux, Cottard, L'Amour, the Le Pautre, Meissonnier, Neufforge, Oppenord, Patte, Silvestre and Tijou - belying Mary Gladstone's supercilious comment that there was not a book at Waddesdon "save twenty improper French novels" (apud Girouard, VCH, p. 136).
dome and heavy floral swag as at Lemercier's Pavilion de l'Horloge; and although the outer pavilions of this facade suggest Lescot at the Louvre, their pediments have been broken, adding a Baroque note to the house. And this brings us back to Impney Hall. There, too, in a house completed in the mid-1870s was to be seen a curious but not discordant amalgam of motifs spanning more than a century.

The position of Impney Hall in the British architectural scene of the '70s is an ambiguous one, arising directly from its having been designed by a Frenchman in 1860s-Paris, but built in Britain the following decade: while its compact villa plan was the new vogue in the England of the '70s, its angular roof-forms were already out of date. E. M. Barry would have used rounded shapes in these situations. Perhaps it was Spiers's decision to convert the faceted roof of the side tower into a perfect, rounded cone, bringing it more in line with the current taste for the Loire. On the other hand, in some ways Impney was, like the other houses of this group, considerably influenced by French architecture of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Most of the dormers are free interpretations of the Chenonceaux-Ecoville type, but the ones over the centres of the pavilions of the garden front have been given, contrary to Tronquois's published scheme, broken pediments and lush Baroque swags. Whether this was Spiers's idea is again not clear, but it is not out of keeping with the house as a whole for it bristles with the busy ornament and polychromy of the Louis XIII period, and would have had more, had not a programme of simplification (which ran counter to the change seen in the dormers) been resorted to, particularly in relation to a set of banded
half-columns and pilasters on the garden front which look as if they have come from some chateau like Beaumesnil (1633-40)\(^1\) or Salomon de Brosse's Luxembourg.

It is interesting to note in this house, therefore, elements of old fashion and of new. The Louis XIII elements look forward to the Baroque fashion at the end of the century. They also remind us of the contemporary taste for Queen Anne.

\(^1\) Beaumesnil is illustrated in Sauvageot, *Op. cit.*, IV, pp 49-55. The half columns at Impney were eliminated altogether, as was a pair of panel decorations immediately above them.
CHAPTER SEVEN: Queen Anne and France

"I feel certain that the most eminent men of the 'Queen Anne' School are the greatest admirers of the four great architects of France: J. L. Duc, Duban, Vaudoyer and Labrouste," remarked Richard Phene Spiers before an audience at the R.I.B.A. in 1884. Few critics in more recent years seem to have agreed.

The relationship between the Queen Anne Movement and the French Renaissance Revival has been insufficiently recognised. The fact that the Loire chateau style and 'Queen Anne' emerged simultaneously about the year 1870 has been overlooked. They were parallel streams which yet fed each other. Both had their origins in works of the 1850s and '60s: for the most part works of vastly different natures—though even then there was some common ground. The gulf between the two styles was to grow less over the decades until in the 1880s the chateau fashion was simply absorbed by the increasing eclecticism of the Queen Anne Movement.

This movement, as Girouard has shown, had its roots in the Gothic Revival, first hints being found in the vicarages and cottages of Butterfield and even Street. With the exception of Nesfield, the leading lights of the movement (Webb, Shaw, Stevenson, Bodley, Robson, G. G. Scott, jun.) had trained and first met one another in the London offices of Street and the older Scott, and it is the Gothic spirit of this training which governs the composition...
of buildings of the new movement. The originality of the movement lay in its application of a Gothic treatment of composition to detailing picked from the English seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was not the detailing itself, in many cases, which was new so much as the way it was used. The Jacobethan Revival in domestic architecture had been flourishing for some decades, so motifs like the curly Dutch gable of Jacobean architecture, for instance, were nothing new by 1870, in rural building at least; and even the more despised late Stuart and early Georgian periods had been attracting some slight attention during the 1840s and '50s in one way or another. Perhaps the Queen was responsible! A "bal costume" in the attire of the early eighteenth century, and with a special "Sir Roger de Coverley Dance" was held at the palace in the summer of 1845 and kept the Illustrated London News busy for weeks.

In the architectural world, Wren was a fairly constant topic of interest, though primarily for his churches. A threat to demolish some twenty-three of these attracted the attention of the

the building journals to the ecclesiastical architecture of his period. His secular architecture was not neglected entirely either however and, interestingly, The Builder in 1855 twice published leading articles which set out to compare the seventeenth-century architecture of England and France. Architects in the 1850s who incorporated late Stuart or early Georgian features in their buildings tended to do so in designs which were conspicuously French in other ways. The best known example is John Shaw's Wellington College of 1856-9, heavily influenced by Wren's Hampton Court but with a very prominent mansard roof, _oeil-de-boeuf_ windows and other French features. Much has been written about this building and its relationship to the development of "Queen Anne"; but its debts to France have been all but ignored.

1. 30 London churches to be demolished in all, 23 by Wren - to increase revenues from the land. See Bldr, 14 & 28 Jan., 15 Apr., 13 May 1854, pp 13, 42-3, 198-9, 254-5.
2. Wren's Hampton Court (east elevation) was illus. and described CEAJ, 1852, pp 422-3; Bldr 1852 ran a series of articles on "Houses and shops of old London" including illus. of Sir Paul Pinder's house, Bishopgate, and Schomberg House, Pall Mall (Bldr 24 Jly. & 18 Dec. 1852); R. Phipson read to the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History at Ipswich, 29 Sept. 1854, and published in pamphlet form, a paper called Sparrowe's House, Ipswich.
4. See Hitchcock, ANTC, p. 293; Pevsner, Berkshire, pp 45-6, 260-2, pl. 59a; Girouard, "The Wren revival at Wellington", CL, 18 Jun. 1959, pp 1372-3; Girouard, S & L, p. 10; CL, 18 Dec. 1915, pp 829-832. For contemporary accounts see ILN, 4 Aug. 1855, p. 155 (illus.); Bldr, 16 Feb. 1856, pp 85-7 (plan and illus.); Bldr, 7 Jun. 1856, pp 317-8; EN, 4 Feb. 1859, p. 110; ILN, 12 & 19 Feb. 1859, pp 156, 162, 192 (illus.). Contemporary with Wellington College Shaw had also designed some ambiguously French-English houses in Threadneedle St (Bldr, 3 Mar. 1855, pp 97, 103). See also above, p. 58.
to French Classicism, but a mansard roof and the other similarities which the Wellington College bears to Louis XIII architecture could hardly have pretended to be pure William-and-Mary in the second half of the 1850s when interest in the New Louvre was at its height and French Classicism was the chosen style at houses like Bedgebury, Marbury and Belle Vue. The French-English ambiguity of Salvin's Marbury Hall has already been seen; so too has Burn's fondness for Gibbs surrounds on his Louvresque Glasgow Station design and Montagu House. Norman Shaw's own student design for the Wellington College combined a precocious interest in the Wren of Greenwich with a set of miniature French pavilion roofs. Even the Queen Anne Movement's famous Ipswich window was pre-empted by nearly twenty years in Hine's French-roofed warehouses in Nottingham. In light of the mounting enthusiasm for French Classicism which the building of the New Louvre was fostering it is not surprising that British architects should start to observe the closely related architecture of their own country. Direct influence of the French-style buildings just mentioned upon most early Queen Anne buildings of the 1860s is unlikely but there seems no reason to doubt that both types were manifestations of a widening interest in the seventeenth century generally. Further, direct link is not conceivable between the Queen Anne designs of W. E. Nesfield and

1. See above, pp. 155, 176-7. This was to become widespread in mock-chateaux of the 1870s and '80s.
3. See above p. 80.
buildings like John Shaw's Wellington College, Salvin's Marbury and even the work of William Burn, for Nesfield had trained first in Burn's office until 1853, and then under Salvin (who was his uncle). It was Burn who got Shaw the commission for Wellington College, and furthermore he was to precede Nesfield at Kinmel Park, Denbighshire, with his discreet early Georgian stable block of 1855. Most significant of all are some hitherto ignored drawings done by Nesfield while in Salvin's office. They are for the

113A

Grantham Lodge at Belvoir Castle. They are in an overtly Loire-chateau style; and, dating from ca. 1855, stand with Stokes's sketches as the earliest manifestations of the Loire style in England. Even so, as with the other early exponents of the Queen Anne style, Nesfield's outlook was to begin with largely Gothic. His book, Specimens of mediaeval architecture (1862), fruits of a trip to France with Norman Shaw, is largely of church architecture, with only an occasional glance at the domestic buildings of the late Gothic-Transitional Renaissance period.

113B

In his Kew Lodge design of 1866 there was a sudden change. Here the underlying French feeling (particularly of the roofs) was of the seventeenth century. This feeling was to become more overt at the closely similar lodge at Kinmel built two years later. The

1. See Girouard, VCH, pl. 283.
3. An interior view of the Blois stair; Jacques Coeur's house; details from Mont St. Michel.
The steep mansard and pavilion roofs are chiefly responsible for this, though there is French inspiration too in panels decorated with a circle motif, and in the *œil-de-bœuf* lucarné in the chapel roof. In combination with the high roofs even the strident polychrome banding tends to remind one more of the Mansart of Balleroy and Berny than of Wren's Hampton Court. Nesfield's work was the first amongst that of the actual Queen Anne movement as such to incorporate such clearly French material, and stands as a link between the proto-Queen Anne of Wellington College and the eclectic Queen Anne of later years. French and other Continental (particularly Netherlandish) detailing was to become a very prominent aspect of

---

**Footnote continued from page 326**

Queen Anne architecture as the 1870s progressed but where French influence was concerned, the emphasis was decidedly upon the sixteenth century of Francis I rather than the style of Louis XIII, coinciding, it will be realised, with the 1870s interest in the Loire chateaux.

The early Queen Anne work of architects like Webb, Shaw, Stevenson and the rest had, by contrast, shown little or no concern for Continental architecture: this was a conscious revival of the vernacular architecture which the Gothic Revival had interrupted, but to which they applied the compositional techniques learned from that revival. Yet at least one contemporary whose opinion cannot be ignored believed that even here the influence of France was not inconsiderable. E. W. Godwin aired his views on the subject more than once, but never so plainly as in a curious series of brief notes with illustrations published in The British Architect in 1878, under the running title "Queen Anne architecture in France". The intention was to have published, in all, ten facsimile drawings from Du Cerceau's Les plus excellents bastiments de France, with brief notes pointing out features of excellence worthy of emulation and indicating debts owed by the Queen Anne style (both original and revived) to the France of Francis I; for, declared the introduction,

"Although the excellent buildings we intend to illustrate were built before 1576, on them, nevertheless, have been founded the best, the most refined work of what is commonly called "Queen Anne" Architecture. If Cerceau's drawings and the designs of a certain Amsterdam architect, published in the last quarter of the seventeenth century were boiled down, the scum would pass exceedingly well for the great mass of "Queen Anne" buildings, whether of the eighteenth
or nineteenth century."

The series began with a flourish, illustrating first the Cour du Cheval Blanc at Fontainebleau and then two different views of François Premier Blois with notes which outline the idea behind the series. But the articles tailed off sadly and Queen Anne was quite lost sight of as illustrations of the fountains at Gaillon and Anet appeared with scant explanation. There was no note at all to the eighth illustration and number ten in the series failed to appear at all. With regard to Fontainebleau and Blois the author stressed "the way in which order in variety is managed - the maintenance of rhythm without the monotony of exact balance"; "the disposition of the general masses which though generally regular is marked by a difference" (that is in details of positioning of turrets, arcading, fenestration, etc.) dictated by internal requirements. The arrangement of solids and voids in both buildings was given much praise, especially in the case of Blois - the deep plain mass of battered walling on the high facade which overlooks the town, and the irregularity of fenestration on the court facade of the François Premier wing:

"Pierce the blanks and the design loses character and 'go'

1. BA, 26 Apr. 1878, p. 195. This first notice included the illus. of Fontainebleau. The rest followed thus: BA, 10 May 1878, p. 218 (Blois, town facade); 24 May 1878, p. 241 (Blois, courtyard, Francois Premier wing); 7 Jun. 1878, p. 264 (chimney-piece, Château de Madrid); 21 Jun. 1878, p. 290 (Gaillon fountain); 20 Sep. 1878, p. 112 (Anet fountain); 11 Oct. 1878, p. 142 (Delorme's Tuileries); 18 Oct. 1878 (ceiling at the Louvre; an unnamed roof; gatehouse at Fontainebleau); 27 Dec. 1878, p. 254 (Verneuil fountain). The Amsterdam architect would have been Daniel Marot.
at once. In a modern building, especially those which disgrace the streets of London, every bay would be windowed regardless of inner cross walls, while a closet would be lighted by an opening equal in size and importance to the fenestration of the drawing-room or banqueting hall."

Certainly these characteristics of composition were the outstanding attributes of Queen Anne Revival architecture, and even if François Premier architecture was not the initial source of inspiration for Shaw and his fellows one can readily understand its popularity amongst them in the latter years of the movement. As a matter of fact, the first articles in the series, "Queen Anne architecture in France", were anonymous but later numbers were signed 'E.W.G.' and the gist of the early notices is virtually replicated by Godwin elsewhere. He defended Street's Law Courts design in very much the same terms (but without references to France) against criticism, mostly from James Fergusson, which had been published in The Times; and in the Building News in 1875 he had much to say on "order in variety", "solids and voids", and so forth when he crossed swords with J. J. Stevenson. That gentleman had not only down-played the merit of French Renaissance architecture per se as well as its influence upon the Queen Anne style, but had maintained also that the latter was "essentially

---

1. "The eastern part of the Strand front looks just what it is - five storeys of offices attached to the law courts. No doubt The Times would like to see the windows in a frontage of 507 feet all of uniform shape and size. This possibly is the only idea of architectural unity which our amateurs possess - closet and council chamber, court and corridor, all lit by regulation pattern window" (Archt, 30 Sep. 1871, p. 164).
Classic in character". After demolishing Stevenson on the last issue, Godwin urged the case for France with some eloquence:

"The buildings erected in France during the reign of Francis I are for the most part as thoroughly healthy and strong in idea and in mass as they are refined and tender in detail. And not only is this the case with the great, well known examples such as Chambord and Madrid ... but we see it to be so with nearly every château or manoir or maison of this period."

Godwin himself had sketched a few such manoirs and maisons. No doubt he was thinking also of buildings like the Maison de Jacques Coeur, Bourges, which had been attracting British sketchers for some years, and the small houses drawn by Cotman back in the 1820s. More recently, Claude Sauvageot had illustrated a small house in Orléans which caught the contemporary imagination. This was the Maison de Jean d’Alibert in the Place du Marché à la Volaille. These buildings demonstrated perfectly Godwin’s arguments. Despite the disagreement between him and Stevenson in 1875, the latter chose also to reproduce the Orléans house (twice, no less) in his book on House Architecture (1880). In the intervening five years he had come a long way to meet Godwin, for he now found

---

1. "The Ex-Classic style called 'Queen Anne'", EN, 16 Apr. 1875, p. 441, replying to Stevenson in EN, 12 Mar. 1875.
2. Sketches of the Manoir d’Ango and a house in St. Lô were published in EN, 27 Feb., 3 & 10 Apr., 29 May 1874, pp 228, 364, 396, 584.
3. Amongst them Nesfield and R. N. Shaw. See above, p. 174n and Appendix B.
4. Sauvageot, Op. cit., III, pp 1-23, pl. 4-8. Illus. of it in the press (see Appendix B) derived directly from Sauvageot or indirectly via Stevenson (see below). It had been illus. by Verdier and Cattois, Architecture civile et domestique, Paris, 1855, II. It must not be confused with the nearly identical Maison de la Coquille, rue Pierre percée, probably by the same architecture (illus. in Ward, The architecture of the Renaissance in France, I, p. 77).
the French Renaissance "more interesting and more profitable for
study than the correct Classic"\(^1\). When analysing the Orléans
house, Stevenson showed unconsciously how close an affinity existed
between it and his own Queen Anne houses\(^2\).

He also had praise for the Maison de Jacques Coeur. That
house and the Maison Jean d'Alibert between them seem to have in-
spired a sizeable group of small-scale buildings in Britain in the
late nineteenth-century - mostly gatehouses and lodges. An
especially appealing feature shared by them was the close association
of two entrance arches; a big one for carriages echoed by a
smaller one for pedestrians. In each case this was part of a
subtle, over-all dialogue between solids and voids. Most faithful
to the spirit of these French originals (but with decoration much
reduced) were Godwin's North Lodge at Castle Ashby, Northants (1867)\(^3\),
and John Douglas's lodge at The Paddocks, this latter a particularly
strong exercise in Godwinian "solids and voids"\(^4\). A design for an
entrance gate and bridge by George W. Ward (1887) captured the

---

Sauvageot) appears in vols. I, p. 248, & II, p. 151. He also
selected an exposed French stair for the cover of vol. I. See also
above, p. 17n.
2. Ibid., pp. 248-9.
3. Illus. Archt, 10 Jun. 1871, p. 302; MDA, 1872, pl. 28. For
3rd Marquess of Northampton. The south gate was symmetrical and
and more decorative and chateau-inspired (Archt, 21 Oct. 1871,
p. 202). More like the North lodge and with the subtle Queen
Anne-cum-François Premier proportions was Godwin's house for
P. Phipps, Billing Rd, Northampton (Archt, 7 Jan. 1871, p. 10).
4. See above, p 300.
decorativeness of the early French Renaissance while preserving the strength of the irregular formula nicely\(^1\); but others were tempted into weakly pretty variations on the theme\(^2\).

From all this one must assume that even if the "order in variety" which was the speciality of the Queen Anne style owed nothing to the French Renaissance in its early stages, Godwin's famous "Free style" houses in Tite Street, Chelsea, did\(^3\). Undoubtedly Douglas's similar work did. Undoubtedly, also, some of the early work of the inventive "Free-style" architect, James McLaren, owed something to France, both directly (he trained in Paris) and indirectly via Godwin. In his "House for an artist", Fulham Park Estate (1877), he achieved an attractive blend of Queen Anne and France with only the slightest hint left of the Scottish Baronial work of his beginnings\(^4\). In fine, it seems only fair to give to the Francois Premier Revival at least some of the credit for the strength

---

1. EN, 30 Sep. 1887.
2. E.g. Carriage entrance and gate lodge by "Fleurs de lys" which won the Building News Designing Club competition, 1877. (Illus. EN, 3 Aug. 1877, pp 100, 104; see also EN, 20 Jly. 1877, p. 63.)
3. A surprising amount of Godwin's output was undisguisedly French. The Compiègne Hôtel-de-Ville influenced his Congleton Town Hall (1865) and competition design for the Bristol Assize Court (1866, illus. EN, 9 Jun. 1871, pp 450-3). With assorted French roofs were competition designs for the St Anne's Heath Lunatic Asylum (i.e. Holloway Sanatorium, see EN, 23 Aug. 1872, pp 142-5); and the Berlin Reichstag (with Robert W. Edis, see Archt, 13 Jly. 1872, pp 24-5). See also sketch for Lancaster Club and residences in flats for the Embankment (BA, 2 Jan. 1880, p. 8); vestibule and gallery for St Stephen's Palace Chambers, Westminster (BA, 16 Dec. 1881).
of composition which emerged in garden-suburb architecture at the end of the century and which so impressed foreign observers like Hermann Muthesius.

A good deal clearer is the extent to which the Queen Anne movement, even in the early 1870s, was making use of decorative motifs derived from the French Renaissance. Apart from Nesfield's work, the earliest signs of this were to be seen in a group of buildings which received maximum publicity. Coinciding as they did with the emergence of the Loire style itself in the early '70s, they led a number of critics, including (most vociferously) William H. White, eventual secretary of the R.I.B.A., to regard the two styles as one. The most ambiguous of these buildings was the London School Board's office on the Thames Embankment, designed by G. F. Bodley.

This tended to be linked, virtually in the same breath, with on the one hand Shaw's quintessential Queen Anne building, the New Zealand Chambers and, on the other hand, the very French St Stephen's Club, Westminster, by John Whichcord, and Sir Matthew Digby Wyatt's Alford House.

Summing up the architecture of 1873 (something of an annus mirabilis for the Queen Anne movement as Girouard puts it), The Architect sought to trace early signs of this new phenomenon:

"It will suffice to mention," wrote the newspaper critic, "Mr Shaw's Wellington College, and more recently the Sun Fire Office at Charing Cross, Sir Digby Wyatt's brick and terracotta house near the Albert Hall, the hospital designed by Mr Norman Shaw for the Metropolitan Asylums Board, Mr Waterhouse's Caius College, and Mr Edward Barry's mansion at Shebden (sic)"

1. Archit, 27 Dec. 1873, p. 327. It calls 1873 "The first year of the Queen Anne Revival".
... to shew that the transitional period between the late Gothic and pure Renaissance has at intervals been looked to for precedents, from which to work, by prominent architects."

Actually, The Architect was not here confusing the Queen Anne and the Loire styles, for it continued,

"We cannot help regretting that the course pointed out by the works we named from the pencil of Mr Waterhouse and Mr Barry was not the one followed. The French Transitional art of the time of Francis I. was their mode and a more charming phase of art could not be followed, nor one better adapted to modern use for domestic and secular purposes."

It is clear, however, that it considered the two families to share a common lineage.

W. H. White thought the whole lot an outrage and held Claude Sauvageot and his book of *Palais* responsible\(^1\).

"The last outburst of affectation which, in the hope of nationalising it, has been called the "Queen Anne" style of architecture, is purely and simply due to the industry of a few clever French draughtsmen who have employed a considerable quantity of leisure in committing to paper the plans, elevations, sections and details of a series of buildings, the majority of which are remarkable for being as picturesque in their constructed ornament as they are false in their construction,"

he fumed in the first of a pair of acid articles entitled "Dolly

---

\(^1\) Archt, 5 Jly. 1873, p. 3, he sarcastically advised "the ingenious disciples of the new'school' (i.e. Queen Anne) to buy M. Sauvageot's excellent book ... because it is little known to the ordinary run of clients, the press and the public, and full of examples and working drawings which, with skill and patience, may be made suitable for trade purposes". Elsewhere he proclaimed that "it is significant of the time that the French book from which most of this ornament (which adorned the New Zealand Chambers and the London School Board Offices) is derived was presented by the R.I.B.A. to the winner of the "Ashpitel" prize on Monday last." (Archt, 8 Nov. 1873, p. 238). The prize winner, Hugh Stannus, replied that the book in question (Sauvageot, of course) had been his own choice (Archt, 15 Nov. 1873, p. 260). See also White on "Types of French architecture", Archt, 18 Apr. 1874, pp 220-1, in which he attacks the Maison Jean d'Allbert which he insinuates supplied the likes of Shaw with much detail.
Varden Rediviva. Like that fictitious personage the buildings of
the Queen-Anne-cum-Loire fashion were guilty of decking themselves
in a superabundance of meretricious and meaningless ornament. In a
word, they offended in their use of decorative motifs against the
canon of structural honesty, so dear to the Gothic Revival. Like
his namesake, the architect, William White (with whom he must not
be confused), he believed that decoration should mean something; and
what could be the meaning, pray, of that fleur de lys so prominently
positioned over the main door of the New Zealand Chambers? He had
evidently not yet encountered the ubiquitous sunflower of
Aestheticism and further pondered, therefore, upon the connection
between Louis XIV and the offices of a modern shipping line. Whimsy
was indulged in when he mocked up a satiric architectural fantasy
compounded of the least defensible decorative foibles of late
sixteenth-century French architecture.

"What Swift's (or Pope's) celebrated 'Ode by a person of quality'
is to literature, so the New Zealand Chambers in Leadenhall
Street, the proposed offices for the London School Board, and
a new building in Whitehall which has just emerged from the
happy concealment of its scaffolding are to art - that is,
rhyme without sense or reason;"

he concluded.

The maligned building in Whitehall was undoubtedly the St Stephen's

1. Archt, 13 Sep. 1873, p. 128. For second article see Archt, 20
Sep. 1873, pp 142-4. A third article followed (Archt, 8 Nov. 1873,
pp 237-8) called "Scenic architecture". White had practised as an
architect in France, ca. 1863-71, and in India, 1871-3, and had just
arrived in England.
2. Part of a lecture to A.A., "On the present state of thought
concerning architecture" (Archt, 31 Jly. 1874, pp 62-6).
3. Archt, 13 Sep. 1873, p. 128.
Club. It was actually situated on the corner of the Victoria Embankment and Bridge Street (and not in Whitehall itself) and was linked by subways not only to the steam-boat pier but also to the Houses of Parliament so that its members (Conservative Party) might the more hastily be summoned to the House in event of a crucial division. White was perfectly correct to trace much of its detailing (and also that of the School Board Office) to Sauvageot, and in this he was not alone. Hugh Stannus had made good use of his Ashpitel Prize and was not slow to point out that the St Stephen's Club had been carried out with conscientious regard to the details of the Château of Ecoville for the main block, dormers and roof; and of the Château de Pailly for the balcony.

Both buildings are in Sauvageot. It was a pair of huge Ecoville dormers which dominated Bodley's School Board Office. This type (already met at Callendar) was to become the most favoured dormer-type in François Premier architecture of the 1870s and '80s, replacing in positions of importance the similar but simpler Chenonceaux variety.

1. The building still survives, shorn of its frills. The subways now serve the Westminster underground station.
2. BN, 10 Jly. 1874, p. 73. This he pointed out during the discussion which followed a paper read by F. C. Penrose to the Architectural Association, 26 Jun. 1874, on "The influence of the Italian Cinquecento on the early French Renaissance". For other reports of this lecture and discussion see Eldr, 4 Jly. 1874, pp 562-4; Archt, 4 Jly. 1874, pp 7-9; BA, 3 Jly. 1874, p. 5; EN, 3 Jly. 1874, pp 5-6.
3. Op. cit., IV, pp 13-31 (Ecoville); II, pp 5-22 (Pailly). Ecoville was later illus. in BN, 3 Mar. 1876, pp 218, 220, where it is described as "a favourite source of inspiration for more than one of our London architects." The "very great similarity" with the St Stephen's Club was pointed out the following week by two irate correspondents (copyism - a bad example to the young), EN, 10 Mar. 1876, p. 259. See also Appendix B.
Also prophetic of things to come was the disproportionate size of the school board dormers, anticipating many a hybrid Dutch gable tricked out with outsized details derived from French chateau dormer windows.

The Pailly balcony, supported on long S-shaped brackets, which Stannus saw at the St Stephen's Club was to become almost the exclusive property of the Queen Anne Revival in the late 1870s and '80s, indeed one of the most characteristic motifs in its later years along with another balcony type supported by pendant arches (probably from the Hôtel d'Assézat in Toulouse); deep, arcaded loggias (from the Château de Madrid amongst many examples); and depressed arches, particularly at ground level for shop windows as in the 1840s. César Daly regarded the depressed, elliptical arch as the quintessential feature of François Premier architecture in his highly influential book, Motifs historiques d'architecture in which work many of these details were illustrated with meticulous measurements in order, it was expressly stated, to "faciliter le travail pratique et quotidien de l'architecte."
The St Stephen's Club belonged to the Francois Premier Revival by being thorough-going in its French detailing and by adhering fairly strictly to a system of symmetry and regularity (even though as we have seen paradoxically the original French buildings were less fastidious) while the School Board Office, despite its Ecoville dormers, belonged (at least until alterations changed its dominant mood) to the Queen Anne Movement by dint of the asymmetric and irregular placement of a few windows and doors, and the disregard for historicism in the proportions of its parts.

The other building at the centre of the Queen Anne storm of 1873 was the house on the corner of Princes Gate and Ennismore Gardens, Kensington, belonging to Lady Marion Alford. It was called Alford House, was built 1871-2, and was the work (as we have seen)
of Sir Matthew Digby Wyatt. It was shown at the Royal Academy in 1872, and like Bodley's School Board Offices understandably caused some confusion, though it was generally approved except for the profusion of swags below the cornice. In 1874 The Building News considered it to be a "representative building" of the Queen Anne style, but the same journal had previously sat on the fence with a suggestion of "French Renaissance" with "something of the air of a glorified Queen Anne style". The Architect suggested Italian, and The Builder would not risk a label at all. The red brick with terra-cotta trim and sunflower motifs link the house with the Queen Anne Movement, but the Baroque festoons, linked here with a mansard and late sixteenth-century dormers, give an air of the Paris of Henri IV and look forward to the similar mood at Waddesdon and Chateau Impney. By the 1870s the roof was actually rather passé, still Second-Empire-ish, and one is inclined to agree with the judgement of a contemporary critic that it was "much too low for the style on which the design is modelled and for the cleverly designed dormers which cut into it." A steeper hipped roof would

1. Though the DNB, XII Supp., p. 33 states that the house was built mainly from Lady Marion's own designs. She was the sister of the 3rd Marquess of Northampton, who had employed Godwin at Castle Ashby, and widow of Viscount Alford, son and heir to the 1st Earl Brownlow. She was herself an artist, art patron and author of books on art needlework.
2. BN, 3 Jly. 1874, p. 45.
3. BN, 17 May 1872, p. 401.
4. Archt, 4 May 1872, p. 222. For Bldr review see 11 May 1872, p. 358.
5. Archt, 11 May 1872, p. 235. Hitchcock, ANTC, p. 233, calls it "The most elegant Second Empire mansion in London" and illustrates it (pl. 142). A drawing is held in the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of
have been quite in keeping with the Queen Anne details of the house, or even pavilion mansards perhaps. As for Loire-chateau turrets, it was early days in 1872 for such things in London. They were to appear soon enough however, and, interestingly, just as the later Queen Anne style owed some of its detailing to French sixteenth-century architecture, so also did most urban examples of Francois Premier and Loire-chateau architecture in the later 1870s and '80s incorporate hints of the Queen Anne Revival, further emphasising the close ties between the two styles. But before considering these later buildings it will be as well to look back over the early monuments of the Francois Premier and Loire chateau revival in city and public architecture.

We have seen in an earlier chapter how Francois Premier detailing was appearing in city architecture during the 1840s and '50s with little concern for structure and massing, motifs being applied to a facade like a skin. Henry Thomas Hope's house had brought sophistication and archaeology to the fashion. The Inns of Court Hotel had brought a widening of motifs, looking more towards the Loire chateaux than had hitherto been the case. Some of the Gothic designs for the public offices competition had had a touch
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Design (Smithsonian Institution), New York; and another perspective view is held by the Covent Garden Gallery, Russell Street, London. The house was demolished in 1955. Illus. also in Robert Macleod, Style and society, London, 1971, fig. 2.1. As well as for this house M. D. Wyatt incurred W. H. White's wrath for a chimney-piece design for Clare College, Cambridge: it was "French and of the most debased epoch ... Berain or Lepautre could not have made a worse design or a better drawing." Archt, 5 July 1873, p. 3).
of the Loire to them; so had the dormer windows at Montagu House. It was not surprising, however, that the first building of a public nature actually built and suggesting compositional as well as ornamental influence from the Loire chateaux was in a fairly rural setting. This, of course, was E. M. Barry's Star and Garter Hotel. Almost its exact contemporary was the French Hospice, again in a relatively rustic environment, this time the Victoria Park, South Hackney. It was built in 1865-6 and could hardly not have been French in style, being a haven for impoverished French Protestants in Britain. The architect was R. L. Roumieu. It is really more a Gothic than a Renaissance design, but its compositional emulation of French proto-Renaissance models like Jacques Coeur's house at Bourges (for the central entrance pavilion) and perhaps Fontaine-Henri (for the extreme pitch of the roofs) associates it more with the François Premier and Loire chateau urban buildings of the '70s than with the Gothic competition designs and the houses of the late 1850s and '60s which used the occasional steep roof simply for variety and skyline. Besides there is a hint of pavilion symmetry to the entrance front, handled in a way rather reminiscent of Benjamin Ferrey's Wynnstay Hall. But it is all rather 'beefy' as Pevsner puts it\(^1\), with angular, High Victorian forms, much polychrome brickwork and metal cresting\(^2\). The Star and Garter with its

---

2. Illus. in Bldr, 2 Jun. 1866, pp 406-7. The French community in England could always be depended upon to build French: e.g. French Hospital, Shaftesbury Ave., by Thomas Verity (1888) with pavilion mansard (BA, 21 Dec. 1888, p. 438, 442-3 (illus); Bldr, 4 Jun. 1887, p. 326); also its associated convalescent home, Kemptown.
rounded pavilions and roofs, and its neat symmetry anticipating Wykehurst, was a much more clear herald of the Loire fashion despite the compositional similarity with Barry's other hotels.

It is to the French Hospice rather than to the Star and Garter that the next major landmark in the history of the Loire style in the urban environment relates. This is Waterhouse's rebuilding of Tree Court at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. The date was 1869-70. It was still a predominantly Gothic building in feeling, but some of the detailing was unmistakeably Loiresque. Like the French Hospice it stands in relation to the full-blown Loire style of Holloway College as did Worthington's The Towers to Wykehurst. There are octagonal cone spires to the turrets at Caius, with small, cone-roofed bartizans at the angles of the main one. They are distinctly of the 1860s as are the hard, angular oriels, one situated diagonally across a corner. The dormer-windows, however, set in a steep-hipped roof, look back to Chenonceaux, and within the court there is a stair-turret à la Blois.
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Brighton, by Charles E. Clayton and Ernest Black (1904) with a well-out-of-date French tower and tourelle (illus. Archt, 4 Nov. 1904, p. 296.)
1. Waterhouse toured the chateau country in 1865 and had a drawing of the Blois stair interior published, Archt, 4 Sep. 1869. EN, 12 May 1871, p. 360, called the dormers "a sort of Burgundian version of Italianising Late Gothic". Other reviewers thought the building Jacobean. It was illus. Bldr, 12 Jly. 1873, pp 544, 547 (reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 228). Criticism was mixed: see EN, 7 May, 1869, p. 404; Bldr, 8 May 1869, p. 358; 28 May 1870, pp 414-9; Eastlake, HGR, Appendix 316; Pevsner, Cambridgeshire, 2nd ed., Harmondsworth, 1970, p. 80, expressing views which he has subsequently abandoned ("Truly a municipal palace", BBC Manchester programme no. BTB083N333N, first transmitted Radio 3, 13 Sep. 1977). A perspective view is held at V & A. (D.1888-1908), reproduced in Marble Halls, Entry 72, p. 118.
The choice of Loire chateau detailing at Caius College was carefully calculated in response to the neighbouring architecture, recalling Charles Barry's reasons for choosing mansards for Whitehall. The college is situated in close proximity with, on the one hand, the Gothic towers of Great St. Mary's Church, and on the other, the Classical Senate House. In the Loire chateau style Waterhouse saw the perfect compromise between these two extremes. Similar circumstances were soon afterwards to dictate Whichcord's choice of a more obvious François Premier style for the St Stephen's Club: across the road on one side were the Houses of Parliament in their frilly Gothic glory while in the opposite direction was Burn's Montagu House, very much in the Classical French mode for all its play with Chenonceaux dormers. The very fact that the Classical Montagu House and the Gothic college in Cambridge shared the same Chenonceaux dormers is in itself enough to illustrate the central position enjoyed by the Loire style in the architecture of the mid- and later Victorian era.

This, and its easy adaptability to modern needs, were further points of similarity with the architecture of the Queen Anne Movement, and it is interesting to note that commentators of the time saw the circumstances which had given birth to the Queen Anne style as something of a re-run of the historical process which had produced the Renaissance styles of the early sixteenth century. For

---

1. "St Stephen's Club forms a link between the somewhat opposed styles of these two buildings." (Blâr, 11 Apr. 1874, p. 311).
some years architectural writers had seen the future of the profession to lie in some sort of compromise between the Gothic and Classic styles. In 1865, for instance, G. S. Aitkin read a paper to the Manchester Architectural Association on "The creation of a new style". This new style he declared would be born of the marriage between the constructive and the decorative extremes of the Classic and Gothic styles. Herein lay the driving force behind the eclecticism of more prominent spokesmen like Ferguson and Kerr. Less original minds of the French Renaissance Revival like E. M. Barry and John Whichcord were content to blend the Gothic and Classic elements of the contemporary architectural scene into the already well-tried formulae of Renaissance France itself (with modifications of course), with the justification that they simply followed the combatants of that other 'Battle of Styles' fought 350 years before: for them, like circumstances warranted like response. The more imaginative men who centred around Norman Shaw, on the other hand, chose (to begin with at least and at that stage unconsciously) to adopt something closely akin to the spirit of the early Renaissance of France but not its details: those came later. As the movement matured theorists grew more aware of the analogy between the two architectural epochs and began to give voice to the idea. Stevenson felt that the originators of the Queen Anne Revival,

"trained and formed in Gothic, the spirit of the Renaissance

1. EN, 26 May 1865, p. 374.
coming to them with the force of new truth ... were under the same influences as the earliest Renaissance architects. They naturally produced work with the same characteristics, and found these styles the expression of their own state of feeling and models for their work."

John D. Sedding had clearly expressed to Norman Shaw very much the same sentiments, to judge from a reply written by the latter in 1882. Shaw did not go along with the idea and professed, somewhat self-effacingly, to see the new Queen Anne architecture as yet another copyist style:

"Come, I say old man, gently does it," he wrote. "You are coming it too waggish when you pretend to see any resemblance between the work of the present day and the "Renaissance of the 15th and 16th Centuries of France, Italy and Germany"."

Their art, he argued, was a natural and imperceptible growth out of what had gone before it, whereas modern Queen Anne was a self-conscious revival of a two-hundred year old style\(^2\). This was only partly true. It was a self-conscious revival with regard to certain of its details only. It was no accident that it took place when it did. Queen Anne was just a different answer from that of the Loire-chateau Revival to the same set of problems, and different from the French Renaissance itself in that it had all happened before.

If the Queen Anne style was Classic in detail and Gothic in

---

2. Shaw to Sedding, 5th Nov. 1882, quoted by Saint, *Shaw*, p. 217 (original at V & A). Bodley's latest work, Shaw contended, was a straight copy. In a second letter (20 Nov. 1882) he continued that it was the same with his own designs: "Just like a bit of real old work. One seems in a single sentence to get to the bottom of the whole thing, viz., first that old work was real and second that ours is not real but only like real."
composition, that of the Loire chateaux tended, as we have seen in relation to houses of E. M. Barry, to be Gothic only in relation to the pitch of its roofs. Indeed, in the case of public architecture the demand for symmetry was a good deal greater than was so with country houses: an asymmetrically positioned tower was decreasingly held essential for an imposing civic facade. Modifications had to be made if this rural, indeed Highland, style (as it had hitherto been deemed) were to be admitted to the urban environment. As a matter of fact, few city buildings were influenced in the round from the Loire chateaux. It was rather the case of the augmentation in the 1870s by means of a wider range of details (some from the Loire) of the long-established Francois Premier decorative taste. Only amongst smaller-scale urban buildings such as clubs or blocks of shops and offices, particularly if on a corner site, was asymmetry felt to be appropriate. Even then, apart from the tourelle (or whatever) which characteristically rose above the apex of the corner, each facade would usually be arranged symmetrically. At the St Stephen's Club Whichcord chamfered the corner, achieving symmetry on two of the three elevations.

The St Stephen's Club (1872-4) was the first full-scale example of sixteenth-century chateau architecture in London with the new academic approach; so the attention it received from the press is not surprising. It did not, however, indulge in the

1. It was exhibited at the RA in 1874. For reports of this see Bldr, 16 May 1874, p. 409; Archt, 23 May 1874, p. 286; and BN, 15 May 1874, p. 539, where it was much praised for being in "the
slender tourelles and round, cone roofs derived from the Loire chateaux which had already appeared in a number of country houses. The roofs of the new clubhouse still to some extent looked back to the truncated pyramids of so much urban architecture of the 1860s; but the pitch is steeper so that the high, hipped roofs of the Hôtel d’Ecoville, and not just its windows, are hinted at. Furthermore the ridge cresting of the earlier decades has been abandoned with instead elaborate finials at the corners. As for the elevations, these were, quite apart from the big Ecoville dormer and the Pailly balcony, more thoroughly tricked out with Francois Premier detailing, again derived from Ecoville, than any previous city building. With nineteenth-century rigidity a busy network of motifs is stretched across each surface: windows are separated from each other by vertical pilasters and by horizontal, circle-patterned panels; there are tiers of marble colonnettes in central positions; mullions are daintily moulded like tiny pilasters surmounted by candelabra in exact uniformity with those at Ecoville.
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beautiful transitional architecture of France known as Francois Premier ... and though (the architect) has not brought out all the capabilities of the style which is absolutely unrivalled in its powers of combining the picturesque and the beautiful, he has done enough to show that there exist models which can give us all that is sought in the present revival, and that their art is free from the uncouthness and extravagance which may not unjustly be charged to many of the buildings now being executed by the new school of architects." The Architectural Association, on the other hand, reported very adversely upon the club after their visit (BN, 1 May 1874, p. 487). It was illus. Bldr, 11 Apr. 1874, pp 308-11; BN, 10 & 17 Sep. 1875, pp 278, 284-5, 308-11; ILN, 27 Feb. 1875, p. 209. See also Bldr, 14 Jun. 1873, pp 459-60; BN, 10 Mar, 1876, p. 259.
Probably from Ecoville also in this case come the statues in their shell-topped niches. The smaller dormer windows most closely resemble those of François Premier Blois or the Château de Madrid, each with a straight pediment simply decorated with a triad of finials.

Superficial veils of François Premier detailing of this nature were shortly to become the very special style of the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair. Nowhere was there to be such a concentration of shops, offices and mansions in red brick and terra cotta (St Stephen's Club had been in Portland Stone) smothered with sixteenth-century French detailing beneath their inevitable dormers and gables. Here again there is a considerable overlap with the Queen Anne style. Many obviously Queen Anne buildings in Mayfair had a scattering of French detail, but there was a sufficient number of buildings so consistently French in their choice of decorative motifs and in their use of Loire-chateau-tourelles over the street corner, to constitute a sub-group of their own, half way between Mayfair Queen Anne and larger-scale mock chateaux. The chief exponents of this type were Ernest George, T.Chatfeild Clarke, and John Thomas Wimperis.

Wimperis's earliest buildings on the estate, shops and business premises at 443-451 Oxford Street, were doubtless a deliberate

---

1. The extent to which this reflected the personal taste of the Duke of Westminster is discussed in SL, XXXIX, pp 59, 140ff. This is the same Duke of Westminster who so consistently employed John Douglas on his Eaton Estate, and Cundy in Belgravia.
compromise between the Louvresque elevations nearby, not long completed by Thomas Cundy III, and the new Queen Anne trend which the Duke of Westminster seemed to favour. Thus there were Ipswich windows and Old-English hipped dormers in conjunction with a mansard roof with steep pyramid at the corner, shell-pedimented windows at first floor level, and hints of the Faily balcony in the brackets above the main door. The bulk of Wimperis's Mayfair work was Queen Anne, however, with no more than an occasional French motif, such as was customary in the 1880s; and the same applied to Chatfield Clarke and Ernest George as well, though when they did design French it was more thoroughly so than in Wimperis's Oxford Street shops. George's first building on the Mayfair Estate (W. J. Goode's china and glass shop in South Audley Street, 1875-6) was very much in the early Queen Anne style with little indication of Continental influence. Nonetheless, throughout the '70s and '80s he enjoyed a continuing love affair with the more picturesque examples of Continental architecture, and during these years published various collections of views drawn by himself on European sketching tours. These were by no means confined to France; but it was his Etchings on the Loire and in the South of France, published

1. See SL, XXXIX, p. 144; illus. in EN, 13 Jly. 1877, p. 28. Even more French was his block of mansions for Charles Fish in Chesterfield Gardens (see EN, 29 Dec. 1876, pp 662, 668-9) with their pavilion mansards; and No. 27 Grosvenor Square, 1886-8 (see SL, XXXIX, fig. 22b and EN, 22 Oct. 1886) for the Earl of Aberdeen.
1874, which enjoyed the greatest acclaim. It was detailing from
the architecture of this area which he most incorporated in red
brick and terra-cotta into his work in Mayfair. Two conspicuous
examples of this which still survive date from 1889. These are
No. 5 Mount Street and Albemarle House (originally Hotel) on the
corner of Albemarle Street and Piccadilly. The former is the more
picturesque with a decidedly concave pyramid roof to mark the
corner of Mount and Carpenter Streets. Albemarle House has a less
varied skyline of chimneys, gables and pyramidal roofs of fairly
uniform height. Both buildings possess elevations elaborately en-
riched with Loire detailing, crisply carved. Diamond panels and
medallions with heads in profile (like those on the Hôtel Pincé,
Angers, and many another François Premier building) are the most
obvious motifs, but the Mount Street house is a more varied com-
position and supplements the diamond variety with panels decorated
with fleurs de lys and crosses, as well as achieving an additional
decorativeness and French authenticity by the use of window-strips
which are topped by Blois-type dormer pediments simulated in
outline in the brick-work.

1. For reviews see Bldr, 9 Jan. 1875, p. 42 ("a very charming
book"); EN, 25 Dec. 1874, p. 746 (which reproduced, pp 760-1, some
of the plates - Carcassonne, the Chenonceaux "warder's tower", a
Blois chimney, & Arles); Archt, 9 Jan. 1875, p. 28. His other books
included etchings done in Germany and Switzerland (1870), the Mosel
(1873), Belgium (1878), Venice (1888). In 1884 he showed a large
collection of such sketches at the Fine Art Society, Bond Street,
the one of Chambord being especially acclaimed (Bldr, 25 Oct. 1884,
p. 550).
2. Such was George's facility for picturesque designs of this type
with crisp and convincing detail that the Bldr (11 Jun. 1887, p. 563)
Chatfeild Clarke, too, specialised in designs with busy veneers of Francois Premier detailing. An early example was his design for the City Liberal Club (not executed)\(^1\). His work of the '80s was more appealing than this dull effort, his shops in Oxford Street (Nos. 385-397) having a confidence and elegance which Wimperis's ones lacked, closely similar though their general compositions were\(^2\).

Here the cone roof at the corner and the composite dormer in the middle of the Oxford Street elevation suggest influence from Azay-le-Rideau and the scallop-shell cornice comes from Blois or Chambord; but the greatest influence upon urban designs of the Francois Premier type in these years came from the less picturesque but more busily decorative urban buildings of the sixteenth century which had already been the source of so many shop-fronts in early Victorian years. Foremost amongst these source-buildings, it will be recalled, were the Hôtel de Bourgthéroulde and the villa at Moret, later known as the Maison François Premier. During most of
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with regard to a drawing for the Albemarle Hotel shown at the RA, 1887, felt obliged to regret that this skill was not employed in "giving interest to buildings of more modern and more original detail instead of producing what appear to the eye to be charming sketches of old town and country buildings of various dates." This preliminary design was more Flemish than the final one (see BN, 13 May 1887, p. 714; for the finished building see BA, 22 Dec. 1893). Similar buildings by George and Peto were on the Mount St.-Berkeley Square corner (Archt, 1 Jun. 1888); and No. 40 Berkeley Square (BA, 14 Oct. 1892).

1. Published in Archt, 12 Jun. 1875, p. 350. A profusion of diamond- and circle-patterned panels and pilasters, arabesques galore, etc., etc. Unpicturesque skyline, however.
the 1870s the building journals had ignored this François Premier
architecture, concentrating instead on the picturesque Loire chateaux,
but from 1878 on throughout the '80s these buildings were repeatedly
illustrated along with similar ornate structures such as the tomb
of the Cardinals d'Amboise in Rouen Cathedral, the Hôtel de Ville
at Beaugency and the house of Diane de Poitiers at Rouen. This, a
tall, wooden edifice, smothered with arabesques and medallions,
enjoyed a particularly good run in the course of which The Builder
in 1887 asked

"Who will venture to say how many modern works have owed some
portion of their design to this small building? What a familiar
feature is the window in the gable!"

Familiar indeed, with its single mullion and its semi-circular
pediment holding a shell. It was the Hôtel de Bourgthéroulde,
however, which was a major source for that eminently sculptural
device, the candelabrum, which men like Chatfeild Clarke took up
with gusto in the 1880s in a bid to vary the range of motifs at
their disposal and achieve a denser and richer effect while at the
same time preserving the over-all flatness of the facade. Candelabra

---

Mitchell, done for the Pugin Studentship Competition and shown at
the RA, 1889. A photograph of the building for comparison with
the sketch was published, Bldr, 15 Dec. 1888, p. 434 (reproduced
in EN, 22 Nov. 1878, p. 530). The Villa at Moret was illus. BA, 25
Jun. 1883; MDA, 1885, pl. 42 and 1886, pl. 3. The Amboise tomb
in EN, 21 Dec. 1883, pp 960-1; the tomb of the Duc de Brézé, Rouen,
in Bldr, 21 Jun. 1884; the Hôtel de Ville, Beaugency (drawn by
J. Twigg) in Archt, 29 Nov. 1879, p. 317; the Hôtel de Bourgthéroulde
in Bldr, 21 Feb. 1885, p. 266, and 7 May 1887, p. 670 (sketch by
Ernest C. Lee). See also A. J. Lafon and A. A. Marcel, L'Hôtel
de Bourgthéroulde à Rouen, Paris, 1888.
were employed instead of attached colonnettes against the window
imposts of the "Cloth of Gold" range at Bourgthéroulde, but also
in lieu of full-scale columns at the Hôtel de Bernuy at Toulouse,
which building was rocketed out of obscurity by the meticulous
treatment which it received in Daly's Motifs historiques. Clarke
doubtless had his copy of Daly at his elbow when he drew up the
elevation of the new Fleet Street offices of The Daily News in
1885. There, bulging candelabra served the purpose of window
mullions. Those which (with much other capricious decoration)
adorn the walls of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Building in
Millbank, Westminster, served no purpose at all. This building,
by W. D. Caroe, represented the death spasm of the Francois Premier
craze, dating as it does from 1903. For some years the likes of
Beresford Pite had been doing their best to bury the sketch-book
mania, the historicist dabbling in pretty details, which distinguished
late Victorian architecture from contemporary work in France.

1. See v. I, pl. 18-21, 25. Pl. 20-21 depict the candelabra-columns
with minutest detail and measurements.
2. See Bldr, 20 Jun. 1885, p. 863. The street-level windows have
Francois Premier depressed arches, and Pailly balcony brackets
serve to hold up the porch roof. For other French designs by
Clarke see Bldr, 6 Aug. 1881, p. 172 (London and Lancashire Life
Assurance Co. Offices, Cornhill) and Bldr, 8 Dec. 1888, p. 414
(competition design for the Battersea Public Library, Lavender
Hill).
3. Illus. EN, 29 Apr. 1904, p. 609; Bldr, 30 Apr. 1904, p. 468;
Archt, 26 Jul. & 2 Aug. 1907. Caroe used similar fat candelabra
round the entrance of his Adelphi Bank, Castle St., Liverpool
(illus. Archt, 27 Apr. 1894). Cf. also window jambs in music room,
49 Princes Gate, Knightsbridge, by Ernest George and Yeates.
4. See below, pp. 519-20.
This was the age when men like Voysey and Mackintosh were seeking a stark simplicity in their revival of vernacular modes of building; yet the great mass of the profession was experiencing, paradoxically, a species of horror vacui which had been sweeping through the major competitions of the late 1880s, with Thomas Colcutt's Imperial Institute (1887-93)\(^1\) and the Birmingham Law Courts by Aston Webb and Ingress Bell (1886-91)\(^2\) being the most publicised examples. Goodhart-Rendel called it the "Eric-a-Brac Style". Old English dormers jostled with towering campanile, François Premier arches, and Chambord dormers. Every favourite Queen Anne and French-chateau device (and much else too) was thrown into the mixture. The Queen Anne and François Premier fashions were choking together on a surfeit of ornament.

If the boundaries between the two were ill-defined at the start, they were all but non-existent by the end. E. R. Robson, Queen Anne pioneer, was, as has been seen, prepared now to do undisguisedly chateau-esque designs\(^3\); Stevenson, too, by the 1890s was selling out to the other side\(^4\). Robert Kerr had had one of his more perceptive moments when he prophesised in 1874 that "What his friends of the Queen Anne School were going to do

---

1. Illus. Bldr, 2 & 9 Jly. 1887; 5 Jan. 1889; EN, 1, 22 & 29 Jly. 1887; Archt, 22 Jly. 1887; BA, 22 Dec. 1893; Bldr, 17 Aug 1895; and copiously elsewhere.
4. E. g. steep French-roofed houses in South Street, Mayfair; illus. Bldr, 11 Dec. 1897, p. 496. The change in his work was remarked upon by EN, 7 May 1897, p. 658.
was ... to pass into a phase of the French Renaissance, a much more elegant style, although there was a great deal of rococo filagree work about it ... He wished the gentlemen ... God-speed in their enterprise and believed that the ultimate result of it would be that we should have a much more refined species of Classic."

And so we did in the Edwardian era once the Bric-à-Brac vogue had run its course. There were other vogues, too, however, deriving from the French Renaissance during the late Victorian period, whose courses had to be run before this "refined species of Classic" should develop. Demanding priority is the Loire chateau style in urban and public architecture, not just as an exercise in decoration or in subtle compositions of "solids and voids", but as full-scale imitations of the palaces of early sixteenth-century France.

1. EN, 26 Jun. 1874, p. 691.
CHAPTER EIGHT: Urban and public architecture, 1870-1900

Because of the degree of formality deemed desirable for buildings of civic importance the Loire chateaux could hardly hope to challenge the established Louvre formula in this field. The Louvre and also the Hôtel de Ville continued to be popular models for civic architecture to the end of the century, with support not from the Loire chateaux so much as from one of the most Classical buildings of the age of Francis I, the Château de Madrid. Yet the Loire chateaux did make an occasional appearance in large-scale public and urban architecture, particularly if the site were relatively park-like or hilly, and the building in question not to be associated with civic ostentation.

The only instance of a design for such purposes being strongly influenced by the Loire chateaux was a belated exercise of the Romantic imagination, which was never intended for erection. This was a student design by C. Percival Walgate which won "honourable mention" in the Soane Medallion competition of 1910. Professor Reilly of the Liverpool University School of Architecture (and promoter of Beaux-Arts principles) regretted that such a design could be admitted to a competition which bore Sir John Soane's name; but the critic in The Architect recognised that the stipulated subject, "An entrance gateway to a capital city", "would be almost impossible at any later date than the seventeenth century and

scarcely even likely in that."

It was a sign of the times, however, that despite this fact, Walgate's was alone amongst the thirteen submitted designs to show any hint of mediaeval treatment: and splendid it was, with its machicolated bastions, Flamboyant dormers, and much to remind one of Chenonceaux, Chaumont and Chambord.

Of more practical designs, the last to be built with obvious debts to the picturesque splendours of the Loire and achieving something of their irregular massing, was completed twenty years before Walgate's belated flutter. This was the Edinburgh Public Library, one of the most successful buildings of the French Renaissance Revival. As the library is in the heart of Edinburgh, the choice of its non-urban style is probably to be explained partly by its precipitous site (rising from the Cowgate to present its entrance four floors higher at George IV Bridge) and partly as a late bow to the old Franco-Scottish link. Not that there is any hint of the Scotch-Baronial style about the library, either as originally designed or built.

It is an unusual building combining a steep roof and cupola over the centre of the building (more reminiscent of some small-town council chamber of Georgian England than of anything in France) with a set of sixteenth-century French features derived both from the Loire chateaux and from the more decorative urban buildings of that period. The original design which won for George Washington

Browne the commission in public competition, underwent considerable changes of detail during the building-process (complete by 1890), the Loire elements becoming much more evident, to the general advantage of the building. But it is to the decorative type of François Premier architecture that the central portion of the entrance front is indebted. Here there is only a very slight difference between the original design and what was built. At street level (George IV Bridge) three identical arches (the centre one containing the main entrance) were substituted for a more fussy arrangement of a single, central arch, flanked on either side by a lower elliptical arch, with a separate, round-angled window above. The other details remained the same: the arabesque-patterned pilasters, the three rectangular windows at first-floor stage, and the richly carved cartouches between the two levels. The new triple-arched arrangement is in fact closer to François Premier models such as the villa from Moret, the Beaugency Hôtel de Ville, or the courtyard facade of the Maison Agnès Sorel in Orleans. The first of these is the most likely source, partly because it was the best known, but partly also because Browne seems to have adopted another device from that building, namely the carving onto the surface of the wall above, a couple of small windows, of a simulation of the decorative pediments which at the Loire chateaux were usually employed above the dormer windows in three dimensions. These small windows, some pilasters and a fourth big, arched window replace a more grandiose arrangement of columns.

1. This latter was illus. in Verdier and Cattois, Op. cit., I, p. 165.
on the projecting section of the facade to the right of the entrance and further emphasised the superficially decorative nature of the design. On the other hand, a number of more structural and picturesque chateau features were incorporated into the library design during construction. Most notable of these was the corbelled, round stair-tourelle, nestling in the angle to the right of the entrance and topped with a cupola, now gone. The other striking change was in relation to the dormers. Originally the projecting right-hand section of the main front sported a sort of cross between a chateau dormer and a decorative gable of the Germanic type; but this was revised so that the roof was properly hipped with a dormer window of Ecoville design projecting from it. The dormer at the left extreme of the same facade also abandoned its simple pediment in favour of the type with curly volutes to be seen at Chambord.

1. This was not incorporated into the design till July 1888 (work began Nov. 1887). See Scotsman, 31 July 1888, and Archt, 3 Aug. 1888, p. 68, reporting that Browne submitted drawings to the Building Committee for this stair to give access from the reference library to what was to have been a dummy floor in the roof, but which the stair enabled to be used as storage space. It was an aesthetic improvement too, breaking up the blank south wall of the projecting north wing. Waterhouse (who judged the competition) had wanted the entrance to be shifted to this north wing, but this was not allowed by the Library Committee as it would have meant extra expense (see Alan G. D. White, The Public Libraries of Edinburgh, 1800-1970; an historical survey, Thesis (F.L.A.), Library Association, London, 1975, p. 84.

2. Competition design was illus. BA, 15 July 1887, p. 42; Bidr, 16 July 1887, pp 92-3; Edinburgh Evening Dispatch, 9 Dec. 1887. See also Archt, 10 June 1887, pp 349-50. Completed building illus. BA, 8 & 22 Nov. 1889, pp 325, 366; EN, 12 Dec. 1890, p. 818; Archt, 1, 15, 22 June, & 20 July 1894. See also Edinburgh Evening Dispatch, 18 Jan. 1889, where the design is described as "Queen Anne". The article claimed to be a "professional view" extracted from The Builder, but that journal (9 Feb. 1889, p. 105) denied all responsibility for or sympathy with the article. See also Bidr, 1 Jan.
The Edinburgh Library was not Browne's only venture into French architecture. Steep wedge roofs and François Premier detailing adorned his first design for the Royal Hospital for Sick Children in the same town (1893), but as built the hospital has more of a Dutch note to it. At the British Linen Bank, 69 George Street, Edinburgh (1905), he abandoned the picturesque chateaux altogether and went all out with superficial François Premier decoration.

Other Scots, too, chose combinations of the picturesque and decorative French sixteenth-century models as their inspiration. William Leiper used the Hôtels of Ecoville and Assézat to good effect at his Sun Insurance Buildings, Glasgow (1889-94). Scottish hospitals, in particular, attracted the French styles: Sydney Mitchell and Wilson indulged in an outlandish Franco-German exercise for the Royal Edinburgh Hospital (1889), while Campbell Douglas and Sellars settled on a Chambord bastion and lantern for the Glasgow Sick Children's Hospital (1888).²

Footnote continued from page 360

1898, p. 19. Plans are held by the Dean of Guild, Edinburgh, and copies of same are at the library itself, along with a bound volume of specifications, the clerk of works' account-book (labelled 'Report Book, No. 1') and two of the clerk of works' notebooks covering the whole building period. All these items have the reference number qI/Z/792/E23/p, plus accession numbers D34310-3.

1. For preliminary design see BA, 10 Feb. 1893. As built, see Archt. 4 & 11 Nov. 1904.

2. Diamond- and circle-patterned panels; a frieze of shells below the cornice (cf. Blois, Chambord, Beaugency); a pierced parapet of Anet type; medallions, arabesques, amorini, etc.


In England hints of the chateaux may be detected in unexpected places - the angle turrets of Norman Shaw's New Scotland Yard (1887 - 90), for instance. Sir John Summerson says of them:

"It looks to me as if Azay-le-Rideau gave the first hint. The building is a chateau with tourelles, overlooking the Thames instead of the Loire."

But perhaps a clue lies also in the building's name. Is it another late essay by an expatriot Scot in the Franco-Scottish style? At any rate, its progeny were copious, though their French look is at most ambiguous, except at one case which quotes from Ecoville and Madrid as well as the Loire. This was Edwin T. Hall's Metropolitan Asylums Board Head Office (1898), also on the Embankment, near the Temple.

Unexpected too is the Frenchness of the very charming Beaumont College Preparatory School (now called St John's School), Englefield Green, on the Surrey-Berkshire border. This was the work of J. F. Bentley of Westminster Cathedral fame, and dates from 1886-8. In many ways the building as a whole, with its red brick striped with yellow stone, its gables with oval lights, and windows with broken pediments, seems to be allied most closely with the Queen Anne Movement, but the doorway is flanked with octagonal, cone-roofed turrets while the elliptical door-arch itself is daintily adorned.

1. The Turn of the century; architecture in Britain around 1900, Glasgow, 1976, p. 11. For illus. of Scotland Yard in contemporary press see EN, 9 May 1890; Archt, 30 May 1890; 5 Jun. 1891; Bldr, 20 Jly. 1907; 1 Jan. 1910.
with arabesque work and Francois Premier medallions. Apart from the Edinburgh Public Library, the approach of all these buildings to the more constructive and compositional aspects of the Loire chateaux was at most tentative. There seem to have been only two public or urban buildings in England which made any real attempt to be like Loire chateaux in the round; and even in these the wayward spirit of the originals was tamed and regularised, the style treated to some extent as a system of decoration. One was W. H. Crossland's Royal Holloway College, perhaps the most startling creation of the French Renaissance Revival. This was in fact not an urban building at all, being situated at Egham, Surrey, quite close to Bentley's school, but as a public institution it belongs in this discussion. The other was E. M. Barry's Temple Garden Buildings, a block of offices on the Victoria Embankment, London. Its garden setting, like the rustic situation of the Holloway College, no doubt goes a long way to explain the choice of so non-urban a style for central London. Important also it seems was the neighbouring architecture. Again the French Renaissance was playing the role of mediator:

---

1. Above is a Fontainebleau cartouche and a pierced balcony à la Anet. The cupola suggests the Paris Hôtel-de-Ville or Queen Anne England. See Bldr, 12 May 1888, p. 342; Archt 22 & 29 Mar. 1889; AR, XII, 1902, pp 18-20; Pevsner's Surrey, p. 273, and Berkshire, p. 190; W. W. Scott-Moncrieff, John Francis Bentley, London, 1924, pl. 27-33. Winefride de l'Hôpital, Westminster Cathedral and its architect, London, 1919, referring to Bentley's apprenticeship under Clutton notes (II, p. 350), "It is said that Bentley made many if not all of the drawings" for Minley Manor.
"By adopting the Renaissance of the early period," noted one critic, "the architects have overcome the rigid forms and inelastic features of a purer Classical style and have made their building harmonise with the Temple Gardens and picturesque masses of brick houses nearby."

The Temple Garden Buildings were of Portland Stone. In so important a position as this the red brick favoured by Queen Anne really would not do for a new building of some pretensions. Here the Loire style could score over its rival. As one commentator remarked in relation to a house in Kensington, the chateau style was "born in purple, its first appearance being connected with the palaces of a King and the castles of a refined nobility, whereas Queen Anne and Old English timber-works have sprung from a humbler source - the farmhouse and the cottage."

The Temple Garden Buildings were offices built by the Societies of the Inner and the Middle Temple in conjunction with each other. The Middle Temple's architect, J. Piers St.Aubyn, had drawn up in 1876 a preliminary design for an extension of that society's existing premises, the Plowden Buildings. It had been in a rather French Gothic style, with round corner towers and octagonal, cone roofs. Barry had been called in by the Inner Temple to devise a similar extension to their premises (the Harcourt Buildings), but when the two societies decided to adopt a common style at Barry's suggestion, it was he who got the commission for the whole scheme, St.Aubyn having to content himself with the internal planning of

---

2. Archt, 23 Apr. 1885, p. 253. This was Laurence Harvey speaking of his villa in Campden Hill.
the Middle Temple's half. Construction was completed by mid-1879.

Special circumstances of the site had caused St. Aubyn to use corner bastions: they were needed to mask the fact that the line of the Embankment frontage was not at right-angles to the side elevations. This irregularity of plan (which ultimately gave Barry the opportunity to employ some octagonal-shaped rooms as at Shabden) resulted from the refusal of the Metropolitan Board of Works to allow the frontage to advance beyond the old river wall, though corner towers had been allowed to project slightly so as "to remove the unsightly appearance the new buildings would have from the Embankment". Barry, inheriting these circumstances from St. Aubyn, inherited also the inducement to use corner bastions like those at Azay and other Loire chateaux. These buildings he already admired for other reasons, so the decision cannot have been a difficult one.

The idea of joining into one the new premises of the two societies involved the formation of an archway over Middle Temple Lane. This is the focal point of the whole design. Here Barry gave full expression to the sculptural handling of the Loire-chateau motifs which he had already employed some years earlier at Wykehurst. Indeed there are various similarities between the two buildings. The bulging, corbelled balcony, derived from Chenonceaux and seen above the main entrance at Wykehurst, was repeated with increased

boldness at the Temple Buildings, framing the street arch along with a pair of Gothic statue niches. Another feature from the Wykehurst entrance front, the peristylar tourelles, reappeared on top of the round corner towers - not with the steep, cone roofs of the Sussex mansion, however, but with small ogee caps with crocketing, such as are to be seen in Tudor architecture from Kings College, Cambridge, to the Elizabethan prodigy houses rather than in anything in François Premier architecture. These are now gone. Of the Loire chateaux it is Chenonceaux to which the Temple Garden Buildings are most allied.

It is to Chenonceaux that the building looks for its symmetrical composition, for the sculptural light and shade of its swelling bows and towers, and for the crowded variety of the dormer windows and chimneys above the rich cornice and parapet. But still, it is an urban building: these are lawyers' offices. Accordingly the Temple Garden Buildings fall a good way short of the fantastic profusion of the Loire original. There is the regular fenestration characteristic of the nineteenth century, and a block-like massing: inevitable compromises with modern office requirements as well as the demands of economy.

Economy had no place at Holloway College. Something like £600,000 of Thomas Holloway's fortune was spent before that edifice

1 Temple Garden Buildings were illus. Bldr, 14 Jun. & 6 Dec. 1879, pp 653-4, 1344; (reproduced in Crook, VA, pl. 271); ILN, 5 Jun. 1880, p. 548; Archt, 11 Jun. 1895; 11 Jun. 1897. See also EN, 21 Feb. 1879, p. 197 (on "New Renaissance Buildings").
was ready to be opened in 1886 by the Queen herself. Though the design was inevitably subject to nineteenth-century requirements and traditions, the superb site near the top of Mount Lee in the wooded and rolling Surrey countryside inhibited to a minimum the inherent theatricality of the style. One contemporary account of the building claimed that, with the dimensions of 550 feet by 376 feet, it was bigger than any other college in the world. T. R. Smith said it was one of the few buildings in England which gave one an idea of enormous size as did the Louvre, the Tuileries and Versailles. If it spread outwards with majestic confidence, the Holloway College also towered upwards, achieving a closer approximation to the sky-line variety and excess of Chambord than any other building of this time which was built. Perhaps it was its very size, however, which prevented the college from achieving the staggering effect of mass heaped upon mass which the unexecuted, smaller design worked out by Peddie and Kinnear for St Martin's Abbey in 1869 had achieved, and which is (as much as the fantastic detail) the secret to the success of Chambord. Roger Smith was probably wiser than he knew when he linked the college with the vast complex of the Louvre and Tuileries. One suspects that it was in a combination of this model and Hampton Court that W. H. Crossland the architect, found his inspiration for the sequence of courts linked by long ranges of buildings. Crossland certainly made some study of the Louvre, as

1. Anonymous pamphlet, The Royal Holloway College (with woodcuts from The Art Journal), ca. 1887, pp. 11-12.
2. Blr, 2 Apr. 1887, p. 497.
will be seen later, and as for Hampton Court, there are nearly as
many stylistic debts to that building as there are to Chambord.
The four-turretted gateway of the main entrance, for a start, recalls

130B Wolsey's great gate at the nearby palace, but it is within the
courts (particularly in the middle, dining-room range, separating
the two quadrangles) that one finds that it is the English and not
the French palace which prevails: yet another case of the inter-
play between the French and Queen Anne styles. To some extent,
therefore, the Chambord detailing of the exterior amounts after
all to just another case of veneer. Certainly the vastly long

130A elevations are (as in the urban essays in the style) somewhat
mechanical in their regularity. The window-strip motif is played
with, but there are so many so close together that the effect is
lost. Besides, the materials militate against success: the
pilasters which join one level with another to create a continuous,
perpendicular ribbon of windows are in red brick like the walls
they stand in, so that the necessary contrast is absent; only the
window surrounds and the capitals and bases of the pilasters are
in pale Portland stone. Added to this the round bastions at the
corners and those punctuating the great length of the four facades,
though undoubtedly evoking the Loire style (more so indeed than
Barry's at the Temple Buildings in that they are topped with tall
cone roofs), have again the smaller proportions of those of Azay
rather than the massive girth of Chambord's. The vigorous inter-
change between curved and straight lines in fairly equal quantity
which makes Chambord so richly sculptural a mass of masonry is not
achieved at Holloway. The curves are but ripples on the surface
of a preponderant flatness. The skyline is more convincing with its profusion of dormers, chimneys, turrets and fantastic crowned towers. The dormers are of a fairly simple Loire type, with raised shell pediments; the belozenged chimneys are from Chambord, though topped with rich cornices and semi-circular caps of Louvre type. As for the crowns on the main towers, their lineage is intriguing and not entirely French. The water tower over the central range which separates the north and south quadrangles is closest to that highly distinctive lantern which is the pivot of the whole composition of Chambord. Yet, isolated as the one at Holloway is from attendant pinnacles and chimneys it has taken on rather more the look of an English market cross, like those at Salisbury and Chichester. The north and south crowns are more Gothic in form than the central one - so much a circle of flying buttresses that one cannot avoid suspecting that the source here was North-country and Scottish churches like St Nicholas, Newcastle and St Giles in Edinburgh. The effect of all

1. The huge crown (1907) over the Victoria and Albert Museum (by Aston Webb) would seem to be similarly indebted. More of the Chambord variety, but in miniature and in the thick of much other Francois Premier detailing, are those on William Hamilton Beattie's North British Station Hotel, Princes St, Edinburgh, 1895 (BA, 10, 24, 31 May 1895; EN, 3 & 31 May 1895; 27 Feb. 1903). Bldr, 12 Dec. 1897, pp 724-5, compared the Chambord crown with those of the northern churches, and it is interesting to note how French Renaissance style buildings in Edinburgh and Newcastle occasionally applied the St Giles type of crown to the top of their central pavilion as an extravaganza of metal cresting, e.g. Heriot Watt University (built as the new Edinburgh School of Arts or Watt Institution to designs of David Rhind, 1872 (see Bldr, 5 Oct. 1872, p. 779) with extensions by David Cousin, 1876 (see EN, 17 Nov. 1876, p. 507)); Waverley Hotel, Edinburgh, by John Armstrong (see Archt, 10 Nov. 1883, p. 289); and Newcastle Police Courts by John Lamb (see Bldr, 14 Nov. 1874, pp 947-9).
these skyline features, coupled with much inventive and bizarre (if rather coarsely executed) carving, is immensely rich\(^1\), and though the vastness of the complex has caused even this aspect of the building to consist of a series of separate clusters of excitement, instead of one great, central climax one must concede that it is a building of amazing ebullience and vigour, and not unworthy of the sixteenth-century school of its inspiration.

There is some confusion as to the date when the idea to build this college was conceived, and when preparatory research in France took place. The foundation brick was laid on 12th September 1879\(^2\), but planning had been going on for some years prior to that.

Contemporary sources maintained that the idea of an institution to meet the demands of higher education for women (for it was as a women's college that it began) was first expressed by the wife of the founder, Thomas Holloway, and that the first steps for the furtherance of the project were taken at a conference in Holloway's rooms in Oxford Street in 1875\(^3\). As early as 1871, however, Holloway had enlisted the aid of George Godwin, editor of The Builder, in prompting a correspondence in his journal on how best to dispose of "a quarter of a million for the public good". This was

---

1. Carving by the Italian, Fucigna, who had worked under Scott on the Albert Memorial, includes swans, crocodiles, storks, cobras, owls, with more conventional subject matter.
3. "Bldr", 26 Jun. 1886, pp 936-7; and Royal Holloway College, 1887, p. 5. The former reference also states that the site was not acquired until 8 May 1876.
to be over and above the £30,000 which he had already promised for a lunatic asylum to be built at St Anne's Heath, Virginia Water (now the Holloway Sanatorium)\(^1\). One should have imagined, however, that Holloway (who was architect of the asylum too) would have been so amply occupied with that building in the years before 1875 as to have had little time to spare for planning a college as well, were there not a fair amount of evidence of varying degrees of reliability suggesting the contrary. The most interesting but also ultimately least reliable evidence is a diary purporting to be that of Holloway dealing with a trip made by himself and Crossland in September 1873 to study Chambord. The unreliability arises from the fact that the contents of the diary indicate that it was concocted after the event and that the handwriting is not Holloway's but that of his brother-in-law, George Martin-Holloway\(^2\).

Even so, a reference in the diary (30th September) to the purchase

---

1. *Eldr*, 25 Mar. 1871, p. 220, announced that an unnamed individual who had recently promised £30,000 for a lunatic asylum wanted to spend a quarter of a million or more "so as to do the greatest public good," and desired opinions of readers as to most worthy causes. Typically the response was profuse, and Holloway wrote to Godwin (15 Apr. 1871 - letter at the Sanatorium) expressing his interest in suggestions made by correspondents: "I might here observe that I intend to devote half a million to public benefit," he volunteered, thanking Godwin "for ventilating this subject in the Builder". Holloway, it should be stated, had made a fortune out of pills and patent medicines.

2. This diary is held along with much other material, including letter and account books and a few plans for heating and ventilation arrangements (signed by Crossland 1888 & 1893) in a large brown suitcase at Holloway Sanatorium. An annotation to the diary, dated January 1900, by Vere Langdon Oliver, son-in-law of G. Martin-Holloway and a trustee of the sanatorium, declares of the 1873 section, "This is in the hand-writing of the late Sir George Martin-Holloway."
in Paris of architectural books to aid Crossland's work seems to be corroborated by a note in a surviving account-book of the receipt by Crossland in Paris on 1st October 1873 of £8, purpose unspecified. In 1887, when lecturing on the college, Crossland indicated how by coincidence Holloway's and his own thoughts had been directed at the same time, yet independently, towards French Renaissance architecture. T. H. Wyatt, who had been one of the judges of the asylum competition, had suggested the French style to Holloway (it being one he had worked in a good deal himself) and had furnished him with "books, photographs and engravings of some of the most notable examples, especially Chambord". Holloway was not a little delighted therefore when Crossland, quite unprompted, submitted also for his perusal "illustrations of the chateaux of the Loire and Fontainebleau and placing Chambord first." Crossland had been working in a brand of Franco-Flemish Gothic on the asylum, and before that in a late French Gothic-Transitional Renaissance mode (similar to that used by Waterhouse at Caius College) at the Ramsden Estate Offices in Huddersfield. But now, it appeared to

2. RIBA Trans, New Series, III, 1886-7, pp 141-8 & pl. 35-7; also Bldr, 2 Apr. 1887, pp 496-7; BN, 1 Apr. 1887, pp 464-5.  
3. A notice concerning the sale of Wyatt's library (Bldr, 14 Jun. 1890) is disappointing. Only Petit's Châteaux de la Vallée de la Loire would have interested Holloway. The collection also included the Revue générale d'architecture; Pugin's Paris and its environs; Cotman's Normandy.  
4. Completed 1870 for Sir John Ramsden, Bt. Illus. Bldr, 23 Mar. 1872, p. 227: an extensive and very picturesque proto-Renaissance building of angular turrets and steep hipped roofs in the 1860s style. This mode was carried on in Huddersfield by Edward Hughes at the Market Hall, 1878-80 (BA, 18 Apr. 1878), and the Technical
him "that a return either to the purer Classical styles or to the Renaissance of the 16th century was impending." Accordingly, Chambord was, from Crossland's account (and the diary's too) measured "from bottom to top", and on the return trip from Blois client and architect made a tour of inspection of the choicest of French chateaux
.

Even if work of this nature did in fact begin in 1873 no firm decision in favour of the Loire style seems to have been made for several more years. Crossland recounts how on their return from France his employer fell under the influence of

"certain highly educated ladies ... who persuaded him that the proper style of architecture to adopt was not the Renaissance but the style in which most of the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge had been built."

This resulted in a four-week spell in Cambridge for the benighted architect working out a scheme with characteristics "of all the larger colleges". But then Mr Holloway was "attacked by a low form of fever ... during which the influence of the learned ladies had

Footnote continued from page 372
School and Mechanics Institute, 1881-3 (BA, 29 Jly. 1881). Crossland also did for Ramsden the more Renaissance Kirkgate Buildings, Huddersfield, 1882 (Bldr, 6 Jan. 1883, p. 10), achieving picturesque effect with Ecoville and Chambord dormers and tall Germanic spires. His Post Office was also said to be in the "Francois Premier" style (BN, 28 May 1875, p. 594) but is hardly French at all. For all these see also A descriptive account of Huddersfield - illustrated, Brighton, W. T. Pike (publisher), 1895.

1. Diary, 26 & 27 Sept. 1873, refers to "Chevorney and Valency" (sic). Crossland in RIBA Trans, 1886-7, p. 143, lists "Cheverny, Blois again, Amboise, Chaumont, Chenonceau, Valençay, Versailles, Fontainebleau, and having made large purchases of photographs and books in Paris, we made for home."
lost its effect". Whether it was a fever or a learned lady which played the most prominent role in inducing the contemplation and abandonment of the next scheme in this tortuous planning history is not clear, but the design which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1877 had nothing to do with either Chambord or Cambridge, nor even Hampton Court. This time it was the Louvre - which is interesting in light of what has already been said of the plan.

What is most curious about it is that the half plan of the principal floor which was published with the front elevation of this scheme is clearly that of the Chambord-type edifice which was ultimately built (but not begun for another two years) and does not tally with the Louvresque facade, an anomaly which contemporary critics do not seem to have observed. There is a hint of the courtyard pavilions of the built design to the main pavilion of this Louvre version, and the decoration of the panels between the windows

1. RIBA Trans, 1886-7, pp 143-4.
2. It was illus. BN, 21 Dec. 1877, p. 614. Comment on its appearance at the RA is to be found in Archt, 19 May 1877, p. 317; BN, 18 May 1877, p. 486; and Bldr, 12 May 1877, p. 474, which amazingly mistook it for Elizabethan, perhaps on account of the long oriels on the wings. Concerning the seeming uncertainty as to the best style for the college, a furious letter from Holloway to Crossland refusing more funds (dated 4 Oct. 1876) is of interest: "You have been preparing plans and drawings - which are and cannot be definitely settled". Holloway did not expect the first contract for the college to be taken till the next January (even that was two years early); "not one sixpence more" would he pay to the dilatory architect (no work was going ahead at the asylum) - already £500 had been advanced on what was to be done at Mount Lee. Supposing Crossland were to die and nothing yet done - what would happen then?
3. Broad Pedimental construction with three round windows. Its source is Lefuel's new Pavillons de Flore and Marsan. There is an echo of it also in Crossland's later Kirkgate Buildings, Huddersfield.
recalls the Francois Premier wing at Blois; dormers are of a simplified Loire type, and the long oriel are topped by cone roofs.

Otherwise it is a dull and conventional three-pavilion, New Louvre scheme with truncated pyramids over the terminal pavilions and a colossal squared dome in the centre. Perhaps the main reason for abandoning this idea was that which a critic in *The Architect* voiced at the time:

"The whole is as unsuited for erection in a country place as anything architectural could possibly be. Buildings like this are essentially civic and are entirely out of their element except in the streets of a great city."

It might seem surprising to find, twenty years after the Whitehall Competition and the completion of the New Louvre, that this sort of design continued to be much used. In fact, however, the squared domes and the truncated pyramids of the Louvre and the Tuileries, and the associated pavilion composition continued...
to be one of the most favoured, to the turn of the century, not only for prominent civic buildings (as the big competitions of the 1880s repeatedly showed) but for smaller-scale commercial architecture in the metropolis as well in a way which had not been essayed in the 1860s. Thus in harmony with The Architect's disapproval of the Louvre style for rural areas, The Building News said in 1880 that certain business premises recently erected near Piccadilly with Louvre-type roofing were

"in the style that not only from experience is found to be the most suitable to the streets of the Metropolis but is also most readily adapted to the wants of the practical businessman."

The architects of these premises were Archer and Green, a partnership which was responsible for a fair amount of work in varying French styles including a couple of monster blocks of flats, Whitehall Court on the Thames Embankment and Hyde Park Court (now the Hyde Park Hotel), Knightsbridge. The former is one of the most impressive urban buildings in Britain of François Premier inspiration. 2.

1. EN, 30 Apr. 1880, p. 526, referring to the premises of W. G. Skinner, "the well-known army tailor", 57 Jermyn St West. A big truncated and crested pyramid roof is over the centre. The facade is rather Parisian with a combination of late sixteenth-century French motifs and much rather Greek detailing (acroteria, incised key patterns etc.).
2. Other examples of French-style buildings by Archer and Green which preceded Whitehall Court were: premises for Attenborough, the jeweller, at 71 The Strand (Bldr, 3 Mar. 1883, p. 289) and at 193 Fleet Street (Bldr, 9 Jun. 1883, p. 774) replacing earlier French premises by Frederick Herring (see above, p. 59). Also shops for Dobson & Sons, and for L. C. Clifford at 32 and 30 Piccadilly (Bldr, 6 Jan. 1883). These buildings all tended to look to late sixteenth-or even early seventeenth-century France. The firm also built the only exception to the Nash terraces round Regent's Park, Cambridge Gate, 1875, with French pavilion roofs, rather
The mid-Victorian years had witnessed a great increase in the range of building types which was largely attributable to the growth of a national social conscience commensurate with the growth of the empire - an awareness, in fact, of the responsibilities of greatness. Accordingly, in the 1860s and '70s new building types like hospitals and public baths, libraries and educational institutions created an architectural boom. Another field for social and architectural experimentation was that of urban housing, and here a considerable influence was felt from France. Perhaps it was the national attitude that "an Englishman's house is his castle" that had caused the typical urban middle-class dwelling to be a vertical "slice" from street to attic in some interminable terrace "with bay windows repeated in 'damnable iteration' as far as the eye can conveniently see"\textsuperscript{1}; but whatever the cause it was "like living on a ladder instead of on the earth's surface" according to J. J. Stevenson\textsuperscript{2}. The French lived otherwise (and so did the Scots for that matter), favouring blocks of residences of several storeys, with a number of households served by a common stairway and each limited in its extent to a single floor. The French called them "maisons à loyer"; to the Scots they were "flats", and this was the name they were known by in the heated debates on the subject.

\textsuperscript{Footnote continued from page 376}

High Victorian (illus. BJ, 5 Nov. 1895, p. 201; see also Pevsner, London II, p. 350, and Hitchcock, ANTC, p. 235); collaborated also with F. & H. Francis on the First Avenue Hotel, Holborn (1881-3) which is much more in the Francises' style.
indulged in by the profession during the 1870s. Chief proselyte of the flats crusade was the same W. H. White who had taken such exception to the Queen Anne vogue. Having lived and worked as an architect in Paris for most of the preceding decade, he arrived on the London scene in 1873 intent on converting the English to the Parisian way of life. Not surprisingly he encountered a good deal of opposition.

The subject was in fact not entirely new to architectural circles. Back in 1845 William Tite had addressed the Institute on the advantages to be had in the uniformity of design offered by the French system. In 1853 the first block of middle-class flats had been completed in the newly constructed Victoria Street, Westminster, to the designs of Henry Ashton. Shortly afterwards the cause had been espoused by a number of architects and philanthropists chiefly concerned with working-class accommodation, who published their views in pamphlet form. Even so, little advance was made in the next twenty years. The strength of the Gothic Revival would not have aided the cause of such buildings. Scott stressed the desirability of individualising each house in a row to accentuate the vertical thrust; but even Cundy's unGothic,

---

1. Eldr, 8 Nov. 1845, p. 533.
2. For a developer called Mackenzie (see Eldr, 3 Dec. 1853, pp 721-2). The flats were greeted as "what has long been a desideratum in London".
3. William Chambers, Improved dwelling-houses for the humbler and other classes; based on the Scottish dwelling-house system, London, 1855; Arthur Ashpitel and John Whichcord, Town dwellings: an essay on the erection of fire-proof houses in flats; a modification of the Scottish and continental systems, adapted to the smallest or to moderate means, London, 1855.
palatial, terraced blocked in Belgravia had on the whole stuck resolutely to the English system, a row of ludicrous little porticos at street level defying the palatial unity of the French roofs above. One major catalyst to the renewed discussion of the subject (which then simmered on throughout the 1870s) was undoubtedly again that highly influential French book by César Daly, *L'Architecture privée*. Its second section was devoted to the explication of the maison à loyer. Equally important, however, was the role played by White who, tireless as a terrier, resurrected the issue every second year or so in addresses to the Architectural Association or the R.I.B.A., backing up his acid rhetoric with examples from Daly's book. He argued hotly on aesthetic, economic and social grounds. His opponents argued equally hotly on nationalistic and snobbish grounds. Such establishments might be all very well for the French

1. "Fanciful", said the RIBA president; "a little too highly coloured," agreed BN, 23 Nov. 1877, p. 505.
2. Large blocks of flats lent themselves to unified and grand architectural effects, especial scope being offered by the simple, central communal entrance for instance. It was hoped that flats might be the means of wresting urban housing out of the hands of the speculator and into those of the architect. This did not prove to be so however: the economic advantage of jamming a greater number of residences on to a piece of land for no increase in ground rent made flats particularly attractive to speculators. One communal flight of stairs was cheaper and safer than many. These economic advantages were expected also to encourage a higher class of design but did not always do so. The social advantage was that people who could not afford a house in the better areas could more readily contemplate a flat.
but they really would not do for polite London society. But, as an editorial on the subject in The Builder remarked in 1876, "when a thing gets talked of in England that is the most decisive step towards the adoption of it as a fashion." By then the campaign was indeed gaining ground. White was being joined by other prominent architects, such as T. R. Smith. By 1883 he was able to claim victory. Not surprisingly it was the economic advantages

1. The French or Americans might have a passion for riding in elevators but few Englishmen could be expected to fancy living above the second floor. There would have to be changes: French maisons à loyer housed anyone from a lord on the first floor to a chimney sweep in the attic, but in England "gentlemen would certainly expect to meet gentlemen on the stair; and as for the ladies, it is difficult to assign a limit to the distress and shame that would be occasioned by an habitual encounter on mutual steps and risers between one caste and another," (Archt, 20 Sep. 1873, p. 141; see also Archt, 27 Sep. 1873, pp 153-4). If a concierge in the French manner guarded the communal entrance, he would gossip; if there were no concierge, anyone might ascend the stairs. In French blocks servants of all establishments were housed in rooms on the top floor, but this too would lead to gossip and (worse) immorality. A separate trade stair, while desirable would incite loitering and mischief. The number of rooms to a typical Parisian flat was felt to be insufficient, so many English blocks like Whitehall Court offered residences of up to 20 rooms sometimes occupying two floors. Often English flats lacked catering facilities: Queen Anne Mansions (off Victoria St) was run like a big hotel with a restaurant. Likewise Hyde Park Court.


3. Claiming that blocks of flats now covered whole streets in London as in Paris he proceeded to urge that each flat have no less than three ante-chambers, seemingly out of some desire to revive something of the gracious living associated with the levées of the Grand Monarque (see Archt, 27 Dec. 1884, p. 417). For White on the Paris system of flats see: Archt, 4 Oct. 1873, pp 168-9; BN, 10 Dec. 1875, pp 638-40 (with plans from Daly, p. 651); Bldr, 11, 18, 25 Dec. 1875, pp 1100-3, 1131-4, 1147-8; Bldr, 25 Mar. 1876, p. 291; (with T. R. Smith) Bldr, 1 & 8 Apr. 1876, pp 305-8, 344-5, and BN, 31 Mar. 1876, pp 315-6; BN, 23 Nov. & 7 Dec. 1877, pp 505, 521-3, 575-6; Archt, 24 Nov. & 8 Dec. 1877, pp 277-8, 313-4; RIBA Trans, 1877-8, pp. 21-65 (including plans and elevation by White of flats with mansard roof).
of flats which ensured their success. In the 1870s and 1880s an ever
decreasing number of people could afford to live centrally in London
in any other type of residence\(^1\). Few flats were more central and
few more grand than Whitehall Court.

The planning stage of Whitehall Court seems to have been
somewhat thorny, or (to be more accurate) the planning stage of
Waterhouse's National Liberal Club was somewhat thorny, owing to
the fact that the two buildings were to go up simultaneously on
contiguous sites overlooking the Embankment Gardens, and the archi-
tect of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests (Arthur Cates), who
had to approve the design of constructions on crown land (as was here
the case) wished to ensure a "general harmony" of design not only
between the two, but within the area as a whole. A paper warfare
on the subject broke out in the columns of *The Pall Mall Gazette* in
November 1884 and spread shortly to *The Builder*. The instigators

\footnote{Conference of Architects toured new blocks of flats (Bldr, 24 Jun. 1876, p. 612). Joseph A. Stark spoke on the subject, Bldr, 27 Dec. 1879, p. 1424-6 (flats bring to Parisian residences "power, monu-
mental grandeur, breadth of treatment and character"). Frederick E. Bales spoke about his new Hyde Park Mansions, Edgware Rd (Bldr, 8 Mar. 1884, pp 351-3; BN, 7 Mar. 1884, pp 360-3; Archt, 15 Mar. 1884, pp 171-5). See also Archt, 16 Apr. 1870, p. 184; 26 Jly. 1873, p. 41; Bldr, 18 Mar. 1876, pp 270-1.

1. By 1906, Edwin T. Hall (in W. Shaw Sparrow, ed., *Flats, urban houses & cottage homes*, London, 1907, p. 82), was writing: "flats have passed through the crisis of fashion and become necessary under the economic conditions of today." The new mobility of society partly explained them also. He then compared English and French
examples. Thanks to Malcolm Higgs for directing me to this book. See also Bldr, 26 Jan. 1901, pp 81-5. For Frank T. Verity's
Edwardian-Parisian flats see below, p. 504.}
of the hubbub seem to have been an article in The Daily News, 23rd October, 1884, and a letter from Waterhouse himself, published the following day, in the first of which it was suggested that governmental pressure had dissuaded the architect from carrying out his original intention to build something after the model of a French chateau of Francis I. This was "a most excellent style to adopt for the purpose" in the opinion of the Pall Mall Gazette's vexed correspondent, "F.R.I.B.A.", which gentleman then pronounced the "general harmony" of the district, with which the new building was supposed to conform, to be a "general harmony of mediocrity" and deplored that "the intervention of bumbledom" seemed committed to its perpetuation. All Waterhouse's efforts to explode the myth of a chateau plan drawn-up and discarded were ignored until he was forced to publish in The Builder in May 1885 designs by himself done in the July of the preceding year shortly after he had been named an architect of the project, and others dated November 1884 in which month the foundation stone had been laid and the controversy was at its height. Certainly the differences

1. Pall Mall Gazette, 6 Nov. 1884, p. 11. This newspaper had published an illus. of the proposed club, 1 Nov. 1884, p. 5. "F.R.I.B.A." did not like it and assumed there was a better one in the Waterhouse waste-paper basket. Fergusson complicated the issue (PMG, 8 Nov. 1884, p. 2) by decrying the corner tower of the published design (it would dwarf everything in the neighbourhood). The Builder which had felt (8 Nov. 1884, p. 615) that the new building would "afford some relief to the monotony and commonplace which is the character of too much of the new architecture of the locality", had changed its tack by 15 Nov. 1884, p. 649, and espoused "F.R.I.B.A."'s cause. Another correspondent (PMG, 11 Nov. 1884, p. 2) added his voice to the chorus for a French-chateau design.
between the two designs are minimal\(^1\). The most amusing thing of the whole uproar is, however, that while correspondents inveighed against the "club's being made a cat's-paw of to enhance the size and grandure (sic)" of Whitehall Court\(^2\) and called simultaneously for a more chateau-like design, it was Whitehall Court which was, of the two buildings, to be the more like a sixteenth-century chateau. No more chateau-like version of the National Liberal Club was ever published than the picture which appeared in *The Building News* during the controversy, illustrating the entire complex (presumably as Archer and Green would have had it) with the clubhouse in perfect conformity with the block of flats, but for the additional northeast tower, here a good deal more indebted to Chambord than the tower which was actually built\(^3\). Naturally an architect of Waterhouse's standing was not going to allow himself to be bullied into reproducing Archer and Green's design. It is only surprising, however, that he should have changed his design at all in the way he claimed he did if pressure to conform was being put on him, for although the difference between the July and November schemes are, as has been

---

1. *Bldr.*, 9 May 1885, p. 669 (a description of the building and plan were published at the same time, p. 652). He had written to PMG (11 Nov. 1884, p. 2) during the furore admitting that both himself and the architects of Whitehall Court had been "somewhat fettered by the determination of the Office of Woods and Forests that a general harmony should pervade the joint elevation of our two buildings, destined as they are for widely different purposes; but the reasonableness of this enforced harmony being once allowed, I cannot in common fairness charge the action of the "Woods and Forests" with what in the opinion of "F.R.I.B.A." is unsatisfactory in my design." "F.R.I.B.A." remained unconvinced however (PMG, 17 Nov. 1884, pp 3-4).
said, minimal, the November one is of the two a little less French certainly, but also less like Whitehall Court in a few minor details of the tower, the dormers and the elimination of a broad, elliptical arch as part of the loggia which opened on to the Embankment Gardens Terrace. The National Liberal Club that was built is only slightly French - a few chateau-ish hints around the edges, so to speak.

The entrance is rather Henri II with its curly pediment and columns of Delorme's Tuileries order. But the dormers are more Dutch than French; and though the corner tower invokes memories of Chambord its detailing, particularly of the lower part, is rather more of the German Romanesque despite the way the windows indicate the rake of the stairs.

The club blends quite happily, however, with Whitehall Court.

---

1. Most contemporary accounts were content with "Early Renaissance" as description. Bldr, 23 May 1885, p. 720, registering another change of opinion, now said the club would be a "jewel" in comparison with the mediocrity of its neighbours. For illus. see BA, 13 Mar. 1885, p. 128; EN, 30 Jan. 1885, pp 165-6. It was visited by the A.A. (Bldr, 15 May 1886, p. 725) and successive conferences of architects (EN, 9 Apr. 1886, pp 559-70; Bldr, 21 May 1887, pp 781-4, plus plan). See also EN, 27 Jun. 1884, P. 1029; 7 Nov. 1884, p. 763; 1 May 1885, pp 673-4; 30 Apr. 1886, p. 689; Archt, 28 Jun. 1884, p. 426; 8 Nov. 1884, p. 308; Bldr, 22 May 1886, p. 737; 25 Dec. 1886, p. 904; Pevsner, London I, pp 106, 669. At the club there are two perspective views dated 4 Nov. 1884 and 1886. Also photocopies of 9 plans and 2 elevations signed and dated 1 Nov. 1884. Originals not located. Waterhouse succumbed to the French Renaissance increasingly in his old age: Madrid composition and pavilion mansards at Hotel Metropole, Brighton (EN, 10 May 1889, p. 649); French jumble at St Mary's Hospital, Manchester (BA, 19 May 1899, p. 358); Ecoville dormers and Pailly balcony at Surveyor's Institution, Gt. George St., Westminster (AR, I, 1896-7, p. 313; EN, 1 Jan. & 4 Jun. 1897; BA, 16 Dec. 1898; Bldr, 1 Apr. 1899; Archt, 15 Sep. 1899).
both in its general picturesqueness and in more specific details such as the way in which it continues both the loggia which runs the full length of the court, and the Pailly balcony at fourth-floor level. The wide, composite dormers of Whitehall Court, too, particularly the central one with high hip roof running back behind it, have an affinity with the ones on the club while being less specifically Dutch than those. Furthermore the Club is an essential part of the composition of the whole complex for the tower at its north-east corner (which Fergusson had so objected to) answers Archer and Green's pavilion at the south-east extreme of the facade and completes the four-pavilion composition which has its origin in the Château de Madrid as illustrated in Du Cerceau. The fact that it is not an exact counterpart of the Whitehall Court pavilion roofs adds to rather than diminishes the interest of the whole, and indeed the salient difference between Whitehall Court and the National Liberal Club is the subtly irregular positioning of the dormers, loggias and bows, in the latter (combined with a greater simplicity) as opposed to the heavy-handed regularity and excess of detail and ornament of the former. There is sufficient interest in the composition of the Court's Embankment facade, and particularly its skyline, for this to be forgiven, but the side and back elevations are stodgy indeed.

The relationship of the National Liberal Club to the French Renaissance is ambiguous. Whitehall Court's debt to Francis I's palace in the Bois de Boulogne is a good deal clearer. But the Château de Madrid composition had been stretched out into something
enormous. Where the French palace punctuated its loggia-ed facade with four small, single-bay pavilions, at Whitehall Court the pavilions have become massive over-fenestrated affairs, lacking the simplicity of their model and thus losing also the power of contrast. Between the pavilions there are six doubled bays of windows and loggia arches where five simple bays were used at Madrid. The size of Whitehall Court has forced the architects to convert the pavilions with their pyramidal roofs (the central ones with subsidiary lanterns) into the major features of the design, where in the French chateau they were only tiny echoes of the larger hipped roofs which rose over the body of the building. At Whitehall a continuous low roof is all that is needed to link the massive pavilions.

If Whitehall Court is the Madrid composition stretched outward, Hyde Park Court (1888-92), the other Archer and Green block of flats, is, by contrast, the same scheme squeezed upwards; four pavilions again rising to pyramidal roofs but with only three doubled bays (loggias at the upper levels) between the pavilions, the whole rising to the unusual height of eleven storeys.

The Whitehall Court interpretation of the Château de Madrid

---

set something of a pattern for less original architects in the 1880s and '90s. The Yorkshire twin-brothers team, John and Joseph Leeming, gave it a particularly good run, first in their prize-winning design in the international competition for the Lisbon Post Office (1888)\(^1\); and (when that fell through) in a pair of North-country market halls (Halifax and Leeds), which looked more dazzling on paper than when actually built\(^2\). At Leeds (1901) the pyramidal roofs of the formula were supplemented with Baroque domes suggestive of those currently in vogue for new government offices in Whitehall. Verity and Hunt produced a similar design for the Nottingham Municipal Offices, though the date of the competition (1883) suggests that they might have influenced Archer and Green's Whitehall Court than that the reverse was the case\(^3\). Henry Tanner, an architect remarkable only for his unoriginality, was certainly thinking of Whitehall Court, however, when he concocted his drawings for the Cardiff Post Office. He even went so far as to tack the National Liberal Club's tower on to the end\(^4\). That was only one of a tedious series of provincial post offices erected to his designs in the final decades of last century, almost invariably laced with clichés from the Château de

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{ Illus. 4 & 11 Aug. 1893, pp 135, 169. "So many changes of government have taken place that although four years have elapsed the confirmation of the award is still in abeyance" (p. 135). Help from Chambord here too.}
\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{ Illus. EN, 24 Aug. & 7 Sep. 1883; Bldr, 19 Jan. & 2 Feb. 1884, pp 109, 182. This won the competition but was not built.}
\[\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\text{ Illus. EN, 21 & 28 Sep., 26 Oct. 1894.}
Madrid and the Paris Hôtel de Ville. If the Château de Madrid was a popular model at this time, the Hôtel de Ville was more so. During the High Victorian period it had been secondary to the Louvre as an influence, but from 1870 onwards it enjoyed a new fashionability. This was partly because the old building had been burned to the ground during the Commune, 1871, and its rebuilding along the old lines, this time at the hands of Théodore Ballu and P.-J.-E. Deperthes, was attracting much attention. Partly also, the formal grandeur of its symmetry and the picturesqueness of its roofs supplied a welcome alternative to the Louvresque domes and pyramids which had dominated civic design since the 1850s. Furthermore, the journals were giving much publicity to the endless French provincial hôtels de ville which drew on the Paris original. Whatever the causes of it, the compact, three-pavilion composition of the Hôtel de Ville with its serrated silhouette of three steep, hipped roofs in close proximity, the central one with cupola on top, established a formula.


2. The competition of 1872 had stipulated that the original design by Boccador be the guiding principle (see Archt, 3 & 10 Aug., 16 Nov. 1872, pp 60, 74, 275). The British press followed the competition closely and on the completion of the new building (1882) published a flood of illustrations of it and its predecessors (see Appendix B). The architects published a book, Réconstruction de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris; motifs de décoration extérieure (Paris, 1884) which was no doubt much used in Britain. On the reaction to the ruination of Paris during the Commune see below, p. 395.
amongst competition hopefuls for provincial town-halls and echoed on into the present century in small-town or suburban municipal chambers, libraries, even public baths. It will be noted, however, that whereas Garling in his competition design of 1857 for the Foreign and War Offices had reproduced the newly extended Hôtel de Ville of Second Empire Paris with its side wings and truncated pyramid roofs, the architects of the 1880s as a rule chose the compacter scheme of the original building even though Ballu and Deperthes had rebuilt the wings as well. Also, whereas the central part of the Paris building was lower than the pavilions (only the cupola rising above them), the Victorians could not accept so weak a stress at the heart of a design and accordingly reversed the ratio in most cases. Another tendency of the new wave of Hôtel de Ville designs was to hip the central roof so as to leave a gap between it and the pavilions. This was a feature of the original and other Renaissance buildings which Garling had ignored but which Cundy had introduced at Grosvenor Place, Belgravia in 1869.

1. E.g. Chatfeild Clarke's second prize design for the Battersea Public Library (Bldr, 8 Dec. 1888); Aberdeen Public Library by Alexander Brown, 1889 (EN, 18 Jly. 1890, p. 72; Bldr, 14 May 1898, p. 458; AR, XXIV, 1908, p. 235); design for baths by Peter Anderson (Bldr, 25 Jan. 1890); Ayr Public Library by Morris and Hunter (Bldr, 8 Aug. 1891); Dundee Gymnasium by Baillie McCulloch and Jamieson, 1891; Bermondsey Public Library by J. Johnson (Bldr, 23 Jan. 1892, p. 60; EN, 29 Jan. 1892); Linlithgow City Offices by Charles E. Tweddie (Bldr, 2 Sep. 1899); Dumfries and Maxwelltown Library by F. G. Grierson (Archt, 23 Feb. 1900); Crewe Town Hall by H. T. Hare (Archt, 3 Oct. 1902).

2. Especially popular in unexecuted designs, e.g. Assize courts by S. B. Russell (R.A. Schools prize design, Bldr, 22 Jan. 1887, p. 148); Trades House, Glasgow, by Campbell Douglas & Sellars (BA, 14 Sep. 1888, p. 186; a public library by Arthur Sykes (Soane Medallion award, Bldr, 9 Feb. 1889, p. 108) to name but a few. It was probably unnecessarily expensive to be actually done very often.
In 1898 F. T. Baggallay criticised this as "one of the worst and commonest faults of contemporary French architecture". One recent example looked, he thought, "as if it wanted a chain or cable round the top to prevent its falling apart." But, to the 1880s and '90s it aided the cause of the picturesque skyline which in those decades was enjoying its Indian summer.

Most irresistible was the cupola of theHôtel de Ville. It provided a design with a central focus more delicate than a Louvre dome; and perhaps, too, in these "Queen Anne" years it reminded people of the innumerable late Stuart and early Georgian examples of the same thing. Interestingly, though the Hyde Park Court flats clearly quoted the Madrid composition, a cupola perches in the middle of the pyramidal roofs. Even at Whitehall Court the extra-large central dormer and associated hipped roof give a central emphasis to that building which was not present in the chateau. In fact, cases of the Château de Madrid inspiring designs without the architect's succumbing to the temptation of the cupola are rare. Pearson's Westwood House was one example already noted in an earlier chapter; another was E. M. Barry's design for the Sick Children's Hospital in Great Ormond Street, London, built 1872-6. Here the proportions of the original chateau are more closely adhered to

than had been the case at either of the Archer and Green blocks of flats, and Barry earned the praise of the critics by making the decorative motifs of the chateau into features which were functional also. Thus the slender terminal towers of the main facade with their octagonal cone roofs and peristylar loggias\(^1\) contain the extraction and ventilation shafts for the whole building; the rusticated piers flanking the central section of the facade (and hinting at the small pavilions in the centre of the Madrid Château) contain the smoke and air flues. Further, the plentiful use of loggias supplying sheltered and sunny recesses in the open air in which patients might sit, was deemed especially appropriate for a hospital\(^2\).

The Great Ormond Street Hospital was a rather heavy and dull design. A prettier use of the same features was to be found in another hospital: T. R. Smith's North London Consumption Hospital (1878-80) in Frognal Rise, Hampstead. More picturesque emphasis is given to the roofs in a way very reminiscent of Madrid (terminal pavilions and a central steep hip) but the Hôtel de Ville cupola is there as well; at the corners are slender tourelles as at Madrid but with sharp cone roofs. Pailly balcony brackets are put to good effect and the loggias also, on the sunny southern

\(^1\) Cf. Wykehurst and Temple Garden Buildings, but here they play the role of the terminal hip-roofed towers in the dominant Château-de-Madrid composition.

\(^2\) The hospital was illus. Bldr, 27 Jan. 1872, pp 65-7; BN, 30 July 1875, pp 114, 125-6. See also Bldr, 11 May 1872, p. 358; BN, 17 May 1872, p. 401.
elevation. It was not to be expected that architects would resist the usual eclectic mixtures of details even if a single model such as the Hôtel de Ville or the Château de Madrid provided the basic composition. Louvresque chimneys, heavy quoins, and plentiful 139A urns in lieu of finials give W. and R. Mawson's competition design for the Bradford Technical School a Louis XIII touch to it despite the Hôtel de Ville lantern. There was also an Ecoville dormer. H. A. Cheers devised some very attractive schemes which applied Ecoville dormers, angle turrets, Italianate step-ways and so forth to the well-worn Parisian format.

Another example of the Hôtel de Ville pattern with help from

---

1. Illus. BN, 19 Dec. 1879, p. 740; ILN, 6 Nov. 1880, p. 453; Bldr, 25 Dec. 1880, p. 750; 31 Dec. 1892. See also BN, 7 Sep. 1877 (the competition); Bldr, 5 Jly. 1879, p. 755; EN, 9 May 1879, p. 498; 18 Feb. 1887, p. 175. Smith had used the Hôtel de Ville as a model in his Manchester Assize design back in 1859 (Bldr, 7 May 1859, p. 309). Second in the hospital competition were Henry and Charles Legg with a feeble, French, three pavilion composition (EN, 28 Jun. 1878, p. 648). Smith's design set a pattern for later hospitals: e.g. Alfred W. Cross's unpremiated design in the Hastings and St Leonard's Infirmary competition, 1885 (Archt, 2 Oct. 1885, p. 209); Clarence Memorial Wing, St Mary's Hospital, Paddington, by Salter and Adams (Bldr, 27 Jly. 1893, p. 68). Archt, 24 May 1879, p. 303, compared Smith's use of loggias to those of many a Queen Anne design but found his showed "purer and more pleasing detail".

2. Illus. BA, 5 Dec. 1879; see also BA, 24 Oct. 1879, p. 162.

3. E.g. 2nd prize design for Battersea Town Hall (EN, 18 Dec. 1891; BA, 18 Dec. 1891); 2nd prize design (with Aspinall and Smith) for Darlington Town Hall (EN, 6 Apr. 1894); Scarborough Constitutional Club (EN, 28 Oct. 1887, p. 669). Rather similar 138B were the Lewisham Public Baths (Forest Hill site) by Wilson and Aldwinckle (Bldr, 6 Oct. & 1 Dec. 1883; EN, 15 May 1885).
elsewhere was the City of London School, yet another French building for the Victoria Embankment. Owing to changes to the site the architects Davis and Emanuel (who had won the commission in a competition held in mid-1879), were obliged to modify the original scheme before construction could begin in late 1880. A simple Hôtel de Ville scheme (with slight help from Madrid) was made more compact. Flemish lucarnes were added to the roof and the side pavilions reduced to a pair of narrow towers carrying elaborate cupolas suggestive of nearby St Paul's. There was a general increase in François Premier surface decoration in a way similar to the Edinburgh Public Library.

The steep roofs of the school were chosen, it was said, to ensure that the building was not dwarfed by its massive neighbour, the Royal Hotel, which swept around the corner from Bridge Street at Blackfriars into the Victoria Embankment. Part also of Davis and Emanuel's scheme for the school was a semi-circular addition to the hotel itself, from street to attic, to soften the harshness of the unadorned western termination of that building, and to ease the transition from it to the neighbouring school. This addition

---

had a steep French roof and *œil-de-bœuf* windows; for the hotel was, like nearly every other hotel of the day and for the next thirty years (as will be seen), rather French too, though in this case (built 1873-80 to designs of Edward Augustus Grüning for Polydore de Keyser) a more than usually heartless specimen. A drearily regular, Franco-Italianate elevation marched around the curve of the road, and with it a long high French roof, punctuated by only the meanest hints at pavilions, barely rising above the uniformity of it all.¹

But here was progress. Designs of this sort signalled the decline of the Picturesque and heralded the modern age. First, however, we must return to the influence of the Tuileries and the Louvre. The Picturesque might be dying but it was not yet dead. The Hôtel de Ville and the Château de Madrid might supply alternatives to the Louvre for civic compositions but they by no means supplanted it. Just as the Loire style amongst country-houses had been simply another (the latest) French style added in the 1870s to the range of types available, so also were the Hôtel de Ville and the Madrid formulae simply additions to the repertoire of styles at the urban architect's disposal. They represented the limit to which it was felt civic architecture could appropriately go in response to the general taste in the 1870s and '80s in the France of the sixteenth

rather than the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. For three reasons, however, the Louvre-Tuileries pattern continued to hold its own. The first was the steadily reviving fortunes of Classicism at the end of the century, associated with direct influence from the Ecole des Beaux-Arts; the second was the attention which was refocused on the Louvre-Tuileries complex which, like the Hôtel de Ville had sustained terrible damage during the Commune of 1871, following the Franco-Prussian War and the fall of the Second Empire. The third reason was the most potent of all: the three-pavilion, Louvre formula had been proven time and again to be admirably suitable for grand-scale urban architecture and there seemed no reason to abandon it. The squared Louvre and Tuileries domes just got fatter and fatter. Crossland's unexecuted 1877 scheme

1. Much space was given in the journals throughout 1871 to the ruination of Paris, e.g. "After-glow in Paris", by Robert W. Edis, Archit, V, 1871, pp 296-7, 312-4; VI, 1871, pp 3-4; "The wreck of Paris", EN, 2 Jun. 1871, p. 423, where the Louvre-Tuileries complex was called "an edifice unequalled in the world though now mangled and dilapidated". EN, 3 Mar. 1871, pp 158-9, called it "a structure unparalleled for extent and splendour". Phene Spiers exhibited drawings of the ruins at the A.A. (EN, 3 Nov. 1871, p. 331; republished AR, II, 1897, passim). Then followed "Reconstruction of public buildings in Paris" (Archit, 19 Oct. 1872, p. 217) and many other articles. Controversy raged over the fate of the Tuileries. Pavillons de Marsan and Flore were restored (illus. Bldr, 19 July 1879, p. 804); but the rest was demolished Dec. 1882. Architectural activity in Paris continued to receive attention in a way accorded to no other foreign city (see below, p. 440n); and a new spate of Paris sketches broke out, e.g. P. G. Hamerton's Paris in old and present times, London, 1885, (2nd ed., 1892; see EN, 30 Oct. 1885, pp 684-5, for review and reproductions). See also EN, 24 Sep. 1880, p. 354, for exhibition of Paris sketches. More useful to architects was the newly completed three-volume work by Lefuel, Palais du Louvre et des Tuileries. Archit, 20 Jun. 1885, p. 370, announced that the Paris authorities had granted that journal special rights to reproduce the art and architectural works of that city.
for Holloway College bore a dome of more than hemispherical dimensions over its entrance. Nearly as distended were those on the also unexecuted student design of William Frame for a "nobleman's town residence"¹, and amongst compositions actually built those on Lee and Smith's Caxton Hall, Westminster² and the Royal Courts of Justice Chambers in the Strand by William Wimble and Goymour Cuthbert³. Oeil-de-boeuf windows were de rigueur. The formula achieved its ultimate and inevitable absurdity at the "Canterbury" amusement arcade in Westminster Bridge Road, where there was nothing but a squared dome covering it, with one huge ogling eye-window in the middle - "designed for the purpose of displaying revolving scenes and the announcements of the "Canterbury"."⁴ It was indicative of the overwhelming flow of taste from Paris to London at this time that year after year the Academy or the Institute gave their awards to student work that was Parisian of

¹. RA Gold medal design, 1875. Illus. BN, 11 Feb. 1876, pp 142, 146-151. See also BN, 17 Dec. 1875, p. 663. The entrance front had steep, truncated pyramids.
2. Two schemes for this published. One called Westminster Parochial Offices (Bldr, 9 Oct. 1880, pp 449-53) with hipped pavilion roofs, central dome; second called Westminster Town Hall (BN, 27 Jul. 1883, pp 128, 145) without dome. As built it has dome but more closely resembles second scheme. Asymmetrical corner tower.
4. Designed by Albert Bridgman for R. E. Villiers. The arcaded entrance displayed a fish tank, stalactites, and "drooping ferns in nooks of rock work and rippling streams (which) line the footway on either side". See Bldr, 16 Sep. 1876, pp 905-7.
one type or another. That students were so absorbed by Paris was not surprising, for their elders were likewise, as the big competitions of the 1880s amply show. What is perhaps surprising is that amongst these student designs of Parisian inspiration there should be one by Charles Rennie Mackintosh for a museum of Louvre composition.

But in his early days Mackintosh's heroes had been James Sellars and J. J. Burnet, both of whom were conspicuous exponents of French models in the Glasgow Municipal Buildings competitions of the early 1880s.

1. Even the Paris Opera was starting to influence new work in the 1870s and '80s. For student designs of this sort see Chapter 10. Louvresque and Hôtel de Ville type designs include the following: 1875, W. Hilton Nash, Soane Medallion, design for a London residence with New Louvre truncated pyramids (BN, 16 Apr. 1875, p. 428); 1875, W. Frame's town-house (see above); 1881, Roger T. Conder, Soane Medallion, design for a provincial county court with Hôtel de Ville composition but round Loiresque towers (BN, 22 Apr. 1881, p. 452); 1883, Frederick R. L. Edwards, medal, design for an academy of music with wedge roofs, truncated pyramids, etc. (BN, 6 Apr. 1883); 1885, Thomas MacLaren, RA Gold medal, town-house design with Hôtel de Ville wedge roofs, cupola and pavilion arrangement plus Ecoville dormers (Bldr, 26 Dec. 1885, p. 911, & BA, 15 & 22 Jan. 1886); Arthur Sykes, certificate of honour, Soane Medallion competition for Madrid-cum-Hôtel de Ville police court (BA, 11 & 18 Feb., 18 Mar. 1887). See above, p. 389n, for other design by Sykes; also one by S. B. Russell.


The question of the Glasgow Municipal Buildings was a vexed one in those years. Two competitions had been necessary. The first, in 1880, had been won by George Corson of Leeds with a design compounded of elements from the Louvre and the Hotel de Ville; there were terminal pavilion roofs of truncated pyramid form and a colossal central tower (a feature much favoured by competitors in both contests)\(^1\). Corson was not, however, given the commission for he, like most of the entrants, had exceeded the unrealistically low financial limit of £150,000 which had been stipulated. The town council agreed to raise the limit by another £100,000 but felt another competition was needed. This took place in the summer of 1882 and was won by William Young's Italianate scheme which now stands. The British Architect more than other journals devoted a great deal of space to illustrations of the unsuccessful designs in this second contest (many of which were French to some degree)\(^2\), particularly the two by James Sellars in collaboration with his partner, Campbell Douglas\(^3\), and two by J. J. Burnet. One of the

1. Corson's scheme was illus. *BA*, 10 Sep. 1880, p. 120; *Bldr*, 18 Sep. 1880, pp 356-7, 361; *BN*, 17 Sep. 1880, p. 326.


latter was in fact Burnet's scheme resurrected from the 1880 competition, a decorative design which made no attempt whatsoever to disguise its debt to the Paris Hôtel de Ville. The treatment of the central cupola in particular was more faithful to its model than was usual in British designs - not just perched on the roof ridge but rising from a richly sculptural clock-tower, complete with broken pediment above the clock. Burnet's entry in the second competition (to which the Mackintosh museum bore some likeness) was less overtly connected to either the Louvre and Tuileries or the Hôtel de Ville in broad matters of composition; but certain details were from these buildings (especially the treatment of the main entrance) and there is a strong Baroque feeling to the design as a whole (as was in fact the case with an increasing number of the entrants in the competitions of the 1880s) which looked forward to the full-blooded Baroque of the turn-of-the-century architecture.

Burnet had been a student at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris, but his and the designs of other Paris trained architects were not the only ones to be feeling the influence of that institution. The Beaux Arts spirit, driving force behind the reviving fortunes of Classical formalism in Britain, was exerting a wide-spread challenge.

---

1. The 1880 scheme was illus. 5 & 12 Jan. 1883 and 18 Jan. 1884. David Walker reproduces the first of these as pl. 4 in his "Early work of C. R. Mackintosh". It received considerable praise, but BA, 18 Jan. 1884, p. 28, said it was "more suitable for a wealthy city in sunny France than the severer climate of a Scotch city. Its dignity, of which it possesses plenty, is of too elegant a type for the more sturdy expression we feel to be appropriate to the Scotch character."

2. For the second competition design see BA, 8 Sep. 1882 and 22 Jun. 1883.
by the 1880s to the lingering legacy of Gothic irregular composition and to that newer, also essentially English phenomenon which had dominated even civic architecture in the previous decade: the free Classicism of 'Queen Anne'. In the thirty years from 1880 official architecture in Britain came closer than ever before to that of the French capital; but discussion of this Beaux-Arts influence will be better treated elsewhere. Suffice it to say at this point that an increasing number of designs (executed and unexecuted) for public buildings up and down the country, such as those by Burnet, Douglas and Sellars, and the Mackintosh museum just mentioned, reflected the grandiose Classical formalism and symmetry which had prevailed in French academic architecture throughout the century, barely touched by the Gothic Revival. The Louvre and the Paris Hôtel de Ville continued therefore to be the favoured models in British civic architecture. The interest in applied François Premier decoration waned rapidly as the century came to a close, and Classicism and the Baroque reasserted their dominance.

The same tendencies characterised the Admiralty and War Offices competition of 1884, the most important competition of the decade. It was a sign of the new trends that Malcolm Stark and James Lindsay came closer to the lavish Baroque ornamentation of Lefuel's Louvre in their design than British architects had before 1.

Of the nine finalists only one, the firm of Glover and Salter

presented a Gothic design - French of course and looking about twenty years out of date. The rest of the finalists chose for the splendid site between Whitehall and St James's Park Renaissance schemes which contrived mixtures of Italy and France in varying quantities for their detailing, with more or less prominent use of characteristically French roof forms. A feeling of contemporary Paris was generally evident, particularly on the Whitehall elevations which were uniformly regular, whereas the awkward shape of the site and the fact that the beloved English Picturesque had a little life in it yet meant that in all cases the aspect from St James's Park was broken up and usually punctuated by a tower. The winning design (with a few insignificant French pavilion roofs towards the park) was by Leeming and Leeming, but again they were prevented from carrying it out, for it was decided to compromise with mere additions to the existing building. Second prize went to Aston Webb and Ingress Bell for the most French design of them all, an elegantly decorative reference to the Château de Madrid and bearing some affinity with Burnet's first Glasgow scheme.

1. The Leemings designs were copiously illus. in all the building journals, 1884-5. Ditto the other finalists. Maxwell and Tuke were more French than most (EN, 8 & 29 Aug. 1884; Archt, 13 Sep. 1884; Bldr, 18 Oct. 1884; BA, 26 Dec. 1884). See also designs by non-finalists with some French Renaissance features: Waterhouse (Bldr, 29 Nov. 1884); I'Anson & Son with F. T. Baggallay (Bldr, 30 Aug. 1884); E. R. Robson (Bldr, 16 Aug. & 27 Dec. 1884); P. J. Marvin (Bldr, 30 May 1885; 29 May 1886).

2. Illus. in BA, 12 & 29 Sep., 10 & 24 Oct. 1884; Bldr, 13 Sep. & 4 Oct. 1884; EN, 15 & 22 Aug. 1884; Archt, 30 Aug. & 20 Sep. 1884. There were pyramid and wedge roofs, a cupola, Madrid loggias with medallions in the spandrels; diamond-patterned chimneys, etc. Bldr, 4 Oct. 1884, p. 454, said "The elevation of Messrs. Webb and Bell's design is by far the most refined in detail of the
The Glasgow Municipal Buildings Competition and that for the Admiralty and War Offices set the pattern which was to recur virtually every year as town after provincial town decided that it too must have new municipal chambers. The Birkenhead Town Hall competition of 1882 was dominated by richly decorative Parisian contributions; Nottingham followed one year later, then Sunderland, Edinburgh.

Footnote continued from page 401
three (place-getters) but whether anyone who saw it executed would take it for a War Office may be a question to be asked." Sketches by Aston Webb, done 1886, of the newel of the Blois stair and of Tours Cathedral were published in BA, 12 Jun. 1891.

1. Three designs in The Architect all had a high tower flanked by bulging Louvre domes: Edward Birchall (11 Nov. 1882); Hoult, Connell and Wise; and Albert Vicars and John O'Neill (both 23 Dec. 1882). See also French design by John Salmon (BA, 10 Nov. 1882).

2. 1883, won by Verity and Hunt (see above, p. 387). George Corson came third with French pyramid roofs (BN, 31 Aug. 1883; Bldr, 26 Jan. 1884).

3. 1886, won by Brightwen Binyon with Louvre-Hôtel de Ville design (Bldr, 26 Jun. 1886; 21 May 1887; BN, 19 Dec. 1890). Third prize to Doubleday and Caws with pavilion roofs (Bldr, 17 Jly. 1886). Binyon's first big success was his Ipswich Corn Exchange (1879-82) - a lushly sculptural Louvre scheme (ILN, 30 Oct. 1880; BN, 21 Nov. 1879; 5 Mar. 1880).

4. 1887. Another hollow victory for Leeming and Leeming. Doubtless because of the hilly site and the proximity of St Giles Cathedral and the neo-Baronial houses of Peddie and Kinnear in Cockburn Street, a greater number of designs showed Loire chateau features than was usual in these urban designs. Patriotic Scots were no longer disposed to believe in the Franco-Scottish link (see David MacGibbon and Thomas Ross, The castellated and domestic architecture of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1887-92, II, p. 4; Mackintosh also thought it "very unkind of Mr Walton to ascribe all the artistic features to France" (Howarth, Op. cit., p. 12)); but J. W. Simpson & F. J. Milner Allen said they chose the French style because of its similarity to Scottish architecture (Bldr, 26 Feb. 1887, pp 311-2; for their design see Bldr, 12 & 26 Mar. 1887; BN, 20 May 1887). Bldr, 5 Mar. 1887, p. 342, agreed. Other French designs were by Brighton Binyon (Bldr, 16 Apr. 1887); J. B. Everard (BA, 1 Jly. 1887); Foster and La Trobe (Bldr, 13 Aug. 1887); Alfred Broad (Bldr, 1 Sep. 1888).
and Gloucester. The Birmingham Assize Competition was no different. The apogee of the trend was at the Sheffield Municipal Buildings competition which flooded the building journals of 1890. Six finalists and fifteen others presented designs displaying varying degrees of Frenchness: Louvre-Hôtel de Ville-Madrid variants, French 'Bric-à-Brac', Franco-German extravaganzas, even an odd portent or two of the more sober French Classicism which was to dominate Edwardian architecture.

For civic architecture then, the Parisian styles were certainly popular; for hotels, they were well-nigh universal. Continuing the tradition of the Great Western Hotel at Paddington, hotel after hotel which rose in London was completed with high French roofs,

1. 1889, won by G. H. Hunt (Louvre elevation sans roofs: Bldr, 13 Jly. 1889; EN, 26 Jly. 1889); 2nd prize to Medland & Son (Ecoville dormers); 3rd prize to J. Fletcher Trew (pavilion roofs). These, plus French design by Giles and Gough, are in Bldr, 20 Jly. 1889; EN, 26 Jly. 1889.

2. 1886, won by Webb and Bell (see above, p. 355). Other finalists (all illus. Bldr, 14 Aug. 1886) included J. J. Burnet and Son (French Flamboyant Gothic); Maxwell and Tuke (Madridish); Bateman and Hunt (Louvresque). See also Henman & Timms’s Hôtel de Ville design (BA, 16 Jly. 1886).

3. E. G. by James Lindsay (Bldr, 19 Jly. 1890; BA, 11 Jly. 1890). Also R. A. Briggs’s design which is pretty clearly indebted to Héré’s Hôtel de Ville, Place Royale, Nancy, as illus. in Patte’s Monuments érigés en France à la gloire de Louis XV, 1765 (see Bldr, 29 Mar. 1890, pp 230-7). Illus. of the other French designs are too copious to catalogue. See all the building journals throughout 1890. Especially French are designs by William Harvey and Bernard Smith; Everard and Pick; Ernest Runtz; J. W. E. Tilley; John Robinson; B. Woollard; Reade and Macdonald; Sugden and Sugden; P. J. Marvin. French 'Bric-à-Brac' by E. Mountford (winner); F. H. Tulloch; Henry T. Hare. Franco-German by Flockton and Gibbs.
punctuated by pavilions in the manner of the New Louvre. In the early years the hotels had sprung up in association with the big railway termini, except for the Westminster Palace and the Inns of Court Hotels which were built in newly developed thoroughfares. After 1870 the laying down of an important new road in the West End seems to have been followed almost as a matter of course by a proliferation of monster hotels in the French style upon the choicest sites which were opened up. Thus it was with the Holborn Viaduct, Northumberland Avenue and the Thames Embankment. Even in the new century the creation of Aldwych was followed shortly by the erection of the Waldorf Hotel with massive Louvre or Tuileries domes, half a century after Lefuel's great palace had been completed.

Like the huge blocks of flats of the 1870s and '80s the hotels of those years continued to increase in size and height, causing much consternation. When in 1875 the Queen Anne Mansions reached ten storeys and topped 116 feet in height, the district surveyor of Westminster, Edward Dru-Drury, brought an action against H. A. Hankey, the proprietor and builder, to halt proceedings. Hankey claimed he had had prior permission to build to this height, and that, besides, there was nothing in the Building Act of 1855 to prevent him. This was all too true. The Metropolitan Building

1 Archt, 22 Dec. 1877, p. 348, stressed the ambiguity of the legislation and that Hankey was out to make the most of it. The Queen Anne Mansions saga dragged on for years with a new bout in the late 1880s. See Nicholas Taylor, "Unheavenly mansions", AR, Apr. 1966, pp 310-2; Priscilla Metcalf, "At home in Westminster", AR, CLV, 1974, pp 135-8.
Act of 1844 had insisted that street widths be at least equal to
the height of the associated buildings. The 1855 Act omitted
this regulation. It was rapidly reinstated in 1862 but only in
relation to buildings in new streets less than fifty feet wide.
For constructions in streets of greater width there was no clear-
cut decree: an upper limit of one hundred feet without special
dispensation from the Board of Works was implied rather than
stated in so many words. The issue was further complicated by
the question of rooms in the roof - and here were the practical
as opposed to aesthetic reasons for the popularity of the high
French type. Not only were the storeys housed in such roofs cheap
to erect but it was fairly widely agreed that the implicit hundred-
feet limit of the building regulations (or the lower limit in a
narrow street) applied to the height of the masonry only, from
street to eaves. With a mansard, as many as three (rarely more)
extra storeys could be built with impunity, it was widely held, so
long as the masonry rose no more than a hundred feet. In fact the

1. Metropolitan Building Act, 1844, 7 & 8 Vic., c. 84, Schedule I.
2. Metropolitan Local Management Amendment Act, 1862, 25 & 26
Vic., c. 102, clause 85.
3. Metropolitan Building Act, 1855, 18 and 19 Vic., c. 122,
Schedule I, part 1 ("Rules for walls of dwelling houses"), clause
2, was a table giving required thicknesses of walls depending on
height and length of wall. The highest group catered for was
90' - 100'. No other reference to total height of building occurs
in the act. Even this one refers to "dwelling houses": hotels
sometimes managed to wriggle out though flats were caught.
4. See article in BN, 14 Jun. 1867, p. 408, on French roofs, where
it says that though rooms in the roof might be cramped they were
better than no rooms at all and they were the only way of over-
stepping the height limits in the regulation for these did not
include roofs.
Building Act said that "the height of every external and party wall shall be measured from the base of the wall to the level of the top of the topmost storey," but interpretation of this was all a matter of semantics (is an attic in the roof really a storey?) and the pressure of vested interests.

As the years proceeded the official attitude hardened somewhat. In 1882 the Board’s decision went against F. T. Pilkington and his Army and Navy Hotel in Victoria Street, Westminster when he argued that the height was determined by the wall height. Permission should have been sought, it was ruled, to raise this building to 116 feet even though the parapet did not exceed the hundred-feet guideline. Permission to build over a hundred feet continued to be easily obtained however, and only two years later the Chairman of the Board of Works was telling the Houses of Commons that the Hôtel Métropole (sic) in Northumberland Avenue with its three storeys in the roof and a height from road to roof-ridge of 150 feet in no way infringed the Metropolitan Building Act. The question of just how many storeys should be allowed in a roof (irrespective of

1. 18 and 19 Vic., c. 122, Schedule I, preliminary section, clause 2.
2. No action was taken, however, as wall thicknesses exceeded the minimum as laid down by the 1855 Act for buildings up to 100'. See Bldr, 11 Feb. 1882, p. 178. It was built 1881-2 (see Archt, 10 Jun. 1882, pp 361-2). Its roofing was French. For a discussion of the design see Bldr, 30 Dec. 1882, pp 834-5. This hotel rapidly went bust, was auctioned with a view to being converted into flats (Bldr, 31 Jul. 1886, p. 184) but was taken over by a new company still as a hotel: renamed the Hotel Windsor, (see Bldr, 9 Apr. 1887, p. 554).
3. Bldr, 26 Jul. 1884, p. 118 - replying to a question tabled by a Mr Gray as to the safety of such buildings.
height) was a much argued one as well. The 1844 Act had sanctioned one only. The 1855 Act omitted this clause (doubtless an indication of the influence even at that early date of the newly fashionable French roofs). Bids to reinstate it repeatedly failed. Comparison was repeatedly made with the more stringent restrictions of continental cities. Not until the 1894 London Building Act was there any definite legislation on the matter: scared into action by the spectre of New York's sky-scrapers, Parliament decreed that no more than two storeys be allowed in a roof and that no building in the metropolis (excluding churches and chapels) exceed eighty feet from street to parapet, excluding, however, "ornamental towers,

1. "& 8 Vic., c. 84, Schedule K.
2. A bill to amend the act in various ways including this was proposed in 1870. The Bldr (18 Jun. 1870, p. 477) commented that "some of our warehouse and hotel designers will be shorn of the strength residing not 'in their hair' but in their roofs, by this Delilah of legislation". The one-storey rule survived in Liverpool in 1869, but the report of the special sub-committee of the Liverpool Architectural and Archaeological Society on the proposed amendments to the Building Act, 1869, remarked that the introduction of the mansard having shown this provision to be undesirable, it was now violated with impunity and would probably be omitted from the proposed amendment to the Liverpool Building Act. See EN, 30 Jun. 1876, p. 686, on Liverpool where it was ruled that an attic in the roof was a storey within the meaning of the local by-law.
3. See charts comparing height limits in different cities (65 feet in Paris): Bldr, 15 Feb. & 22 Mar. 1890, pp 112, 211. See also Francis Hooper on "Building control in Paris" (RIBA Trans, new series, V, 1888-9, pp 13-32; Bldr, 8 Dec. 1888, pp 409-11); Thomas Blashill's address to 2nd Art Congress, Edinburgh (Bldr, 2 Nov. 1889, p. 312); more statistics about Paris and Brussels (Archt, 15 Jan. 1897, p. 51). Kerr observed that in England the belief prevailed that the individual might do as he pleased so long as he did not harm his neighbour (RIBA Trans, new series, VI, 1890, p. 138).
turrets and other architectural features" - there was still some leeway.

The chief concern about very high hotels and blocks of flats ("Towers of Babel" as Hyde Park Court had been called\(^2\)) was the risk of fire. It was feared that available fire-fighting techniques could not cope with a blaze at heights in excess of a hundred feet. In the case of the Queen Anne Mansions Hankey managed to fend off the Board of Works' attack by pointing out that with the supply of water in tanks which he had installed beneath his rooftops (French of course) and the hydrants which were on every floor "the entire building could be drowned, so to speak, in case of need, in a few minutes"\(^3\). Even so, not only were calamitous fires

---

1. London Building Act, 1894, 57 & 58 Vic., c. 213, clauses 62 (storeys in roof) and 47 (height). An article headed "Monstrosities" (BN, 16 Nov. 1894, p. 667), said, "We are at present by no means anxious to emulate our brethren in New York, Chicago ... in the erection of huge skeleton buildings of steel". It regretted that the new law did not ensure also harmony of height and design. Somers Clarke, Jr., on the other hand, expressed his horror at the thought of a 70 feet limit in 1889: "We are but now escaping from the dreary and monstrous horrors of Belgravia and Bloomsbury, flanked by long lines of level-topped ugliness ..." (Bldr., 28 Dec. 1889, p. 463).

2. Bldr., 5 May, 1888, p. 317. It was very much regretted that the building regulations were so inadequate that the Commissioner of Works in his bid to check the abnormal height of this building was being reduced to the level of threatening to carry up a fence along the park boundary to obstruct its light in a bid to compel the owners to come to terms.

3. Bldr., 18 Feb. 1888, p. 128, in an article concerning the extension of the building to designs by E. R. Robson. The original part of the building had been designed by Hankey himself, ca. 1874, and was then "the loftiest and ugliest building in the metropolis" (116' in all, and 2 storeys in the roof). Other blocks associated with it to be 129' high and designed by Whichcord went up undeterred in 1877 (Arch., 28 Apr. 1877, p. 278). Anyway, Hankey's favourite hobby was fire-spotting which he indulged from a specially contrived chateauesque pinnacle on his nearby house until that itself burned down.
at the Pantechnicon and the City Flour Mills and other places in London very much in people's minds, but also the world had been shocked by the devastating fires of 1871 and 1872 in Chicago and Boston, responsibility for which had been placed squarely on the prevalence of steep mansard roofs of timber manufacture which had made these cities' offices and hotels into so many "huge tinder-boxes". Accordingly in new London edifices which employed these roofs, such as the Hôtel Métropole (invariably spelt thus complete with accents in contemporary accounts) every effort was made to render them fireproof, but they were still regarded with suspicion.

The Métropole was not popular for aesthetic reasons either. It was to it and the other two new hotels in Northumberland Avenue which The Pall Mall Gazette's irate correspondent had referred in the National Liberal Club controversy when he spoke of a "general

1. Archit., 14 Dec. 1872, p. 334. See also EN, 6 Dec. 1872, p. 439, on the Boston fire and the "reigning madness in architecture" in the United States for the mansard roof, "indiscriminately applied to houses of all shapes and patterns ..., without the least regard to the purposes for which they are intended". Many of the roofs rose 40' to 50' above the cornice and were made of wood. "I have before me," continued the correspondent, "a large folio of fine photographs of reconstructed Chicago, and incredible as it may seem, every costly building of the newly risen quarter ..., has for its crown or head-dress this soaring Mansard which a future conflagration may decorate in five minutes with plumes of flames". EN, 17 Nov. 1871, p. 379, reporting on the Chicago fire, had expressed a hope that the fire might have put a check to the passion for mansards "which has controlled the architectural mind of America for several years, and which has resulted in the most astounding medley of building abominations conceivable ...".

2. "The roofs are constructed of wood and iron with every possible precaution against the spread of fire, such as Parian skirtings, window linings, &c., the only exposed woodwork being the doors, and roofed for a greater part with zinc tiles." (Bldr, 30 May 1885, pp 777-8).
harmony of mediocrity" pervading recent building activity in the area. Great had been the speculation as to what should be built in this superbly situated thoroughfare newly laid down in the mid '70s after the demolition of Northumberland House. "Shall the architectural motive of the Avenue be uniformity or variety?" asked The Architect; might not the "undoubted grandeur of symmetry" be a nice change in London? - a chance to achieve something of the grand planning of Paris\(^1\). The Charing Cross and Victoria Embankment Approach Act demanded of buildings to be erected fronting the Embankment and other streets made under this act (which the new avenue had been) that their architectural elevations be submitted by the Board of Works to the consideration of the Council of the R.I.B.A., seemingly in an effort to ensure a standard of architecture worthy of the area\(^2\). But it proved a hollow clause: to submit was one thing, to follow advice was another, and great was the outcry when it was disclosed that although the design for the Hôtel Métropole had been thus submitted the Board had thought it unnecessary "to put the tenant to the expense of carrying out the alterations suggested by the Institute," since the plans for the building had already been amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Board's architect "who was himself then a member of the Council of

\(^1\) Archt, 25 Mar. 1876, pp 189-190. See also Archt, 19 May 1877, p. 316: rumour had it that both the M.B.W. and the R.I.B.A. favoured "some sort of Good Classical Renaissance"; Gothic and Queen Anne would be ruled out.

\(^2\) Charing Cross and Victoria Embankment Approach Act, 1873, 36 & 37 Vic., ch. c (Local and private acts), clause 30.
the Institute."¹ In May 1877 the Works and General Purposes Committee of the Metropolitan Board of Works recommended

"that the Institute be informed that the Board is unable to carry out their suggestion as to a uniform design for the whole street, but that the Board will take care that when the remainder of the property is let, the further buildings to be erected shall ... be in harmony with the plan submitted to the Institute when the same shall have been approved."² That it never was approved was the problem. Thus the apathy which had greeted Sir Charles Barry's scheme for Whitehall prevailed again.

Accordingly the press made a point of censuring the Métropole design. The interiors might be sumptuous but externally the building was "commonplace and the detail coarse."³ The Board's architect was J. Ebenezer Saunders; the other architects, as well as owners of the site, were the firm of F. and H. Francis. Building took place between 1883 and '85.

The same team had been responsible for the Grand Hotel on the corner of Northumberland Avenue nearest the Strand, built 1878-80, and also for the very similar building directly opposite on the corner

¹. Bldr, 19 May 1883, p. 686. The matter had been raised in the House of Commons, see Archt, 10 Feb. 1877, pp 83-4, on "The Institute and the Metropolitan Board of Works: Northumberland Avenue."
2. Archt, 12 May 1877, pp 304-5.
of Whitehall. The third massive hotel in the street was by Isaacs and Florence (1883-7) and was known to begin with simply as the Northumberland Avenue Hotel, but was re-christened the Hotel Victoria in honour of the Jubilee in time for which it was opened. These two teams of architects seem to have had a monopoly of hotel building in the '70s and '80s for both were busy in Holborn as well, Isaacs and Florence with the much publicised Holborn Viaduct Station Hotel (1873-7) and the Francises, in conjunction with Archer and Green, with the First Avenue Hotel in that vicinity also (1882-3). There was a great sameness to these mammoth constructions. The Grand Hotel with the grandest site of them all received the same severe criticism which greeted the Métropole. Nor was the Francises' First Avenue Hotel accorded any lavish praise apart from the inevitable accolade about the great splendour of the interior.

---

1. Built 1881-2. Illus. Archt, 6 May 1882, p. 280; ILN, 5 May 1883, pp 429, 434. Originally to be offices, but taken over as temporary premises by the newly formed National Liberal Club, pending erection of Waterhouse's permanent club. Re-arranged inside by F. W. Waller (Bldr, 21 Apr. 1883, p. 547). EN, 22 Apr. 1881, p. 452, published a similar scheme by Ingrams and Hollands for residential chambers on same site. Did the Francises take over their scheme?


3. See Bldr, 3 Sep. 1881, p. 296; 24 Nov. 1883, pp 683-4; EN, 30 Nov. 1883, pp 835, 844-5; 7 Dec. 1883, pp 880-2. An arcade or avenue ran through the centre of the building, hence the name.
They were vast, strung-out facades, relentlessly horizontal despite their great height, all the attempts to achieve variety by means of decorative string-courses and cornices succeeding only in making them the more fussy. In a paper on hotels and restaurants read to the Architectural Association on 31st January, 1879, Frederick Francis said the use of the mansarded pavilions at the Grand was to "somewhat take off the horizontalism of the facades". But they were mean little things, unlike the towering confidence of the Grosvenor's roofs by then twenty years old; and furthermore their impact was unnecessarily reduced by the English habit of recessing these roofs behind a parapet. This practice already noted at E. M. Barry's hotels, was the subject of a lengthy discourse which appeared in The Building News by Joseph A. Stark who described himself as a pupil of the Ecole des Beaux Arts and of Gottfried Semper of Vienna. The high mansard in the urban architecture of Paris was regarded, he stressed, as a continuation and crowning feature of the facade. It rose directly from the wall plane. To set it back some feet behind a parapet so as to leave space for a gutter (instead of employing the independent lead gutter used in France) was to destroy the effect. In a narrow street in particular this practice could only lead to a "box-like, set-on appearance"; but to increase the pitch of the roof in a bid to counteract the

1. EN, 7 Feb. 1879, p. 158; see also Bldr, 8 Feb. 1879, pp 155-6.
loss of effect only compounded the ugliness¹. Thus it was with the Métropole: the pitch of its roof is near the perpendicular in an attempt to counteract the fact of its being set back behind a parapet. Certainly the building as a whole remains ugly and confused, but an aesthetically sufficient proportion of roofing is visible from the narrow street below, which is not the case in Isaacs and Florence's Hotel Victoria, more elegant as a whole though that building is.

It was suggested earlier that the dull geometric grids which characterise hotels such as those by the Francises and the Royal at Blackfriars look forward to the geometry of modernism, once shorn of their fussy decoration; but men such as these deserve no credit for being forward-looking. The hint of this was first contained in the theories of Durand and had already characterised the original monster hotels of the High Victorian years. The critic who said that the Grand took its keynote from the nearby Charing Cross Hotel was probably not far wrong². The greater elegance of the Hotel Victoria arose from the architects' deliberate

¹. EN, 12 Mar. 1880, pp 322-3. A few months earlier he had contributed an article to Bldr (27 Dec. 1879, pp 1424-6) on "The salient features of Parisian architecture" when he discussed the French practice without the English comparison. He had commenced by saying that "the lively interest felt in Parisian architecture is so general and so legitimate that a further exposition of the subject will hardly need an apology." The argument about the roof as continuation of the elevation and the general failure of London examples to appreciate this was raised again (anonymously, but surely by Stark) in Bldr, 30 Dec. 1882, pp 834-5, with specific reference to Pilkington's newly rising Army and Navy Hotel.
². EN, 10 May 1878, p. 464.
bid to counteract this monotonous horizontality by means of giant-order pilasters. At their Holborn hotel they had somewhat dissipated the upward thrust of the giant order used there by continuing it the full length of the facade so that although spanning the three middle floors the giant order remained still a horizontal stripe. Nor did the roofs much counteract the prevailing horizontalit. There is a homogeneity to it all, however, which is not the case at the Grand or the Métropole. At the Victoria the huge pilasters are restricted to the three pavilions (there was no central pavilion at the Holborn Viaduct Hotel) so that the device has a more powerful vertical emphasis. There is a simpler, more forceful handling of form and decoration to the building as a whole than at the Francises' hotels, seen in the solid, rusticated basement; the vertical bowed strip in the middle above the main entrance; and the broken, segmental pediments above the main cornices in the centre, suggesting strange flying arches.

1. This hotel was built in association with the terminus station of the London, Chatham and Dover Railway (completed 1875). The hotel was illus. Bldr, 17 Jun. 1876, pp 591-3; EN, 15 Dec. 1876, pp 594-7, 605. The entrance to the left shows close debt to the Louvre. See also Archt, 10 Feb. 1872, pp 70-1; 5 Apr. 1873, p. 185; 20 May 1875, p. 322; 10 Nov. 1877; EN, 2 Jun. 1876, pp 540, 557. Another hotel with shops went up adjoining the Holborn Viaduct Station at the same time. This was designed by E. Evans Cronk. It was illus. Bldr, 5 Sep. 1874, pp 747-9: it was a very solid affair but with the inevitable French pavilion roofs. A cartouche on a dormer says 1873. Rather similar to the Issacs and Florence hotel was one by Peddie and Kinnear in Glasgow adjacent to the new central station (EN, 8 Jun. 1877, p. 564).

2. From Lefuel's Pavillon de Flore as at Holloway College, or Beauhesnil in Sauvageot. The original scheme (illus. EN, 2 Mar. 1883, p. 254) had to be modified when the promoting company went bust. Land was lost and the frontage had to be reduced. Details of the new design were different but the overall feeling the same: it was
Colossal hotels continued to be built in London at a startling rate by this newly mobile age. All were French to some degree. Only the Savoy departed much from what Pevsner calls the Giles-Barry tradition of hotel-building. It was a much more hesitant affair, usually said to be by Colcutt, 1884-6, its French roofs and dormers playing very much second fiddle to a seaside array of balconies. Its over-bearing neighbour, the Cecil, was something else again. If not quite the last gasp of the French Renaissance's monopoly over hotel design, this monster (designed by Perry and Reed) was at least the largest — not just in matters of accommodation statistics but in sheer eye-catching bulk. At last the Grosvenor roofs had met their match. A pair of colossal domes rose over the terminal pavilions, their size seeming all the greater for their

Footnote continued from page 415
illus. Bldr, 1 May 1886, pp 639-40; 6 Nov. 1886, p. 664, see also Bldr, 14 Oct. 1882, p. 492; 2 Jun. 1883, p. 757; 18 Apr. 1885, p. 569; 9 Apr. & 14 May 1887, pp 554, 753-4; EN, 27 Jly. 1883, p. 145; Archt, 28 Jly. 1883, p. 51. 1. Contemporary periodicals (at least) fail to bear this out. ILN, 26 Oct. 1889, pp 534-5, said it was by William Young; Bldr 13 Jly. 1889, pp 29-30, attributed it to the contractor, G. H. Holloway, "which is perhaps the reason why the building cannot be quoted as adding to the architectural beauty of London". Bldr, 12 Mar. 1904, pp 282-3 & 6 Jan. 1906, p. 13, similarly attributed it to Holloway. Colcutt certainly did some dixhuitième interiors and additions to the courtyard, 1896 (Bldr, 11 Jly. 1896; EN, 5 Nov. 1897), and completely recased the exteriors, 1904-10. 2. Built for Richard D'Oyly Carte of Savoy Opera's fame. Illus. ILN, 26 Oct. 1889, pp 543-5 (reproduced in Pevsner, HBT, pl. 11.43); Archt, 8 May 1896, p. 298; Taylor and Bush, Op. cit., pp 100-1, 134. In 1877 a design was published in EN (16 Mar. 1877, p. 264) for a hotel for this site to be called the Royal Savoy and Southwestern Hotel. The architect was W. C. Edward Ellis. To be linked to Duchy of Lancaster House by bridge over Savoy Street and to have truncated pyramid roofs, one with metal cresting crown à la Edinburgh (see also EN, 23 Feb. 1877, p. 209).
being so close together: the central section of the Embankment facade was scarcely wider than the pavilions themselves. This compactness and the clusters of giant pilasters on the pavilions gave to the Cecil an unusual vertical thrust, aided also by its situation, raised as it was on a platform built out, Adelphi-style, above the Embankment Gardens. The Savoy looked "like a toy" by the side of it.

The last of the great Victorian French-style hotels, the Carlton on the corner of the Haymarket and Pall Mall (where New Zealand House now stands), was no improvement upon the Cecil, with its cluttered decoration and obtrusive cornice slicing the building in two horizontally. Executed 1898-9 under the supervision of Isaacs and Florence but to the designs of the late C. J. Phipps, the Carlton shared a two-pavilion composition of squared domes (like that of the Cecil) with Her Majesty's Theatre which Phipps

1. Cf. proportions of Château de Montalivet-Lagrange (1610) illus. in Petit, Châteaux de la Vallée de la Loire.
2. BN, 19 May 1890, p. 646. The Cecil (biggest in Europe when built) was designed 1888, built 1890-6. Begun by the swindler, Jabez Balfour, before his crash. Built as part of a complex grouped round a private garden reached from the Strand by Cecil and Salisbury Streets (the land had belonged to the Marquess of Salisbury, Prime Minister of the day). Illus. Archt, 8 May 1896, p. 298, with the Savoy: "Photography cannot flatter and from the plate we publish it will be seen that the new building (Cecil) has more architectural character than some of its rivals". Illus. also Bldr, 20 Oct. 1888, p. 285; BA, 13 Mar. 1896, p. 182; Taylor and Bush, Op. cit., p. 121. See also Archt, 9 May 1890, p. 287; BN, 9 May 1890, p. 646; Bldr, 21 Feb. 1897, p. 148; BA, 8 May 1896, pp 327-8. A scheme for the Strand front (Bldr, 19 Oct. 1895, pp 276-8) was modified later by Joseph Sawyer and erected 1898-1902: only this survives today (illus. BN, 6 Jun. 1902, p. 809; BJAR, 30 Jul. 1902, p. 379). See also Bldr, 30 Apr. 1898, pp 425-6; 25 May 1901, p. 520; 6 Jan. 1906, pp 12-13. For the Palm Court by E. Keynes Purchase, 1912, see BN, 3 May 1912, p. 648; Bldr, 14 Mar. 1913, pp 321-5.
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had completed in 1897, only a month before his death, for Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree. The theatre inside was indebted to Gabriel's Opera Royal at Versailles. As for the interiors of the hotel, the Louis Quinze Palm Court opened the London career of the great Beaux-Arts partnership of Mewès and Davis. The hotel's manager was none other than César Ritz. The hotel which Mewès and Davis were shortly to build in Piccadilly for that famous maître de cuisine and by-word for sumptuous living was to eclipse all its predecessors for the elegance of its dixhuitième interiors. But this and the last of the Parisian hotels belong to another chapter.

CHAPTER NINE: Literature

"We have every possible facility for a study of the architecture of Europe, both ancient and modern alike, by personal visits and by innumerable books, prints and photographs, and we are living to some extent under the influence of the great, though too antiquarian, architectural activity of France," wrote The Building News in 1859. In order to revive an architectural style of the past or simply to use one as a jumping off point for something more original (which the theorists deemed more desirable) an architect might either do a lot of travelling first armed with a sketchbook and camera, or stay at home and look at a book. All the nineteenth century's revivals brought forth a crop of publications designed to make the task of the architect easier and also simply to gratify the very nineteenth-century foible for knowledge and accuracy. The French Renaissance Revival was no exception. Travel books with picturesque views which heralded a change in taste gave way to volumes of bigger and more carefully drawn plates. As the taste became established, details, sectional views and plans proliferated, and periodicals published lectures on the subject. By the Edwardian era, when Mewès and Davis were building the Ritz, huge volumes of photographs were being published and the first full-scale historical surveys of the French Renaissance were beginning to appear. Paradoxically, by that stage the Revival was nearly over. Historicism was enjoying a last fling with the taste for French eighteenth-century Classicism. But censure of the

1. EN, 22 July 1859, p. 665.
sketching mentality was mounting; the Victorian passion for picturesque historic details was being rejected at last.

The historicism of nineteenth-century architecture caused the profession much soul-searching. While it was recognised that copying was sterile and to be discouraged, there was an over-riding feeling that the past could not be escaped. When Philip A. Robson expressed the opinion that "architectural books should have more illustrations than text," in an address on "The architect's library", given to the Architectural Association Discussion Section in 1898, Heathcote Statham warned that

"rightly used (books) may be a means of stimulating the imagination. But they are painfully likely to lead the young architect, only to substituting other people's imagination for his own."

The favoured approach throughout the Victorian period was an eclecticism which sought to produce original amalgams of diverse and well-used motifs. César Daly's books were deliberately produced for this purpose. In his Motifs historiques he avoided illustrations of entire buildings lest the practitioner be led to reproduce in his work more of an historic chateau than an occasional detail:

"Reproduire simplement le passé, ce n'est pas, à proprement parler, faire de l'art, avons-nous dit; mais voir dans les combinaisons d'un fragment ancien le motif d'une composition nouvelle et l'en faire sortir, il y a là, dans une certaine mesure un acte vraiment créateur."

Daly expressed the hope that the motifs he offered with such careful detail in his book would be absorbed beyond recognition into the work of contemporary architects. At the same time he recognised

1. Robson in Bldr, 26 Nov. 1898, p. 485; Statham in Bldr, 10 Dec. 1898, p. 520.
the peculiar dependence of the architect upon the demands of the 
patron, which limited his freedom in a way less experienced by other 
artists. Thus he wrote also:

"Il faut, donc, que l'architecte, aujourd'hui soit familier 
avec toutes les variations et nuances qui ont successivement 
prévaut dans l'architecture durant ces trois siècles (depuis 
le commencement de la Renaissance). Qu'un client lui impose 
pour un hôtel le style Louis XIII ou le Louis XIV, qu'un autre 
veuille une villa en style Pompadour ou un pavillon Louis XVI, il 
faut toujours que l'architecte soit prêt à les satisfaire."

He published his books also, therefore, as an aid to the French 
architect to cope with the demands of public taste. In so far as 
a similar taste prevailed in Britain where the original French 
Renaissance buildings were rather less accessible, Daly's meticulously 
detailed books, it can be imagined, were here more useful still. They 
and other books of that ilk began to appear in the mid-1850s when the 
fashion was well-established in France.

Despite the interest in the French Renaissance in Britain as 
well, there were no British publications which achieved an equiva-
 lent standard in the mid- and late-Victorian years. In the early 
period of the revival (1820-40), on the other hand, what was 
published by British artists was of a higher standard than the 
French. The chief interest at that time was in French church archi-
tecture, but Cotman and Turner, and even more so Britton and Pugin, 
did bring to the few secular buildings of the proto-Renaissance 
period which they chose to record in their books of Norman antiquities

1. Ibid., pp 1-2.
something of the precise drawing for which the British had been famous in the second half of the eighteenth century. The taste amongst these and other sketchers such as John Coney and Charles Wild was so predominantly Gothic-oriented that the Renaissance (or proto-Renaissance) when it was treated at all was hardly presented as a model for modern imitation. Cotman and Turner gave more praise than most to various details of the domestic work they dealt with, and went so far as to remark of the Château des Andelys:

"As, comparatively speaking, good models of ancient domestic architecture are very rare, I would particularly recommend this at Andelys to the notice of every architect whom chance may conduct to Normandy."

Since they reported also the demolition of the chateau their advice was less than practical. Nonetheless, it indicated a different approach from that of their contemporaries. Eclecticism was not yet fashionable and the mixed style of the Renaissance was not acceptable to most. The Rev. Dibdin felt the Rouen Palais de Justice would not "bear the severe scrutiny of a critic in Gothic art":

"To say the truth, this style, however sparkling and imposing is objectionable in many respects: for it is ... neither pure Gothic nor pure Grecian - but an injudicious mixture of both."

1. Britton declared in the introduction to The architectural antiquities of Normandy (1828) that the book was directed at "the architect and man of science".
3. Dibdin, A bibliographical ... tour in France and Germany, 1821, I, p. 103. Repeated verbatim in Coney's Engravings of ancient cathedrals ..., 1832.
Joseph Woods, another architectural commentator, expressed interest in the French dormer in secular work in a letter written from Paris in June 1816. It had "a good effect" in Gothic work, as at the Hôtel de Cluny, he observed, but he added:

"I do not know whether it would be impossible to make the garret windows of importance in Roman architecture, but I have never seen it done successfully."

To him the Tuileries Palace was "abominable".

Early nineteenth-century French publications on the native Renaissance, though more numerous than the English ones were likewise rarely written with any intention of promoting the style amongst architects. It would appear that in the earliest days of the French Renaissance Revival the movement was at least as much a matter of historical and literary association as a matter of detailed architectural analysis. Just as the early days of the Gothic Revival produced a spate of lurid Gothic novels, so was the awakening of interest in the French Renaissance associated with the appearance of the novels of Alexandre Dumas. If the old chateaux attracted attention it was for their histories, full of anecdote and romance, rather than for any niceties of their architectural design. Thus Adolphe Bernier published in 1837 a book entitled Le Château de Pierrefonds, 1594, with chapter headings such as "Une mauvaise nuit" and "L'Orgie interrompue". The books of Louis de la Saussaye on Blois and Chambord allocated a little more space

---

to describing the buildings themselves, but again the main emphasis was on their illustrious owners. Illustrations rarely amounted to more than the odd small engraving, picturesque, but scant in detail. There was a market for this sort of product even into the second half of the century. The Abbé Bourassé, for instance, produced books on Touraine and the royal palaces in the 1860s and '70s. In his illustration of Malmaison the chateau itself is reduced to a column in the background as Napoleon takes his leave of the Queen Hortense. Jules Loiseleur's Résidences royales de la Loire (1863) was hardly better for all that the tiny wood engravings had their sources in Du Cerceau and Silvestre.

Tourism, too, prompted a dose of literature on the architectural monuments of France. Some dealt with a specific place or building, again as much concerned with history as architecture, as in the case of the Fontainebleau guides which Claude Denecourt produced at regular intervals in the 1840s and '50s, several being translated into English. Others collected together the buildings of Paris or elsewhere, not with any dominant concern for one sort of architecture or another but simply as a guide to tourists. Into this category fell two British publications which marked the growing interest in France in the second quarter of the nineteenth century:

2. Résidences royales et impériales de France, Tours, 1864; reprinted as Les châteaux historiques de France, 1876. He also wrote La Touraine: histoire et monuments, Tours, 1855.
A. C. Pugin's *Paris and its environs* (1829-31), and the later book, *France illustrated*, by George Wright and Thomas Allom (1845-7). The pictures are small and would have been of little use to an architect. Similar books had been appearing in France for years: Baltard and Duval's *Paris et ses monuments* (1803-5), for instance, and Legrand and Landon's *Description de Paris et de ses édifices* (1808).

Publications which related more directly to contemporary architectural endeavour were slower to appear. The taste for François Premier decoration in the 1830s induced Englishmen like A. W. N. Pugin and Charles Wild to sketch the old houses of Rouen and Caen, as we have seen. The Frenchman, Eustache de la Quérière showed a similar interest. Likewise, in relation to the Louis Quatorze taste in interior decoration contemporary authors produced various books of designs for furniture and fittings in this style. But here the need was not urgent, for the dix-huitième styles belonged to the recent past and had been recorded in innumerable highly detailed publications compiled by the artists themselves. Wrest Park is an example where we have ample evidence of the extent to which architects and designers of the nineteenth century had recourse to such pattern books: those of Jacques François Blondel in this case particularly to the fore.

Few other houses are so well documented in this way, but it was undoubtedly a wide-spread practice amongst Victorian decorators. Also revealing is David Bryce's book of tracings alluded to already. The Meissonnier fantasies which he copied may or may not have supplied the inspiration for Harlaxton's Baroque extremes.
The same artist's *Oeuvre* was the source of more practical tracings for wall-panelling, mirror surrounds and so forth, which very likely were incorporated pretty well unchanged into some Scottish interiors of the 1850s or '60s; just as use would have been made of the patterns for railings and gates, consoles and brackets, which he took from Blondel's *Maisons de plaisance* and Mariette's *L'Architecture françoise*¹.

Lord de Grey did not use such books only for the interior of his house. The whole building had its origin in Blondel's *L'Architecture françoise*, as has been seen. These eighteenth-century books, and more so those of the preceding century by Marot and Le Pautre, were of great use to designers of French Classical mansions and urban offices from the 1850s onwards.

Information concerning the book collections of Victorian architects is scarce. What little we have does indicate, however, that these pattern books were not uncommon in the libraries of the average architect. Bryce's library contained a fair collection of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century literature². The R.I.B.A. library copies of the *Petit Marot* and Antoine Le Pautre's *Oeuvres d'architecture* both belonged at one stage to T. L. Donaldson, executant architect of the Hope house in Piccadilly³. The Le Pautre

---

1. See above, p. 150. The sources of most, but not all, the tracings can be found in the above books. The parterres came from Mariette's *Oeuvres d'architecture* (copy at R.I.B.A.).

2. See above, p. 214.

3. His signature is inside the front cover of the Marot; the Le Pautre contains the inscription: "To my old & fast & most respected Friend Thos. L. Donaldson (signed) C. R. Cockerell, 1853."
was purchased by the Institute in 1897. The printed catalogues of the Institute Library indicate that even if an architect did not have his own copies of these works, a fair number of them could have been consulted at the Institute. In 1846, for instance, the library held copies of the Petit Marot, Blondel's *Cours d'architecture* (1771-7), and Patte's *Etudes d'architecture* (1755). By 1856 Patte's *Monumens à la gloire de Louis XV* (1767) had been added to the collection along with *Les maisons de plaisance* and another copy of the *Cours d'architecture*. *Le Grand Marot* had been acquired by 1864 and works by the Le Pautres and Mariette by 1868.1

By the mid-nineteenth century original copies of these works were old, fragile, rare and expensive. Not surprisingly, therefore, a need was felt for facsimile reprints of individual books or for collections of designs culled from a range of different works. Publications like L. G. Adams's *Décorations intérieures* (1865), which contained copies of designs by Berain, Marot and others greatly facilitated the Victorian architect's access to this sort of material.2 Even more necessary were reprints of sixteenth-century works. Less literature had been published in the first place and

---

1. R.I.B.A. Library catalogues were printed 1838, 1846 (with MSS additions to 1856), 1865 (with supplements to 1868, 1871, 1874, 1877). In 1889 a cumulative catalogue 1833-88 was published (with supplement 1898).
its greater age made it all the scarcer. Thus Hippolyte Destailleur's facsimile edition of Du Cerceau's Les plus excellens bastimens de France, which he brought out in 1868, was enthusiastically received. The Architect found it "of the highest interest ... a treasure of delight for the admirer of the Renaissance." Much applauded also was Destailleur's decision to incorporate into the second volume some rare plates, which Du Cerceau had excluded from the original work.\(^1\) With regard to Du Cerceau's work the British had some advantage over the French: a number of drawings executed for Catherine de Medici were held by the British Museum. How they came to be there is not recorded. In 1909 W. H. Ward reproduced these in facsimile under the title French chateaux and gardens in the XVIth century.\(^2\) Du Cerceau had also published his Livre d'architecture (1559) containing illustrations of town-houses. Add to these the works of Philibert Delorme\(^3\) and one has virtually the sum-total of the architectural literature published in the sixteenth century which might have helped the Victorian architect to a knowledge of the buildings of that era.

Few in number though they were, these books were of great importance as records of schemes which were never built, just as the Grand Marot contained many unexecuted ideas for the Louvre, and Antoine Le Pautre's Oeuvres contained schemes for vast palaces which

\(^1\) *Archt*, 20 Aug. 1870, p. 105.
\(^2\) See *Archt*, 27 Apr. 1900, p. 271, for discussion of them.
he did not have the opportunity to erect. More important still were the records these books contained of chateaux which had been built but which had been altered in subsequent years or demolished altogether. Thus, the Victorians' knowledge of the Château de Madrid derived entirely from Du Cerceau and a few later views such as that in Mariette's *Veies des plus beaux bâtiments de France* (1685), where the artist, Perelle, depicted the palace complete with periwigged coaching parties in the foreground.

Invaluable though Du Cerceau's books in particular were for information about the sixteenth century, the illustrations on the whole lacked the precise detailing to be found in their eighteenth-century equivalents. In those, plans, profiles, sections and ornamental details supplied the historicist architect with all he could need. When the taste for the sixteenth-century chateaux was fairly well established in France in the 1860s, therefore, a quantity of books began to appear, to cover this deficiency. Prior to about 1855 there had been very little available in this area, either published in England or France, as has been said. Of modern publications, one of the most useful would have been W. J. Miller's *Sketches of the age of Francis I*st (1841). The great chateaux of the Loire tended to supply a picturesque setting for scenes of jousting tournaments and hawking parties; but the architectural ornament was occasionally presented with a degree of detail which might have to some extent fired the imaginations of architects. One concludes, however, that accurate reproduction of sixteenth-century motifs at this stage must have depended upon personal inspection of the original chateaux. Fortunately accurate reproduction of old
buildings was not what was required.

Apart from Müller's book, there was only one other mid-century British publication concerning any aspect of the French Renaissance which can have been of much influence upon the architects of the day. This was Clutton's Domestic architecture of France (1853), which set out to provide architects with some new ideas with which to improve their designs, taken from the late Gothic, early Renaissance architecture of France:

"It is more particularly the object of the present work to draw the attention of the architectural profession to a phase of mediaeval art wholly distinct from anything to be found in the country, and to point out from the published examples certain principles in its construction and details which may, perhaps, be advantageously adopted in modern practice."

The text showed forcibly how certain aspects of early French Renaissance architecture tallied with notions which were already dear to the mid-Victorians, and was for this reason no doubt highly influential in encouraging the adoption of steep roofs, ridge creasing, finials, exposed staircases and so forth. Little credit can be given, however, to the illustrations. They are sketchy and imprecise, and surprisingly continue the tradition of including scenes of human interest.

The difference between Clutton's book and the new trend in France is very striking if one compares his work with its nearly exact contemporary by A. Verdier and F. Cattois, Architecture civile et domestique, 1855. The preface of this, too, indicated

an intention to demonstrate the relevance of the early Renaissance dwelling to contemporary building practice on grounds of the expressive qualities inherent in the style. Both books concentrated on small-scale buildings as being more adaptable to modern purposes than the grander chateaux:

"In the smaller country houses of the sixteenth century we have models that would suit remarkably well with all modern requirements and could with great advantage be made use of here,"

approved one reviewer of Verdier and Cattois¹. Some of the subjects treated in the two books coincide. For meticulous accuracy and detail the decision goes decisively in favour of the French publication².

The work of the Frenchman, Victor Petit, on the other hand, was undoubtedly popular amongst the architectural profession, despite having illustrations quite as sketchy as those in Clutton. Herbert Batsford, publisher of architectural literature, around the turn of the century, declared of Petit's Châteaux de la Vallée de la Loire,

1. EN. 7 Mar. 1861, p. 182. He continued: "The Hôtel de Cluny and de Latrémoüille in Paris, the Hôtel de la Bourghéroulde in Rouen, the Hôtel de Ville at Compiègne, are familiar examples of the style of work we mean, though to see its thorough adaptation to the purposes of modern rural architecture, the student must look out for examples in the villages and small towns through which he passes ..."

2. House, rue des Trois Pucelles, Tours (Plate 1 in Clutton) boasts a posse of archers in the yard. In Verdier and Cattois the same building (called "Maison dite de Tristan, Tours", v. II, between pp 120-1) has plans and sections shown. Cf. also Clutton, pl. 2 (Hôtel Chambellan, Dijon) with Verdier and Cattois, II, between pp 112-3 ("Maison à Dijon").
more than thirty years after its publication, that "it (would) ever remain one of the best productions of its time". Fifteen years later still, The British Architect found it worth while to reproduce some of the pictures from Petit's other important book, Châteaux de France. The greatest value of these books lay in the number of little-known buildings which they brought to public attention.

W. H. White, however, had only scorn for Petit's books:

"They have been published now a good many years," he wrote in 1873, "and the little influence they have had upon the designs of modern adapters seems to prove that geometrical drawings possess an advantage in a practical sense over sketches and perspective views."

He feared much more the new batch of carefully drawn volumes by French architects which followed the example of Verdier and Cattois. These made copying an easy temptation. Many, published by the Paris firm, Morel & Cie., were on show at the International Exhibition of 1871. The French publications put the products of other nations to shame. "Such books to the architect are invaluable. They are his main mental pabulum," enthused The Building News.

3. In 1890 a work referred to as Architectural studies in France, and said to have been first published in 1854, was reissued (was it Châteaux de France?). BA, 31 Oct. 1890, said its value lay "in its description and comparison of early French Gothic and in many out of the way examples which (Petit) brings to our notice".
Most prominent amongst these new publications was Claude Sauvageot’s *Palais, châteaux, hôtels et maisons de France du XVe au XVIIIe siècle* (1862-7)\(^1\). Nearly as well known were Adolphe Berty’s *La Renaissance monumentale en France* (1867) and the huge monographs by Rodolphe Pfnon on Fontainebleau and Anet\(^2\).

"The force of the Frenchmen lay and still lies in their metre-rule and their workmanlike habit of making geometrical drawings," White asserted with regret. "Thanks to them the recipe for ensuring success in a design for a modern English building has been rendered very simple: take a form of construction with which the London public are not familiar; clap innumerable slices of pilasters upon it; cover it with foreign architectural ornament of an un-translatable character and there is no school-board too exalted to hide its nakedness behind it."

Without a doubt he spoke with justice. We have already noted with what frequency details to be found in Sauvageot and Daly emerged in the last three decades of the Victorian era to adorn buildings, urban and rural, up and down the country. If a fair number of architects could boast copies of the French seventeenth- and eighteenth-century pattern books in their private collections, many more owned these modern publications - even men who were not particularly involved with the French Renaissance styles.

Robert Rowand Anderson, for example, owned a copy of Sauvageot\(^4\);

---

1. Usually said to have been published in 1867 but it was issued in parts, the first ones appearing in 1862 (reviewed in CEAJ, 1 Nov. 1862, p. 357) containing illus. of the Hôtel de Vogüé, and Châteaux de Pailly, Tanlay, and Ancy-le-Franc (i.e. parts of vols. I & IV).  
3. Archt, 13 Sep. 1873, p. 128.  
4. Copy now held by the Edinburgh Art College Architecture Library.
Arthur Cates had Verdier and Cattois as well as Daly's Motifs historiques; T. H. Wyatt had Petit; Hugh Stannus had Sauvageot. The Bryce library catalogue reveals quite a collection of modern French literature, including works by Sauvageot, Berty, Daly, Pfnor, Guillaumot, Calliat, Darcel and Rouyer, Petit and many more. The R.I.B.A. Library and that of the Architectural Association built up collections of these books too, the former enjoying a boost to its buying funds in the William Tite Bequest of 1868. Many public libraries would have held these works; and then, too, there was FABS.

The Foreign Architectural Books Society was founded in London on 11th February 1859. The aim was the purchasing of continental publications to be circulated amongst the members of the society, the books then being sold off at the end of the year to the highest bidder. The Building News found it a laudable scheme and urged provincial centres to form similar groups. The foundation members included Arthur Blomfield, T. Roger Smith, John Norton and Horace Jones. Other early members were Nesfield, M. D. Wyatt, E. M. Barry,

1. See Bldr, 12 Oct. 1901, p. 324, concerning bequest of books to A. A.
2. See above, p. 372n.
3. See above, p. 335n.
4. W. H. Picton, when reviewing Daly's Architecture privée (BN, 19 Aug. 1870, p. 132) said it was available "at the Free Public Library". There was also the Marlborough House Collection: see Ralph N. Wornum, An account of the library of the Division of art at Marlborough House, with a catalogue of the principal works, London, 1853.
5. EN, 30 Jun. 1871, p. 506.
Somers Clarke, J. L. Pearson, and Waterhouse. Norman Shaw declined membership. He could not even afford to pay his tailor, he quipped in a facetious letter to the secretary, C. F. Hayward; but wished the best

"for the success of the FABLIMBS ("Foreign Architectural Book Lending, Interchanging, Mutual Benefit Burial Society.")"

The first books circulated by the group were the Archives de la Commission des monuments historiques (which began publication in 1856), and Viollet-le-Duc's Dictionnaire des mobiliers français. Membership was kept at fifteen only. What began as a series of meetings for discussion of books, to be followed by light refreshments (punctually at ten), rapidly devolved into large dinners followed by light discussion. Outings for the group were characterised by much badinage and bonhomie. The influence of FABS was no doubt fairly limited. Even so, it provides an interesting example of one of the ways in which architects with a taste for the French Renaissance Revival kept abreast of the latest literature on the subject.

But, to return to the books themselves: what White most condemned in publications such as those by Sauvageot and Pfnnor was their falsification of historic models. They might be meticulously drawn but they were not accurate.

"Regret for the destruction of historic buildings is increased by the knowledge that chateaux like those of Madrid, Marly and others of the same kind, now demolished, can be reproduced upon paper in such favourable colours, without absolute detriment to portraiture," wrote White. The fact was, he pointed out, that many of the details included in Sauvageot's Palais, Pfnor's Fontainebleau, and Guillaumot's Château de Marly-le-Roi (1865) - to name the worst offenders - were "neither more nor less than the conceptions of living men". Eugène Millet's scheme for the restoration of St Germain-en-Laye to what he believed it had been like prior to its alteration during the reign of Louis XIV was served up in Sauvageot as if it were the genuine François Premier article. Even the chapel was there, which Millet had not yet begun to reconstruct. Similarly, many of the details to be found in Pfnor's Fontainebleau were executed, White pointed out, by MM Huber Frères, "the well-known decorators, under the direction of a Paris architect". It was as if Gilbert Scott were to include in a book of antiquities a picture of what he thought Westminster Abbey was like in the days before Hawksmoor and Wren. Certainly literature could be influential, White agreed: were it not for Viollet-le-Duc's "remarkable" Dictionary, "the noblest modern buildings would not wear their present aspect either in form or in detail." But such influence was not always good: less noble, he believed, were the newly modish Queen Anne and chateau-style buildings.

which he saw all too clearly to have their inspiration in Sauvageot's misleading manufactures.

Restoration of chateaux and cathedrals was in France during the second half of the nineteenth century quite as rampant as that which prompted William Morris to found his Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. Such projects supplied the British press with a liberal quantity of illustrations of ostensibly ancient chateaux. Pierrefonds, for instance, was much noted during the 1870s and '80s; Chantilly in the '90s. Thus what the British architect learned of the French Renaissance was to some extent received at second hand via the falsifying literature and the restoration programmes of contemporary France.

Contemporary French activities were, in fact, throughout the course of the French Renaissance Revival, a major stimulus. A taste for seventeenth-century France was induced by the new work at the Louvre; a taste for the compositional formula of the Paris Hôtel de Ville was induced by the rebuilding programmes of that building. Later there was the Opéra, then the Petit and Grand Palais, with their arrays of historicist detailing. With each of these new Parisian buildings there was published a highly detailed book of drawings to explain it all to the contemporary architect and recharge his tired battery of motifs. Lefuel's decoration of the private apartments of the Empress Eugénie at the Tuileries was rapidly consigned to print and engravings to further stimulate the taste for the

---

César Daly’s book on modern French design, *L'Architecture privée au XIXe siècle sous Napoléon III*, was, as has been seen, immensely important in its influence upon British urban designs for villas, flats, office-blocks and interiors. From the appearance of the first series in 1864, encomiums were heaped upon the book:

"There is no other publication devoted to the architecture of Paris that is to be at all compared or mentioned with this for accuracy and clearness of explanation ...", wrote The Builder\(^1\). Other less detailed books devoted to the modern architecture of Paris (much of it historicist as in Britain) there were aplenty however, even if less splendid in production. Those by Calliat, Normand, Delalande, Barqui, Leveil and Adam, were the most prominent\(^2\).

César Daly was acclaimed also for his *Révue générale de l'architecture*, a journal which he edited from 1840 to 1895\(^3\). For a brief interlude the *Révue* went into abeyance because of the Franco-Prussian war: Daly's very own house and garden were laid waste by the "invading Bavarians"\(^4\). The reception in Britain of the reappearance of this "admirable publication" was most cordial, The

---

2. See Bibliography B for these.
Builder inviting new subscriptions from amongst its readers\(^1\), for the Révue, it was felt, was

"the only journal of architecture in France which can fairly claim the highest rank of importance in regard to matter and manner of its contents and its illustrations"\(^2\).

British architects were certainly familiar with it. T. H. Wyatt subscribed\(^3\). Ernest Runtz presented thirty-two volumes of it to the Architectural Association Library in 1911\(^4\). It was strong on theoretical and technical issues, but less impressive for its illustrated material. *Le Moniteur des Architectes*\(^5\) and Victor Calliat and Adolphe Lance’s *Encyclopédie d'architecture*\(^6\) excelled it in this area.

---


3. See above, p. 372n.


During the 1870s and '80s The Architect and The British Architect seem to have had reciprocal arrangements with the Moniteur and the Encyclopédie for the exchange of illustrated material. Many of the best plates of modern French work and of the old chateaux appearing in British periodicals at this time derived from the French journals.

The architectural press played an important role in fostering the French Renaissance Revival. From the foundation of early journals like The Civil Engineer and Architect's Journal and The Builder in the 1840s right on into the twentieth century, the British press allocated space to detailed considerations of the building activities of the French capital - an honour which was rarely extended to any other continental city¹. Relevant lectures and addresses at the R.I.B.A or the Architectural Association were reported carefully. Occasional articles on aspects of French architecture were written especially for publication. Editorials praised the adaptability of the French Renaissance styles to modern needs. As the century wore on, illustrations of French architecture, both modern and old increased in number. Throughout the 1860s The Builder even used small emblems from Du Cerceau and Jean Le Pautre at the beginning of their leading articles, as an alternative to capital

¹. See the following: "An architectural note from Paris", by George Godwin, CEAJ, Dec. 1841, pp 406-8; "Parisian and London house-building", CEAJ, Sep. 1840, pp 310-1; Table of buildings erected in Paris in the nineteenth century, CEAJ, Jun. 1840, p. 203; and many regular features in Bldr in 1840s and '50s. In the 1870s and '80s Bldr ran regular features such as "From the banks of the Seine", "Notes from Paris", and later "Letters from Paris". Architect ran a series called "Paris notes". There were many more such in all the journals.
letters entwined with Ruskinian foliage. The illustrations of French historic buildings were often prompted by the publication of a new book or the restoration of a chateau. More frequently they were the fruit of innumerable sketching tours in the Loire Valley and Normandy for which members of the profession seemed to have an inexhaustible appetite. With the introduction of the new technique, photolithography, an artist's sketch could be reproduced with perfect accuracy instead of having to be converted to an engraving by another hand.

When Crossland was preparing his designs for Holloway College he measured Chambord "from bottom to top", as will be recalled. This did not, however, obviate the need to purchase a supply of the best architectural publications available in Paris. As the years went on the dependence of architects upon books seems to have increased. Few were the measured drawings of chateaux which appeared in the journals; many were the picturesque views. The eighteenth-century pre-eminence over European rivals enjoyed by British architects such as Stuart and Revett for their delineations of the antiquities of Greece had been lost to France. The Edwardians, no doubt rightly, saw it as a result of the Gothic Revival.

Young architects were all out for short cuts. A leading article in The Builder, 1889, indicated both the unwillingness of the modern architect to spend time measuring old work with the care and precision hitherto felt necessary, and also the beginning of the decline in the taste for highly decorative work:

"Must it be confessed?" the article began: "The Loire is rather disappointing ... when the sketcher goes forth to sketch, however much he may be delighted with the curious and the
beautiful, he undoubtedly hankers after the useful. Moreover, unless he has unlimited time at his disposal, he desires subjects for which an hour or two will be enough. But in these châteaux of the Loire he is sadly hampered by the carving."

The visitor has no time to sketch the carving, it was argued; but the châteaux were nothing without it.

By this stage, however, the camera was solving such problems. The art publisher, Armand Guérintet of Paris, was beginning in the 1880s and '90s to bring out his endless run of books and loose-leaf folios of photographs which treated in minute detail the historic buildings of France regardless of period. From the architect's point of view they were a mixed blessing. Reginald Blomfield wrote that

"the conditions of the study of architecture have been greatly altered and not entirely for the good, by photography. In recent years collections of photographs of historical buildings have been manufactured with indefatigable industry ... These collections are easily made, and with the help of paste and scissors large and sumptuous volumes can be turned out with the least possible difficulty."2

The latest one which had come to hand he noted included only the briefest of historical notes on the various owners and no reference at all to the architects. There was not a single plan or section to be seen.

The fact was that the mania to record and catalogue for posterity the architectural heritage of France was supplanting the desire to supply the architect with working models. Here is the

explanation of the fact that although the Edwardians were vigorous in censuring the old sketching tradition and had rejected the mediaeval and early Renaissance styles for practical work in favour of the serenest Classicism of the eighteenth century, their era none-theless filled its architectural journals with a torrent of illustrations of the sixteenth-century chateaux and other types of French architecture - more indeed than had been the case in the 1870s and '80s when the taste for these chateaux was at its peak.

In 1911 there was a more particular reason for this attention. At last the French Renaissance Revival, which had so absorbed British architects with one aspect or another for nearly a century, had found itself some chroniclers: not just one, but two. Serious historical consideration of the style had been sparse in Britain. Mrs Mark Pattison (later Lady Dilke) had brought something of the specialist approach to selected aspects of the French Renaissance, but the value of her work was drastically curtailed by the fact that she had ignored completely the royal building accounts relating to the sixteenth century despite their publication by the Comte de Laborde, two years before the appearance of her own first book on the subject. They were an essential source for an understanding of that era. General historians of architecture included chapters on

---

the French Renaissance as a matter of course; Reginald Blomfield had included material on the French Renaissance in his *Studies in architecture*, 1905. In 1911, however, appeared his enormously detailed and scholarly survey, *A History of French architecture from the reign of Chalres VIII till the death of Mazarin*, which he continued eleven years later up to the death of Louis XV in 1774. Also appearing in 1911 was W. H. Ward's only slightly less impressive *Architecture of the Renaissance of France, 1495-1830*. With these publications dabbling was replaced at last by scholarship. But by then the French Renaissance Revival as a range of working styles for the architects of the day was all but dead.

The influence of France continued for some years to affect British architecture, but in a way which had less and less to do with specific historic motifs (though Blomfield, himself, found it hard to break with the style of A. J. Gabriel whom he admired above all others). More and more, on the other hand, was French influence being felt in matters of planning and composition, as well as architectural education. To these issues, the details of this chateau or that were irrelevant.

Before dealing with these developments it will first be

---

desirable to look at France in its last roles as a source of stylisms, at the very end of the historicist phase in the story of British architecture: these stylisms were the Baroque which re-emerged in the last decades of Victoria's reign, and the Neo-Classicism of the reign of her successor.
A taste for the Baroque seems to have persisted just beneath the surface of Victorian architecture virtually for the duration of the queen's reign. Architects like Burn and Bryce and Lord de Grey at Wrest had on occasions displayed a fully architectural concern for the style, and at the time of Victoria's accession French Baroque and Rococo interiors and decorative shop-fronts were quite the fashion. By the end of the century the circle of nineteenth-century trends had brought all this round again, with the exception that the boom for Baroque architecture (as opposed to decoration) which began in the 1890s and continued throughout the Edwardian decade was on the whole a self-consciously nationalistic fashion: it was the Baroque of Wren, Vanbrugh, Gibbs and Archer in which the turn-of-the-century architects, with only the odd exception, were finding their inspiration.

The Continent, and in particular France, was however not without influence on the rise of this fin-de-siècle vogue. It was the Louvre again, and more especially the monumental Paris Opéra by Charles Garnier (1861-74), which kept the lantern of Baroque alight in the mid-century. As has been seen, Lefuel's Louvre made its primary impact on British architecture in terms of its three-pavilion composition and its very distinctive roof type: only occasionally (as in David Bryce's Bank of Scotland and Brodrick's Scarborough Hotel) was even half-hearted attention paid to the fantastically lush detail of the New Louvre's pavilion dormers. By the time Lefuel's three volume work on the Palais du Louvre et des Tuileries had completed publication in 1875 the climate of taste was changing.
Something of this has been seen in relation to the detailing of various French-style country houses of the 1870s. By the 1880s men like Stark and Lindsay were able to smother the standard Louvre compositional formula with a layer of Baroque ornamentation which might have been culled from Lefuel’s book and which more closely resembled in spirit the New Louvre than anything done in the 1850s. Equally lavish was the Louvresque design for a County Hall for London, devised by Ernest Runtz in 1889 for a grand site on the Victoria Embankment. More potent than the Louvre, however, as an influence on the advance of the Neo-Baroque was Garnier’s Opera. Nor was its influence purely a stylistic one. In the Opera, Gothic Revival Britain was confronted boldly by the Beaux-Arts principles of composition and planning. The work of Cockerell, Elmes, Gibson and the small group who continued through the nineteenth century to adhere to a similar Classic system of logical, symmetrical and axial planning

---

1. Admiralty design (see above, p. 400).
2. Corner of Temple Avenue, on the site used ultimately for the Metropolitan Asylums Board. The LCC had been newly established out of the old Metropolitan Board of Works and it was felt that this excellent site should be snapped up while still available. In the event it was decided to simply expand the old Board premises in Spring Gardens. For the later County Hall see below, p. 553; Runtz’s scheme with huge truncated pyramids enriched with acroteria and statuary and studded with oeil-de-boeuf windows, and the whole building arranged axially around a central quadrangle, was illus. Archt, 25 Jan. & 5 May 1889, pp 41-5, 253; 8 Aug. 1890, p. 83. A detail of one pavilion was illus. Bldr, 19 Sep. 1891, p. 226; received high praise (Bldr, 13 Jun. 1891, p. 467); and was described rather inaccurately as being “French Renaissance of the Francois Premier period, which finds favour equally with Classic and Gothic enthusiasts and allows of liberal ornamentation with both sculpture and painting” (Archt, 25 Jan. 1889, p. 45). See also Archt, 15 Mar. & 12 Apr. 1889, pp 154, 207. Cf. also Runtz’s competition design for the Sheffield Municipal Buildings, Archt, 28 Mar. 1890, p. 197, which is rather Opéra-ish.
had striven vainly against the tide of the Picturesque, but there was no ignoring the Paris Opera with its self-confident ebullience and monumental grandeur, rising as it was in the heart of the city which more than any other (even in the years of relatively bad political relations between England and France around 1870) had won the admiration of all for the splendour of its architecture and the vision of its town-planning. It was observed in a previous chapter how something of Beaux-Arts Classical symmetry of design was creeping back into favour in the competition designs for municipal buildings in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. It was not until the Edwardian era, however, that Beaux-Arts techniques of planning were openly aired as a desideratum of modern British architecture; but before dealing with this matter in relation to the Opéra it will be as well to dispense with that building’s stylistic influence upon the fin-de-siècle scene.

David Van Zanten has demonstrated how widely known the Opéra design rapidly became in 1860s France: the importance of Garnier’s agence for the Paris Opéra in these years cannot be over-stressed. Between 1862 and 1875 something like thirty-three thousand drawings had been produced for the project, worked upon by a very large number of the young men from the various ateliers of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. Although the building itself did not emerge from behind its

2. Including some English students at the Ecole, like Phéné Spiers (see Bldr, 21 Mar. 1913, p. 344).
scaffolding until late summer 1867, it was possible by that year to buy sets of up to 350 sheets of the lithographed designs. The effect, first in terms of motif-mongering and then in the adoption of the compositional principles of the Opéra, was immense in French architecture in these years, and something of this inevitably filtered across the Channel to England. Not only were the lithographed designs not unfamiliar to many British architects, and later Garnier’s book on the subject also¹, but English architects visiting Paris filled their sketchbooks with drawings of the new building². Further, the architectural journals published plentiful illustrations of the opera house, just as they had of the New Louvre a couple of decades before³. As the fashion spread around the world the Opéra enjoyed further publicity vicariously through the designs of its offspring (as had the Louvre before it) which in turn came to public attention in the press⁴.

². E.g. E. M. Barry. See drawings at RIBAD (04/23(1-4)).
⁴. Garnier’s own voluptuous Casino Theatre at Monte Carlo appeared in Bldr, 21 May 1881, pp 640-1. Theatres and opera houses around the world took up the style: e.g. Geneva (Bldr, 17 Jan. 1880, p. 67),
The Paris Opéra was to a considerable extent a highly original, yet distinctively French, reworking of French Renaissance features, largely derived from the Louvre, old and new, and the Church of St. Sulpice, with more than a touch perhaps of Italian Baroque, especially to its dome. There were the segmental pediments from Lescot's Louvre and the paired columns from Lefuel's; there was the arcading from Lefuel or the Rue de Rivoli, while Percier and Fontaine were clearly the source of the side fenestration. The sculpture was plentiful and rich, and the winged victories on the skyline were to echo on through the next forty years of Beaux-Arts Baroque. What most impressed the contemporary architectural world, however, was the way in which the exterior of this building so clearly and logically expressed the inner parts: vestibule, auditorium and stage in clear sequence beneath loggia, dome and gable, while the royal entrance to one side and restaurant to the other were indicated by lesser domes of their own.

The most startling homage to the Paris Opéra by any architect in Britain was to be seen in the scheme for a national opera house for London which was half built in the 1870s when the money ran out. Startling because it was a fairly brazen copy of the Paris original - which the press was not slow to point out. The project was ill-

Footnote continued from page 449

Prague, (Bldr, 10 Sep. 1881), Budapest (Bldr, 30 Mar. 1895), Rouen (Bldr, 14 Oct. 1882, p. 494), St Petersburg (Archit, 14 Dec. 1894), Stockholm (Bldr, 14 Oct. 1899) Vienna (Bldr, 4 Jan. 1908), Lille (Bldr, 16 May 1908) - to name a few which got publicity.

1. Bldr, 6 May 1876, p. 424, reviewing the R. A. Exhibition where the design was shown said, "It would be gratifying if one could find in this large building to be placed on what may truly be called one of the finest sites in Europe, and claiming specially to be the "national" home of lyric drama, something like a new architectural treatment; but
starred from the start. James Henry Mapleson, manager of the Italian Opera at Drury Lane and impresario behind the new opera house scheme, had had to apply to the Metropolitan Board of Works for permission to extend the Thames Embankment site (where Scotland Yard now stands) to include land which under the Thames Embankment Act of 1862 had been designated for the public use. When the ensuing competition for the design of the opera house was won by the Board's own architect, Francis H. Fowler, it looked like a private deal - which a certain Colonel Beresford took pains to insinuate in the House of Commons. Colonel Beresford objected in vain, however, and Fowler set off on a tour of the opera houses and the crowned heads of Europe. From the latter he received high acclaim for his proposed design. From the former he sought hints on how to improve the "safety, comfort, convenience, splendour or excellence" of his project. The initial design was altered accordingly and was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1876. Work commenced immediately: Thérèse Tietgens,

Footnote continued from page 450
we are bound to say that this is not the case. The main external treatment is ... too obviously traceable to the Paris Opera House ..."

1. Thames Embankment Act, 25 & 26 Vict., 1862, cap. 93, clause 26: all reclaimed land to be for the public use but to be maintained at the expense of the holder of the lease of adjoining property. Mapleson secured for his use 5000 sq. ft of this land and gave back in its place 2 narrow strips to be used as public lanes which were necessary for access to his theatre anyway and would have to be maintained by the taxpayer.

2. See Bldr, 3 July 1875, p. 607. What seemed particularly scandalous was that the extra land been part of the site from the start higher tenders might have been made than that of £3000 which the Board had accepted from a certain Mr Bulmer who had then sold his rights to Mapleson. The taxpayer had lost out again. For the full story see Bldr, 6 Oct. 1877, pp 991-2.

3. BN, 8 Oct. 1875, p. 405. See also Archt, 9 Oct. 1875, p. 197.

the famous prima-donna, laid the first brick; the Duke of Edinburgh
the first stone, and it was confidently hoped that all would be
ready for the next year's season. This it by no means was. By
September 1876 it had run into financial trouble and work had ground
to a halt. The next eight years witnessed a succession of forlorn
attempts to either resuscitate the idea of the opera house as
originally planned or to use the shell for some other purpose. De-
molition took place in 1884.

1. First brick: _Bldr_, 11 Sep. 1875, p. 829; _EN_, 10 Sep. 1875,
p. 739; _ILN_, 25 Dec. 1875, pp 626, 628. It had been hoped the
Prince of Wales would be available (Archt, 17 July. 1875, p. 38).

2. _EN_, 8 Oct. 1875, p. 405, expressed strong scepticism that the dead-
line of 2 May 1876 would be met.

3. _EN_, 15 Sep. 1876, p. 255.

Reports that when work stopped the
basement of Portland stone was completed, also the bases of the first
columns (grand tier level) were in situ, as were the iron girders
and columns for support of balconies. The general plan was apparent.

This all remained behind scaffolding and hoardings while Mapleson
tried to raise £40,000 (£80,000 had already been spent) to complete
the building, first as planned, then on a reduced scale (Archt, 11
Aug. 1877, p. 75). Several times it was reported that work would
recommence (Archt, 23 Nov. 1876, p. 290; 18 Aug. & 22 Dec. 1883,
pp 106, 393). Other schemes which came to nought were to convert
the building to a G.P.O. for the West End (EN, 23 Feb. 1877, p. 209);
a block of luxury flats to designs by Whichcord and to be called
St Stephen's Mansions: the site was very near the St Stephen's Club
(EN, 12 July. 1878, p. 42); a temple for the Free Mason Brethren to
designs by Matthew Wyatt and T. E. Archer (Bldr, 26 Aug. 1882, p.
285); a hotel (Archt, 15 Sep. 1877, p. 150; _EN_, 16 Nov. 1877, p.
501; _EN_, 15 Feb. 1878, p. 176; _EN_, 8 & 15 July. 1881, pp 43, 72
these last reporting a competition in which Fowler was obliged to
compete with all the top hotel architects of the day, such as
Florence and Isaacs, Francis and Saunders, Grüning, and Verity and
Hunt). In the end the shell was bought by "a company of capitalists"
(Bldr, 24 May 1884, p. 766) with a view to raising a series of resi-
dential chambers and offices on the site. The materials of the un-
finished opera house were put up for auction and removal in June and
fetched a mere £2000. In fact it was New Scotland Yard which was
eventually built on the site.
Perhaps it was this saga which made the editor of The Architect in 1886 describe Garnier's book on the Paris Opéra, recently donated by the author to the R.I.B.A., as belonging to "that class of goods which publishers call 'dead stock'". Another opera house such as Garnier's was now an impossibility, he argued, requiring the kind of government and society which had distinguished the Second Empire. Where London was concerned he was quite right, though he made an error when remarking that "that may account for the building being so little studied as a model". A succession of theatres in the 1890s and Edwardian years was to betray the Opéra as a major source for British playhouse facades. None but Fowler's lamented scheme had absorbed its lesson in planning, however - at least amongst those that were built.

The same newspaper, ten years previously, had very much praised the way in which Fowler's revised scheme had reflected the expressive and axial planning of the Paris building:

"The mass of the building shows a high block over the stage, in front of which a kind of rotunda, marked by a conical roof denotes the 'house' and blocks of building in front hold the staircases and saloons. This sensible treatment has been repeatedly followed since the example was set by the Paris Opera House, and has the great merit that the exterior exactly corresponds to the interior."  

1. Archt, 29 Oct. 1886, p. 250: "A few months since, some archaeologists visited the building just as if it were a memorial of a past state of things that could not return".

2. Archt, 25 Dec. 1875, p. 357. See also Archt, 6 May 1876, p. 286; BN, 2 Jun. 1876, p. 540 ("We cannot mistake as we look at this view the entrance and foyer, the auditorium, the stage and the official portion; each is distinctively marked, perhaps to the sacrifice of unity").
In this revised scheme some attempt to vary the Paris formula had caused Fowler to convert the "high block over the stage" from the pointed gable as originally illustrated, into a broad, squared mass, without visible roof, but with small cupolas at the corners. A general increase of ornament in the second design is discernible, with the central dome over the auditorium in particular taking on the feeling of the tent canopy over an Empire-style bed - as if made of richly flounced fabrics. The expense of land had, on the other hand, resulted in a measure of economy with regard to the grand entrance and reception rooms: not only were the stairs and grand saloon to be radically curtailed, but a grandiose scheme for the approaches with fountains and an opulent semi-elliptical colonnade framing the entrance had had to be abandoned: already the realities of commercialism were impinging upon dreams of imperial planning in a way which was to become all too depressingly common in the coming years.

It was insinuated just now that there were some schemes for theatres which were devised by British architects but never built, and which showed, like the luckless Fowler's design, something of the logical planning of the Paris Opéra. This was indeed the case. Usually it indicated direct connections with the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. H. L. Florence, for instance, who was to become so prominent an architect of French-style hotels in the 1870s and '80s, and who had studied at the Atelier Questel in Paris in the 1860s, won the gold medal at the Royal Academy school in 1870 with a design for a theatre which was very derivative from Garnier's paradigm: a high, gabled block marking the stage rises up behind the lower arcaded range of
lobbies and reception rooms across the front. A squared block re-
places the dome. The plans show the strongly pronounced axial flow
of Garnier's Opéra. The intention was that it stand isolated, like
the Paris Opéra, in a big public square "ornamentally laid out and
surrounded by important buildings". The Paris formulae, both of
plan and external treatment, seem to have been received via
Fowler's National Opera scheme in the case of the 1882 Soane
Medallion award design for an Academy of Music by Robert A. Briggs.2
Nearly thirty years later the same model was continuing to influence
student work, direct links with the French educational system no
longer being the rule. In 1909 Alick G. Horsnell won the Soane
Medallion at the R.I.B.A. schools with a scheme for a Shakespeare
Theatre. The detailing is of the severer Néo-Grec type rather than the
ebullient Baroque of the Paris Opéra, but outward expression of
inner function is achieved by means of the same formula. Two years
previously the Tite Prize had been carried off by another theatre
design. This time the author, George Drysdale, had some actual
experience of a Paris atelier. In so far as Drysdale's was a design
for an out-door theatre the Garnier formula could not be repeated,

1. A drawing was shown at R.A., 1871, and reported BN, 5 May 1871,
p. 338; illus. Archt, 22 Apr. 1871, p. 208. Photographs of the
original drawings of front and side elevations, plans and section
are held at RIBAD (Z1/14(1-4)). They employed Beaux-Arts techniques
of shading.
2. Illus., including plan and section, Bldr, 28 Apr. & 12 May 1883,
pp 568, 636. Briggs used the Loire-chateau style too: see his house
but the planning is clear and axial as in the Parisian manner, and the Opéra has been freely plundered for motifs and general feeling.¹

Much more commonly it was this sort of motif-plundering which preoccupied British architects who simply mocked up facades for their theatres comprised of Opéra details: two pavilions flanking a central range of paired columns, liberal ranks of small round windows, perhaps a dome or arcading across the entrance, was the usual format. Most convincing and opulent of this type was, however, not a theatre at all but another student design, this time by Hugh Stannus, for a nobleman's town house, with which the Royal Academy Gold Medal of 1875 was won. It looks a good deal more like an opera house, and no doubt indicates the influence of Phéné Spiers (with his Beaux-Arts training) who had been appointed lecturer at the R.A. schools in 1870.² As well as the Opéra the Louvre had supplied certain details, most conspicuously the use of bas-relief female figures draping themselves on either side of a window opening. Lefuel had used this on his pavilions, but it originated in the Lescot wing. There it was

¹ Illus. Bldr, 7 Mar. 1908, pp 278-9; discussed AR, XXIII, 1908, p. 126 (by A. E. Richardson) and in EA, 24 Jan. 1908, p. 55. See also Drysdale's very Beaux-Arts scheme for "a custom house on a quay" with which he simultaneously won the Soane Medallion (illus. Bldr, 22 Feb. 1908, pp 213-5). Both were discussed in Bldr, 25 Jan. 1908, pp 86-7. Other student designs showing Opéra influence include Claude Kelly's Art Gallery (BN, 7 Nov. 1902, p. 651); Frederic J. Horth's University Theatre (Soane Medallion prize, BJAR, 10 Feb. 1904).

² Seven drawings at RIBAD (X8/7(7-7)). Elevation of entrance facade is reproduced in RIBAD catalogue S, fig. 82. Phéné Spiers reproduced half of same (pl. 5) in his book Architectural drawing, London, 1887 (2nd ed., 1902), as an example of a drawing technique to indicate advancement and projection by means of light and heavy lines.
again at Daly's Theatre, Cranbourn Street, in 1891, combining with an Opera-ish format. That same year the Opéra was clearly also an influence on T.E. Knightley's Queen's Hall, Langham Place; and then in an impoverished, motif-mongering way followed a whole series of fin-de-siècle theatres similarly derived - especially those of W.G.R. Sprague like Wyndham's, the Aldwych, and so forth, on into the new century.

There was another formula which recurred a good deal at this time in concert halls, kursaal and entertainment pavilions, and which seems likely to have originated from a curious blend of the Paris Opéra or the Louvre with the glass domes of conservatories and palm houses. Characteristically it employed an immense, elongated dome or curb roof with squared ends, frequently studded with oeil-de-boeuf windows, and surmounting an elevation compounded of Parisian motifs. Thus H.L. Florence won a second award at the Royal Academy schools in 1870 with a design for a ball and concert room, where a single oblong dome rises above the entrance front where it combines with Opéra-inspired rows of paired columns and circular windows to lend an air of mixed opulence and frivolity appropriate to its function. A pair of small, hip-roofed pavilions terminate the

2. Illus. Eidr, 14 Feb. 1891, pp 128-9; Archit, 26 Oct, 9 Nov. & 7 Dec. 1894, including some rather Louis XVI interiors.
3. Domes of this sort had appeared also in Louis XIV architecture, especially designs by Antoine Le Pautre, as was remarked in relation to the Great Western Hotel which had one (see above, pp 81-2).
composition at each end. Around the turn of the century this formula was given fresh impetus by the vast, curved roofs of the Grand Palais, built for the 1900 Paris Exhibition and by Louis Bernier's Opéra Comique. Grand Palais, Opéra and Palm-house architecture combine with Neo-Grec detailing in Stanley D. Adshead's Royal Victoria Pavilion at Ramsgate, and in the vast Palace of Decorative Arts by John Belcher for the Franco-British Exhibition of 1908 at Shepherd's Bush.

If there was a tendency, then, to look to France, and particularly to the Paris Opéra, for appropriate models for various types of theatres and venues of entertainment, there was an equal tendency to decorate the interiors of such establishments in the styles of the French eighteenth century. These offered plenty of scope, ranging from riotous Rococo to the severest Empire style. When reviewing...

1. R. A. Travelling Studentship Award, 1870. Photo of main elevation at RIBAD (Z1/13). This was illus. BJ, 17 Feb. 1895, p. 291, where it is called a "Banqueting Hall".
4. Also debts to the distinctive Petit Palais arched entrance whose influence will be discussed later. Belcher's was a temporary building made of fibrous plaster over a steel framework. It was originally to have been the Horticultural Hall but its function was changed. It was illus. EN, 22 May 1908, p. 741. An entrance arch and loggia for the exhibition, also by Belcher and elegantly reminiscent of the formal colonnades at Nancy, were illus. BA, 4 & 25 Sep. 1908. Interestingly, Belcher applied the big, curved roof with distinctly French air to an actual conservatory: the winter garden at Williamson Park, Lancaster, behind his monumental Ashton Memorial (BA, 12 Jul. 1912, pp 23, 34).
these interiors the critics rarely failed an allusion to such artists as Watteau, Boucher or Delafosse. Gold was the essential last touch to rich harmonies of porcelain tints - turquoise, cream, ivory, rose du Barry.

The reasons for regarding the Rococo as particularly appropriate for theatres are not hard to find. The paintings of Watteau and Lancret, Pater and Fragonard are populated with Commedia dell' Arte harlequinades and fêtes galantes. Besides, the styles of the Louis were enjoying a resurgence in interior decoration of town and country houses also during the final decades of the nineteenth century, especially amongst the more conservative, rich, good-living section of

---

1. The following were illus. in the the press: Pavilion Theatre, Mile End, by Ernest Runtz (Louis XVI), Archt, 15 Feb. 1895; Victoria Hall, Geneva (fantastic Rococo), Archt, 7 Dec. 1894; Alhambra, Blackpool, by Oswald C. Wyelson and Charles Long (fussy Louis XVI), Archt, 21 July. 1899; Imperial Theatre, Westminster, by Frank T. Verity for Lily Langtry (Empire style), Archt, 6 Sep. 1901; Grand Theatre, Fulham (Rococo) and the Coronet (now the Gaumont), Notting Hill (Louis XVI), both by Sprague, Archt, 22 May 1903; Aldwych (Louis XVI) by Sprague, Archt, 15 Nov. 1907; New London Pavilion, Shaftesbury Ave., by Wyelson and Long (Louis XV), AR, VIII, 1900, pp 251-2; Wyndhams, Charing Cross, by Sprague (Louis XVI), AR, VI, Dec. 1899, p. xxvi; Apollo, Shaftesbury Ave., by Lewen Sharp (Louis XIV), BA, 22 Feb. & 1 Mar. 1901; Waldorf, by Sprague (Louis XIV), BJAR, 21 Jun. 1905; Camden, by Sprague (Louis XVI), BJAE, 23 Jan. 1907; Avenue Theatre (The Playhouse), Charing Cross, begun by Fowler but largely destroyed before completion by the collapse of part of the adjacent station, but completed by Blow and Billerey with paintings "in the manner of Watteau" and ornament by French artists "called over for the purpose, in the style of Delafosse" (AR, XIX, 1906, pp 30, 36-7); Hippodrome (decoration by T. Duncan Rhind, "Watteau style"), Bldr, 9 Jan. 1914, p. 41; London Opera House, Kingsway, by Bertie Crewe (Louis XVI), Archt, 8 & 15 Dec. 1911; Theatre decor (Louis XV) by J. Parly, Bldr, 10 Jan. 1891, p. 31, and interior also by Parly (BN, 25 Feb. 1887, p. 274) said to have been executed by the Plastic Decoration Co. in a design (Louis XVI) "similar to that of various rooms which the company has recently carried out in houses in the West End"; Lyceum Theatre Sheffield, by Sprague (Rococo), Archt, 29 May 1903.
the public. The *Architect*, a not very progressive journal, could almost be said to have specialised in illustrating the sumptuous, mock eighteenth-century interiors which were proliferating in the 1890s, drawing much of the time upon the work of the fashionable society photographer, Bedford Lemere ¹, and including even examples, such as Stafford House, of the earlier vogue for the Louis Quatorze ².

One house with lavish French decor for which the editor of *The Architect* appears to have had a special passion was Alfred Charles de Rothschild's Halton House, Bucks ³.

The Rothschilds were an international and much inter-married family; but the relations between the French and British branches seem to have been particularly close ⁴ and the role of the British

---


4. See genealogy, Appendix C. See also Cecil Roth, *The magnificent Rothschilds*, 1939. Though this connection, as has been seen, Paxton and Stokes had acquired commissions with members of the French branch; Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, though originally of the Viennese branch, spent much of his time in France and had actually been born there. The marriage of one of his sister's daughters into the French branch brought the succession of the Waddesdon estate to Baron James de Rothschild of Paris, who left them to the National Trust.
Rothschilds in the fostering of the French eighteenth-century taste in interior decoration and objets d'art was not inconsiderable. Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild of Waddesdon saw it as very considerable indeed, and in his family pride somewhat over-stated the matter:

"It is true that in one respect my family have assisted in developing a new departure," wrote the baron in his Reminiscences. "From the fall of the old regime in France, until the beginning of the Second Empire the style of internal decoration of French houses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was contemned and ignored. In England the early Italian, the Queen Anne, or no style, had long been preferred ... It was lavish or simple, often its merits were great, but the decoration was never "French". In France the style of decoration remained French, but it was a bastard nineteenth-century style, graceless and tasteless, borrowing hardly a single feature from its predecessors. Whether it is to the credit of my family or not may be a matter of opinion but the fact remains that they first revived the decoration of the eighteenth century in its purity, reconstructing their rooms out of old material, reproducing them as they had been during the reigns of the Louis, while at the same time adapting them to modern requirements."

Elsewhere Rothschild did redress the balance, acknowledging the role played first by King George IV, and then by the 4th Marquess of Hertford, in introducing the taste for the French decorative arts in the first half of the century. But if the Rothschilds were not first they were still frequent patrons of the French eighteenth-century arts. Twenty-five years before the brothers-in-law Ferdinand and Alfred de Rothschild were fitting out their Buckinghamshire chateaux with dixhuitième interiors, three of their uncles had

been active francophiles in the 1850s. Meyer Amschel de Rothschild had decked out Mentmore House, also in Buckinghamshire, 1852-4, with genuine eighteenth-century French boiseries from various Parisian hôtes as well as with some very skilful imitation dixhuitième panelling, while Sir Anthony de Rothschild of Aston Clinton, Bucks, and Baron James de Rothschild, of Paris, were prominent buyers of French furniture and porcelain at the sale of the Bernal Collection at Christies in 1855. Ten years even before this Sir Charles Barry had noted in his diary: "Visited Baron Rothschild's house in Grosvenor Place to inspect works executed by Mon Bix (?) of Paris." This was Sir Anthony's house.

But with this example we are back into the early phase of the Louis Quatorze Revival when the taste was being fired by the influx of furniture which accompanied the refugees of the revolutions in France. The fact is that from that time onwards for nearly a hundred years the taste for the styles of the Louis in interior decoration never really went out of fashion. There were fluctuations of

---

1. The house itself was by Paxton and Stokes in a fine imitation of the Elizabethan prodigy houses. Paxton presumably did not have too much to do with the interior decor for he wrote to his wife, Sarah, with amazed appreciation on the occasion of a visit, 11 Mar. 1860 (Paxton MSS, Chatsworth, Letter, no. 1511): "I... went to dine and sleep at Mentmore. You never saw anything half so gorgeous as the fitting up there". Hitchcock (EVA, pp 242-3) says the dining room boiseries came from the Hôtel de Conti, Paris. Looking-glasses came from the Hôtel de Villars. Much of the rest had been done by Parisian workmen. On the collection of French objets d'art see the Mentmore sale catalogues, Sotheby, Parke, Bernet & Co., 1977.
3. Charles Barry, Desk diary 22, 3rd May 1845. Held at RIBAD.
emphasis between the coils of Rococo and the purer Classical modes or the heavier Baroque; there were challenges from Eastlake Gothic, William Morris, Japan, and Art Nouveau, but the French styles tended to re-emerge every decade or so, and the clients were always the same. It was not a matter of popularity amongst the upper or the middle classes as such, but amongst the bons vivants. Whereas the "Aesthetic" and Art Nouveau styles found favour chiefly amongst an intellectual and artistic elite, the French Rococo taste appealed to a conservative, anti-intellectual and immensely rich section of society, regardless of the origins of their money. J. Moyr Smith, interior decorator and contemporary critic, is instructive on the sort of people who were patronising the style in the 1870s and '80s. Writing in 1887 he names old families and the Rothschild world in fairly equal numbers. After describing the French decor by William Young at Earl Cadogan's London mansion, Chelsea House, he continues that

"some very fine specimens of the French style of decorating drawing-rooms have been executed by Messrs. Felix and Wayman for the Princess Louise, Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, Mrs. Montefiore, Mr. Cyril Flower, Countess of Pembroke and others."
Elsewhere he remarks that the nobility had shown a marked preference for the French Renaissance decoration in their drawing rooms (while excepting the owners of Eaton Hall and Cardiff Castle); but clearly the industrialist nouveau-riche liked the style too. This is the world which George de Maurier satirized in his cartoons for *Punch*. It is the world of the munificent hosts, Sir Gorgius Midas and Mrs Lyon Hunter.¹

As in the 1830s the critics did not approve. The Rococo was a form-concealing style and therefore bad. Terrible was the obloquy hurled upon it: Eastlake held it to be "bad and vicious in principle"²; Mrs Orrinsmith's book on the drawing room compared the French taste unfavourably with that of "uncivilised races"³; while Mrs Haweis considered so vulgar a language of "tints and trimmings" as "far from being desirable - perhaps even possible - in clean English society as it is destructive of the healthy balance on which real beauty hangs."⁴

Footnote continued from page 463

Rothschild, Sir Anthony's wife (who was also his cousin) was Louisa Montefiore. Moyr Smith probably refers to her sister-in-law, Mrs Joseph Meyer Montefiore of Worth Park and Tortington House, Sussex (see Appendix C).

¹. See George du Maurier, *English society at home*, London, 1880; and *Society Pictures*, London, 1891. There is a very telling cartoon in the latter collection (v. II, p. 68) entitled "The lamentable result of insisting on strict silence during the performance of good music" - pianist and singer perform valiantly before an array of empty Louis Quinze chairs.


There were distinct fluctuations as to the exact nature of this taste during the latter half of the nineteenth century. After the success and debacle of the Great Exhibition of 1851 where, as has already been noted, the standard of design of that epoch-making display had been universally deplored, the dominance of early Victorian Rococo extremes was observed somewhat to decline. Amongst porcelain manufactures an alternative to the flower-encrusted Rococo was seen as early as the 1840s in the cleaner lines of imitation Sèvres ware being made at Derby. Factories foremost in the production of this sort of porcelain were Minton's (where French artisans were employed) and Coalport under the direction of W. F. Rose, who paid great attention to exact reproductions of eighteenth-century colours and decorations. Characteristic Sèvres shades such as bleu de roi and rose pompadour (which the nineteenth-century called rose du Barry due to some confusion of mistresses)\(^1\), were much imitated with considerable success, though this mock Sèvres ware betrays its true age by its brassy, mercuric gilding. By the time of the 1862 London Exhibition this taste for the more Classic style of Louis XVI had (along with the earlier Renaissance styles of Italy or France) to a considerable extent supplanted the despised Rococo of the Great Exhibition in furnishings as well as porcelain and silver. But even this development was not greeted with much enthusiasm by

---

\(^1\) Probably related to the Victorians' obsession with decapitated queens: on Marie Antoinette see below, p. 498. See also Roy Strong, *And when did you last see your father? The Victorian painter and British history*, London, 1978, pp 122-135, on Lady Jane Grey and Mary Queen of Scots.
the intelligentsia. John Stewart in the 1862 Art Journal Catalogue wrote of the Louis Seize vogue that

"after all that can be done for it by genius and gold, it has a meretricious tafe' aspect, destructive to the worthy realisation of elevated magnificence. Like a common-looking woman sparkling in gold and finery, this Louis XVI style wants the quiet power of refined dignity and seeks to make up with glitter what it wants in grandeur and repose. Still it is a good step forward upon the style of Louis XIV, which was that so prominent in 1851; and had the nations, and especially England, made no further progress it would have been ample cause for legitimate congratulation. But we have gone far beyond that ..."

And so some of them had: the first designs of Morris and Co. appeared at the 1862 Exhibition. By the 1868 Exhibition at Paris George Sala felt able to celebrate "the all but complete absence ... of furniture in the cumbersome, gaudy and tasteless styles prevalent during the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV and the whole of that of Louis XV."

Gone was "the bric-à-brac of (that) lying, impudent, worthless age"².

The Louis Seize style was by no means gone in these years, however, and such was the vying for the Sèvres vases at one auction in 1876 that the choicest piece was "smashed to fragments"³.

The taste for the relative simplicity of the Louis Seize in the 1860s and '70s can be seen partly as a natural reaction against the extremes of ornamentation to which the Louis Quatorze and Louis Quinze

had latterly succumbed, and partly as a direct result of the influence of the Empress Eugénie, herself. Her passion for Marie Antoinette was widely known and it was at her instigation that much of the Palace of the Tuileries was redecorated in the '60s by Lefuel in a sumptuous version of Louis Seize

It must be admitted, however, that between the imported French boiseries of Mentmore in the 1850s and those of Waddesdon in the '80s there was a pronounced decline in the vogue for fitting out whole interiors after the French eighteenth-century styles. The rich Rococo of Montagu House, decorated in the early 1860s represented the culmination of William Burn's career which had its roots back in the first flourishing of the revived Rococo fashion in the 1820s and '30s. Occasional Louis XVI interiors, such as the twin drawing rooms at Brodsworth Hall, Yorks, were executed in the 1860s; and certainly there was the outrageous punch of the Cafe Royal in Regent Street, whose heavy Louis XIV Rococo seemed to look back to the Wrest Park conservatory and the Harlaxton stair; but the esprit and conviction

---

1. Lefuel's interiors were published in vol. III of his book, Palais du Louvre et des Tuileries, 1875; also in Eugène Rouyer, Les appartements privés de S. M. l'Impératrice au palais des Tuileries, décorés par M. Lefuel, Paris, 1867. Ferdinand de Rothschild pointed out that it was at the Tuileries that Napoleon III entertained all distinguished English visitors, "whence they carried away an impression of a splendour that would have been crushing but for its refinement ..." (19th Cent. Review, Mar. 1892, p. 389).

2. See Girouard, VCH, pp 112-5, and pl. 219, 225.

3. By the then unheard-of team, Archer and Green, for Daniel Nicolas Thévenon, alias Nicol, alias de Nicol. Opened 1865. Patronised by clients as various as the Prince of Wales and Oscar Wilde. It was a Rococo extravaganza with copious mirrors flanked by voluptuous, female, termini caryatids. See Nicholas Taylor, "Rococo grill room", AR, April 1965, pp 307-311; Guy Deghy and Keith Waterhouse, Cafe
of the thoroughly French Rothschild interiors at Waddesdon and Halton, executed in the 1880s did to a considerable extent mark the inauguration of a new phase in the appreciation of the French decorative styles.

That there had been a decline in the popularity of the Rococo style in particular during the ascendancy of the Gothic Revival is only to be expected and Ralph Nicholson Wornum's attack upon the standard of design at the 1851 Exhibition is illuminating when considered in light of his close friendship with Ruskin. Wornum, who was lecturer in art at the Government School of Design and Keeper of the National Gallery, inveighed against the intolerable Louis Quatorze:

"The very nature of this style offers a premium to the neglect of detail; those practising it therefore soon neglect everything of the kind and thus the whole province of ornament is degraded."

It was Ruskin, of course, and the apologists of the Gothic Revival who offered premium to detail, often at the expense of total conception (for which in the Beaux-Arts years of Edwardianism they incurred much censure) so that it was not surprising that a style such as the Rococo, where the emphasis is so roundly placed on a

Footnote continued from page 467
Royal, London, 1955. The extravagances of Rococo were always more acceptable in restaurants, hotels and theatres than in the private house - which explains Stewart's remark about a "cafe aspect": it is only surprising that it was the Louis XVI rather than the Rococo style to which he referred. T. Verity's Criterion was another example of this sort of decor in the 1870s in a restaurant and theatre.
1. R. N. Wornum, "The Exhibition as a lesson in taste" in Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue: the industry of all nations, 1851, London, 1851, p. VI***. The lesson was that there was much to be unlearned. It came from France.
unified conception of space and over-all effect, should find few champions in these years. Conversely, this also explains the style's resurgence in the more Classicizing '80s and '90s. Furthermore, the Rococo was not only an apt interior counterpart for Beaux-Arts exteriors where unity of conception was paramount (though Louis Seize was to become more popular) but, as Tschudi Madsen has shown, it was also a major source of Art Nouveau. That style took from Rococo not only its love of balanced asymmetry, its linear play and pastel colours, but also its concern for total spatial effect. One has only to compare the work of Gaudi with the architectural fantasies of J. A. Meissonnier to see the link. Nineties dilettantes felt an affinity with the stylish and elegant world of the fête galante. Not surprisingly Aubrey Beardsley responded spontaneously to the earlier period, creating his superb pastiche Rococo illustrations for The Rape of the Lock and Under the Hill.

By the late 1870s the fortunes of the French Rococo taste were certainly rallying. In the report of The Architect in 1878 that "English taste has set entirely away from French design ... of the thousands of Christmas and New Year presents bought this winter almost all were oriental," there is a ring of special pleading. The early 1870s had witnessed

2. Archt, 2 Feb. 1878, p. 59. Ironically the Japanese by this stage were hard at work reproducing fake French porcelain themselves.
the bringing to England of two extensive collections of French eighteenth-century paintings and furnishings which would not have been without influence on the public taste. Both were ultimately left to the nation and both were amassed by francophile Englishmen who had lived much of their lives in Paris. One of these was the collection of John and Josephine Bowes for the housing of which they had embarked on the erection of the Bowes Museum at Barnard Castle. The other was the collection of Sir Richard Wallace, inherited from his father, the 4th Marquess of Hertford, and which survives today as the Wallace Collection, Manchester Square, London. From 1872-5, while Hertford House was being prepared to receive it, much of the latter collection was put on display at the Bethnal Green Museum where it proved highly popular with the public, attracting an estimated five million visitors. The Bowes Collection, formed in France in the 1850s and '60s, was the less discriminating of the two, but it did include much high-quality Louis Quinze furniture and a fine collection of porcelain, particularly St Cloud and Chantilly. The Wallace Collection, on the other hand, had then (as now) no rival in Britain for its array of paintings by Watteau, Fragonard, Boucher, Lancret, and others of the eighteenth-century French school.

2. The display at Bethnal Green was described in a series of articles in BN, XXIII, Jly-Dec. 1872, pp 2, 21, 55, 95, 115; and in Bldr, 13 Jly. 1872, pp 538-540. The collection was opened to the public, 1900 (see Archt, 22 Jun. 1900, p. 393).
3. Made especially for the Bowes's French house, the Château de Louveciennes, sometime abode of Mme du Barry.
though its French furniture was soon to be closely paralleled in both quantity and quality at Waddesdon. The Wallace Collection was the work of several generations of the Hertford family, a number of whom had spent much time in France. Lord Yarmouth, later 3rd Marquess, has been mentioned previously for his role as friend and advisor on matters of taste to King George IV and also to Lord Stuart de Rothesay of Highcliffe Castle. Some of the French furniture and porcelain in the Wallace Collection was amassed by him, along with Dutch, English and Renaissance painting; but it was his son, the 4th Marquess, who was responsible for giving the collection its strong French bias. In the field of French painting the latter was something of a pioneer, for his first recorded purchase on the open market (Fragonard's *The schoolmistress*) was made in 1841, and his collecting was at its height between 1848 and 1861. Only George IV, of those who preceded Lord Hertford in the collecting of French furniture, could be said to have equalled his enthusiasm (though there were many who were interested), but the collecting of paintings of the French school remained throughout the nineteenth century the activity of a select few. Nobody appears to have anticipated this interest, and, of those who followed the marquess, the builders of French chateaux preferred contemporary English and French academic painting, anecdotal and sentimental. Not even the Rothschilds who

2. E.g. the sale of the collection of Henry Bolckow of Marton Hall (see above, p. 284n) at Christie's, May 1891, revealed a taste for Landseer, French academic moderns like Gerôme, Troyon, Rosa
did have a taste for the French school equalled him for discrimination and single-minded devotion to the period. It is significant that Sir Richard Wallace (who continued to build up his father's collection) was able to acquire Fragonard's Portrait of a boy as Pierrot for only £913 10s 0d while being obliged to pay £7000 for a Landseer.

Clearly, then, there were only a very few who were involved enough in the French eighteenth-century taste to embrace it in all its aspects. Nonetheless, the impact of the Bowes and the Wallace Collections (particularly the latter) must have been very considerable in encouraging a renewed interest during the 1870s in the furniture and the decorative arts of eighteenth-century France. This was to be rapidly endorsed by the publication of Albert Jacquemart's
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Bonheur. There was one Watteau, however (BA, 8 May 1891). Edward Hermon of Wyfold (see Ch. 6) had a large collection, mostly of Landseer, Edwin Long, etc., sold at Christie's, 1882 (see Archt, 13 May 1882, p. 296). Eight of the most anecdotal and sentimental were purchased by the Holloway College (see Royal Holloway College, Catalogue of pictures, comp. by Charles C. Carey. 3rd ed., London, 1896).

1. Frank Davis, Op. cit., p. 49. However, it is worth noting that in an article by G. Dargenty on Watteau in Archt, 20 Nov. 1891, pp. 312-3, it was recorded that whereas works by that master were known to exist in the collections of only two private individuals in Paris, there were seven Londoners who collected his work. A fair amount of attention was given the subject in contemporary press and in monographs on French painting; even the architectural press showed interest; e.g. articles on Watteau, Boucher and Greuze (Archt, Sept. & Oct. 1882) and from time to time reproductions of actual paintings. Imitation Bouchers, etc., were the rage for over-doors and ceilings (e.g. the clumsy, painted ceiling in the new drawing room at Jardine Hall). Under just such a ceiling sat Mrs Folliott: "She would herself have tumbled on a cloud very passably, in a fleshy Boucher manner, hadn't she been over-dressed for such an excess." (Henry James, A round of visits, in Complete Tales, ed. by Leon. Edel, XII (1903-10), 1964, p. 432).
L'Histoire du mobilier in 1876, which received much praise, particularly when translated into English two years later. During the following decade two other important collections of dixhuitième objects d'art were to attract much public attention, further fostering the trend. The first was the Hamilton Collection, the dispersal of which in 1882 was watched minutely by the press; the second was the John Jones bequest in the same year to the Victoria and Albert Museum. The latter was an accumulation of eighteenth-century French furniture, porcelain and paintings, gathered from the 1860s onwards by an unassuming retired tailor of No. 95 Piccadilly. The quality of the collection was very high. Higher still was that of the Hamilton Collection. The sale has been described as "perhaps the most important single dispersal of French eighteenth-century furniture to have taken place since the period of the French Revolution". The 10th Duke of Hamilton had not only inherited many priceless items from his father-in-law, William Beckford of Fonthill, but had himself been an

3. F. J. B. Watson, GBA, Jly-Aug. 1959, p. 9. BN, 23 Jun. 1882, pp 754-5, remarked that the sale "will be long remembered and the event is worthy of being chronicled as one of interest in the history of modern art sales". It was reported also in Blär, Jun.-Jly. 1882, passim; Archt, 1 Jly. 1882, pp 4-5. See also The Hamilton Palace; illustrated priced catalogue, London, 1882. Louis XVI cabinets from the collection had been shown at the South Kensington Loan Exhibition, 1862.
ardent and discerning collector of French furnishings and Renaissance painting. The sale, like sundry others of the period had been precipitated by the agricultural slump of the 1880s, and it was at such as these that Ferdinand de Rothschild accumulated a good deal of his Waddesdon Collection.

In spite of all this the Bachelors' Wing (part of which was the first section of Waddesdon to be ready for occupation, 1880) was decorated, not in the French eighteenth-century taste but in that of the era of Francis I. Baron Ferdinand continued the tradition, both of his family and of earlier British collectors, of incorporating genuine French panelling in his new house. Accordingly, the Billiard Room owed its wall-panelling as well as the design of its coved ceiling to the sixteenth-century Château de Montmorency. The Smoking Room, built in the 1890s, though not incorporating genuine French work, looked also to sixteenth-century France for its exposed beam ceiling, richly adorned with diamond and circle motifs. The taste for sixteenth-century French interiors never achieved the same degree of popularity accorded the eighteenth-century styles and it is significant that at Waddesdon, a house predominantly given over to the dixhuitième taste, this earlier style should have been deemed more suitable for the Bachelors' Wing. It has been remarked in an earlier chapter that the French eighteenth-century styles, and the convoluted and intricate Rococo in particular, were held to be essentially feminine in mood and above all suitable for the
drawing room or the mistress's boudoir. Dining rooms were far more likely to receive severer treatment and male apartments invariably chose some heavy or simple decor. The Francois Premier style was one of many such; but it was relatively rare in the Victorian era, even during the years of the Gothic Revival which particularly despised the frippery of Rococo, that whole rooms were decked out in this style. More characteristically a chimney-piece modelled on those of Blois or Fontainebleau would be the only gesture in this direction.

1. As late as 1902 this attitude was still being expressed, as in H. J. Jennings's Our houses & how to beautify them, London, 1902, pp 73-4.

2. At Cliveden, Bucks, is a rare case of a genuine Francois Ier chimney-piece acquired by William (later Viscount) Astor at the Spitzer Collection sale, Paris, 1893: from the Château of Arnay-le-Duc, Burgundy, complete with Francis I's salamander. Also at Cliveden, the small library was decorated in Francois Ier style by J. L. Pearson, ca. 1895; also imported eighteenth-century boiseries in dining room, from Château d'Asnières. Other cases of rooms in Francois Ier style include: billiard room at No. 6 Marble Arch by Banister Fletcher (BA, 3 July, 1891, p. 6); dining room at Avery Hill, Kent - panelling by W. Aumonier (BA, 3 Jan. & 11 Apr. 1890). The most original of Francois Ier inspired chimney-pieces were by Norman Shaw at Dawpool and Cragside (design for that at Dawpool, rather French Gothic, 1882-4, held at RIBAD and illus. as fig. 44, RIBAD catalogue S). Saint, Op. cit., p. 71, attributes the more Fontainebleau-type fire-place at Cragside, 1885, to Lethaby. Other Francois Ier chimney pieces were at H. T. Hope's house, (Bldr, 10 Nov. 1849, p. 534); Panmure, 1855 (see above, p. 49); Wynnstay and Gayhurst (see above, p. 179). F. P. Cockerell exhibited a chimney-piece design at the R.A., 1870, in the "French Renaissance style, with large marble figures" (Bldr, 7 May 1870, p. 359); a Louis XII-style fire-place by John Belcher & Son was installed at the Curriers' Hall (BN, 31 May 1872, p. 544) which derived from that at the entrance to the Château of Blois. Here a stag and goat replace the statue of the king on horse-back. Similar ones in terra-cotta by Aumonier were used in the Victoria Law Courts, Birmingham (BJ, 10 Feb. 1897). More common were humble little fire-places with diamond-patterned panels on the surrounds. One such is illustrated in Howarth, Op. cit., pl. 5E, in drawing.
Waddesdon Manor's greatest interior splendours were in the eighteenth-century taste however. Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild noted in the Red Book that Destailleur, the architect of Waddesdon, was involved only to a limited extent in the interior decoration of the house:

"I purchased oak panelling in Paris for several of the rooms, to which it was adapted by various English and French decorators. Most of this panelling came from historic houses; ... That in the Breakfast Room and the Boudoir from the Hôtel of the Maréchal de Richelieu, in the street which was named after his uncle, the great Cardinal ...; the Grey Drawing Room came from the Convent of the Sacré Coeur, formerly the hôtel of the Duc de Lauzun who perished on the guillotine; and the Tower Room from a villa which was sometime the residence of the famous Fermier-Generál Beaujon, to whom the Elysée belonged ... The ornamental ceilings," he continued, "are either replicas of those of the rooms from which the panelling was taken, or copied from ones still in existence in Paris ..."  

The marble-panelled dining room was, however, the work of Destailleur, except for the superb mirrors which came from the Hôtel de Villars in the Rue de Grenelle, Paris, as did ones of the same set installed in Mentmore thirty years earlier. These, dating from 1725-30 make sumptuous use of the Rococo palm-tree device. The other rooms were in all three Louis styles, and remain to this day furnished
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room of Redclyffe, Glasgow, a house by C. R. Mackintosh, 1890. There is no evidence that he was responsible for the fittings, though the Mackintosh of 1890 was influenced by the French Renaissance.  
2. According to Pevsner, Bucks, p. 276. Blunt (Apollo, June 1977, p. 413) refers to correspondence which indicates that it was through Destailleur that the panelling from the Hôtel de Lauzun had been acquired - he had been involved in work there in 1860. A drawing by Destailleur in Berlin shows the panelling of the Grey Drawing Room as it is now.
most splendidly in the eighteenth-century French mode. Aubusson and Savonnerie carpets abound and, as Rothschild said with no exaggeration, the pedigrees of the furniture and objets d'art are "of unimpeachable authenticity". In the garden is a wrought iron Rococo aviary, very dainty and still full of "gaudy plumaged birds", as when Mary Gladstone saw it.

Where Alfred Charles de Rothschild's nearby house at Halton is concerned much less is known. Even the architect is in doubt. The interiors are again of French eighteenth-century type, but except perhaps for the boudoir they are not importations from France. There is


2. W. E. Gladstone's daughter. See Mary Gladstone; her diaries and letters, ed. by Lucy Masterman, London, 1930, p. 361 (quoted Girouard, VCH, p. 136). The architect of the aviary is not clear; it bears the date 1889. Blunt (who points out that its design could have been derived from any of a number of eighteenth-century pattern books and also links it with earlier Rothschild aviaries at Grüneberg and Pregny) mentions (Apollo, Jun. 1977, p. 413) plans in Berlin by Destailleur for grotto and fountains at Waddesdon, "fairly directly cribbed from Vaux-le-Vicomte". Otherwise Destailleur had little to do with the lay out of the grounds which were largely in the hands of the French landscapist Lainé. Apropos of Rococo iron-work, various eighteenth-century pattern books were reprinted in the late 19th century, e.g. Jean Lamour's Recueil des ouvrages en serrurerie que Stanislas le Bienfaisant, roy de Pologne ... a fait poser sur la Place Royale à Nancy, Paris, 1860 (also Berlin, 1895; 1st ed. 1767); Jean Tijou, A new book of drawings, with introd. by J. Starkie Gardner, London, 1896 (1st ed. 1695). Such as these greatly influenced the design of gates, stair balustrades, balconies, etc. Often the imitation eighteenth-century wrought iron work was busier, more tightly coiled than the originals (e.g. student design for gates by Charles Letheren, BN, 28 Dec. 1883).

3. See below, p. 493.
157A a rather coarse brio to the trellis-work Rococo ceilings of the
drawing rooms and the Louis XVI dining room and billiard rooms lack
the essential reticence of the style. They do not, however, deserve
the scorn received from Algernon West and Eustace Balfour 1. Per¬
haps they were unable to forget the zebra rides, the Hungarian
band and the skating rink which were occupying the less discriminating
company out of doors.

In the years when Halton and Waddesdon were being fitted up so
richly, the French decorative styles could be said to have at last
returned in full force after their partial eclipse during the mid-
Victorian decades, indeed The Journal of Decorative Art was so
specific as to name 1886 as the commencement of the fashion which
was "now penetrating the higher middle class of society" 2. By the
'90s the revived taste for Classicism in architecture was ensuring

1. "An exaggerated nightmare of gorgeousness and senseless and
ill-applied magnificence," said West. Balfour was even more extreme:
"I have seldom seen anything more terribly vulgar. It is a combi¬
nation of a French chateau and a gambling house. Inside it is badly
planned . . . and gaudily decorated . . . Oh, but the hideousness of
everything, the showiness! the sense of lavish wealth thrust up
your nose! the coarse mouldings, the heavy gilding always in the
wrong place, the colours of the silk hangings! Eye hath not seen
nor pen can write the ghastly coarseness of the sight!" (Lady Frances
Balfour, Ne obliviscaris: dinna forget, London, 1930, I, p. 221;
see also p. 227). He had found Waddesdon exquisite, especially the
interior (ibid., I, p. 222). For illus. of Halton interiors in
Archt, see above, p. 460n. Bedford Lemere photos of the saloon,
south drawing room and library are reproduced also as pl. 60-62
in Cooper, The opulent eye (see p. 15 for account of the French
taste in the 1880s and '90s); the billiard room is illus., Girouard,
VCH, pl. 18.
that, of the French styles, it was the Louis Seize and, in time, the Empire style too, with their "simplicity of line and ... sparing use of enrichment (which) gradually superseded the meretricious effects of the previous reign".

If one could not get genuine French panelling, French craftsmen were the next best thing, and by the Edwardian period the job was as often as not in the hands of Beaux-Arts trained architects like Mewès and Davis, Bouwens van der Boijen, or René Sergent, who brought a still greater refinement to the treatment of the dix-huitième styles. Where in the first half of the century the French styles had been the special taste of a very few amongst the very rich, by 1900 they had become something of an international style amongst the plutocrats, whether at home or on holiday. Perhaps this was because of the ability of the French styles to combine "artistic quality with practical usefulness", as Ferdinand de Rothschild argued. But, whatever the case, the taste had become the "natural idiom of the great Mayfair house". Rothschild was prophetic: academics might inveigh against the French styles for their impurity

---

1. Jennings, Op. cit., p. 36. Extreme Rococo could still attract attention however, as late as 1909. See the illus. of Lord Nünburnholme's ballroom at 41 Grosvenor Square, EN, 19 Mar. 1909, p. 449; though rather more Viennese in its extremity, it was described as "Louis Quinze" and said to be by George Devey, though this is unlikely, despite his work on the house back in the 1880s. It is illus. also in SL, XXXIX, p. 151.
2. Hotels and ocean liners succumbed to the taste as well. See Chapter 11.
4. SL, XXXIX, p. 153. A very thorough account of the French taste in interiors on the Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair in these years is given here (pp 151-5).
and feminacy and fashions might fluctuate, "but French 18th-century art seems destined to maintain its spell on society and tighten its grip on the affections of the collector, so long as the present social, economic and political conditions prevail, and until some unlooked for catastrophe revolutionises the fate of the world, of art and of art collectors"¹. Actually it took two unlooked-for catastrophes to kill the style completely. As late as 1937 and '38 the Duke of Marlborough and his neighbour at Nos 11 and 9 Kensington Palace Gardens were still favouring the style - original panelling of course². And there was Chips Channon's at Belgrave Square³. Also to some extent painting and book-illustrations and the ephemeral worlds of costume and stage design continued to feel the effect of the fête galante, well into the new century. Correctly costumed recreations of the eighteenth century like those by W. Q. Orchardson had given way to a sequence of dreamy Rococo

1. 19th century review, Mar. 1892, p. 390.
2. SL, XXXVII, pp 164-7, pl. 105c & d. Lenygon and Morant were responsible for the duke's interiors.
3. Sir Henry ('Chips') Channon, diarist and gossip, at No. 5 Belgrave Square. Harold Nicolson described it thus: "Oh my God, how rich and powerful Lord Channon has become! There is his house in Belgrave Square next door to Prince George, Duke of Kent, and Duchess of ditto & little Prince Edward. The house is all Regency upstairs with very carefully draped curtains and Madame Recamier sofas and wall-paintings. Then the dining room is entered through an orange lobby and discloses itself suddenly as a copy of the blue room of the Amalienburg near Munich (by the Frenchman Cuvilliës) - baroque and 'rococo' and what-ho and oh-no-no and all that. Very fine indeed!" (Quoted in Chips; the diaries of Sir Henry Channon, edited by Robert Rhodes James, Harmondsworth, 1970, p. 17). Thanks to Alistair Rowan for this tit-bit.
fantasies, all crinolines and patches, which if not quite killed by the first great war were unable to survive a second.\footnote{The incidence of Rococo or stylised Rococo in the '20s and '30s is a subject for investigation in itself. Lily Garland's incredible Rococo boat-shaped bed in Howard Hawks's film \textit{Twentieth Century} (1934) springs to mind, as one of many examples. Examples of paintings and illustrations of this century include: Charles Conder's work, such as \textit{A toccata at Galuppi's} (1900) and illustrations to \textit{Beauty and the Beast} (trans. by Ernest Dowson, 1908); the \textit{Dane}, Kay Nielsen's illustrations to Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's retelling of old fairy tales, \textit{In powder and crinoline} (1913); John Austen's and Harry Clarke's illustrations for separate editions of Perrault's \textit{Fairy Tales} (both 1922).}
CHAPTER ELEVEN: The Edwardian years and the Beaux-Arts Influence

Interior decoration in the fashionable society house in the late Victorian period often chose Baroque or Rococo forms of French origin. French Baroque motifs from the Paris Opéra appeared in theatre exteriors of the period also. On the whole, however, the Baroque revival for exterior design which characterised British architecture around 1900 was essentially a nationalistic movement. It was the architecture of Britain's own seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the architecture of Wren, Vanbrugh, Hawksmoor and Gibbs, which provided the inspiration for the bulk of the urban and civic building around the turn of the century. The Queen Anne movement of the 1870s had first looked to this period but had been pioneered by Gothic-trained men. By the '90s the Gothic irregularities and early foreign Renaissance detailing were being ironed out of the style and architects sought to re-interpret their seventeenth-and eighteenth-century heritage in its own terms: Classical, symmetrical and English. Details were just a little bigger and bolder than in their historic paradigms but this was only appropriate in this era of imperial pomp.

There are exceptions, however, to any rule. A small number of Baroque buildings by British architects were to be found betraying a markedly continental, sometimes French, note to them. John Giles (of Giles, Gough and Trollope) designed a house for Sir E. B. Malet in 1894 which was of a continental Baroque both inside and out. Perhaps it was the fact that it was destined for the Cap d'Aglio overlooking
Monaco which explained this aberration. Very much on British soil on the other hand were the many buildings in various types of continental Baroque by H. V. Lanchester and Edwin Rickards. A year after coming third in the Edinburgh North Bridge competition of 1896 with a rather Franco-German chateau design, Lanchester and Rickards (along with their short-lived third partner, Stewart) shot to fame with their prize-winning scheme in the Cardiff Municipal Buildings and Law Courts competition. Here, and in a number of schemes which followed - the Deptford Town Hall, the Hull Art School (both built) and the rejected design for the London County Hall - the inspiration was frankly Viennese. French architecture of the eighteenth century had, after all, never succumbed to the Baroque extremes of Central Europe. Rickards (who was the design partner in the firm) contributed sketches of Viennese Baroque

1. Illus. BN, 7 Dec. 1894, p. 783, where it was described as being externally "in a free French Renaissance but internally it is Rococo pur et simple. The magnificent central hall is beautifully decorated by a French artist, the ceiling being founded on the ceiling at Würzburg by Tiepolo". German Rococo might well have had something to do with the exterior of the house as well though BN, (11 May 1894, p. 633) again referred to it as "a poor French-looking Renaissance house ... with an ugly cupola surmounting a quasi tower", (review of R.A.) and Archt, 18 May 1894, p. 315, said it was unquestionably modern Italian. The plan had a French en suite arrangement. Work was supervised by a Mr Tersling of Menton. Giles, Cough & Trollope were also responsible for a dull hotel at Cap Martin on the Riviera, with pavilion mansards (Archt, 25 Mar. 1892, pp 208-9).

2. Like the other place-getting designs, this one probably owed something to Shaw's Scotland Yard, though its dormers and wedge roofs were more overtly chateau-like. AR, I, 1896-7, pp 46-51, where it is illus, considered the design "the most sympathetic and harmonious with its surroundings" of the three prize winners. It was illus. also BN, 6 Nov. 1896, & BJ, 25 Nov. 1896, pp 248-9.
architecture to a series of articles which he published on that subject in collaboration with Alfred W. S. Cross in 1908. At the same time the firm was indicating in a number of other competition designs an interest in French architecture which was curiously varied. Their entry in the 1899 Cartwright Memorial competition at Bradford was a very forward-looking design with elegantly French eighteenth-century air. So too was their later, also unsuccessful, competition entry for the Bromley Municipal Buildings, 1905. In these designs Rickards was responding to the cooler elegance of eighteenth-century Classicism whose increasing popularity in Edwardian years will be dealt with shortly. It is with the Baroque styles however that Rickard's name is chiefly associated: he has been called 'that unusual thing in the English race - a natural designer in the Baroque', and his most successful work continued to be in this manner, in later years as likely to be French as Viennese. Thus it was with his very decorative Parisian shopfront in New Bond Street for the art-dealers, Colnaghi and Obach (1913 - 1914); the unexecuted scheme for a memorial to the Reformation in Geneva, shown at the Royal Academy in 1909; and

1. BJAE, 1 & 8 Jly. 1908.
2. See below, p. 515.
3. Illus. BA, 13 Jan. & 3 Feb. 1905. This sported a rather original mansarded and octagonal dome with 0eil-de-boeuf window in the middle front. Otherwise a horizontal skyline with balustrade and urns.
greatest in his work, with the exception perhaps of the Cardiff
complex, the massive Methodist Central Hall at Westminster (1905-12).
Designed with the express aim of emulating "the style belonging to
the period at which John Wesley commenced his life work"\(^1\), the
Central Hall suggests nonetheless France not England, and its huge
square dome dominates the whole building in a manner reminiscent of
something by Antoine Le Pautre\(^2\). There were to have been two flanking
towers somewhat like the west towers of St Paul's, but they were not
built owing to claims as to rights of light and air put forward
by the adjacent Westminster Hospital. The copious banding of the
elevation is French. The detailing is of a rich Baroque Classicism
whose connection with Methodism was somewhat tenuous. Inside was
a logical and symmetrical plan by Lanchester very much in the
Beaux-Arts tradition. The main stair is of a lush eighteenth-century
French type with double-return plan\(^3\).

---

2. Cf. the square edifice which is the subject of the second dis-
course in Les Oeuvres d'Architecture d'Anthoine Le Pautre, 1652.
1907, p. 702; 11, 18 & 25 Oct. & 1 Nov. 1912; AR, XVIII, 1905,
pp 28-31; AR, XXI, 1907, pp 257-267; AR, XXXII, 1912, pp 261-89;
BA, 30 Jun. 1905, p. 456; 3 Jan. 1913, pp 5, 36-9; BN, 23 Jun.,
28 Jly., 25 Aug. 1905; BJAR, 21 Jun. 1905, pp 350-1; Service,
EATO, p. 345; Service, BA, p. 155. See also Bldr, 24 Dec. 1910,
p. 776 (visit of A.A.); BA, 21 Nov. 1913, pp 352-3 (paper by
Lanchester to RIBA); Pevsner, London I, p. 502. RIBAD holds site
surveys, preliminary designs, contract and working drawings dating
from 1905-12 (OS 12/1(1-130)); also drawings showing the relation-
ship of the Central Hall and the hospital, made in connection with
the legal suit of 1909 (OS 12/1(131-143)); also designs for doors,
exits etc., 1922 (OS 12/2(1-5)).
Rickards was not entirely without followers, and Lanchester's approach to planning and his later involvement in urban development and town-planning were central to Edwardian architecture; but their brand of continental Baroque was by no means so. The Central Hall was their last major work. They failed to secure the commission for the Cardiff Museum in 1910 which would have allowed them to further expand the civic complex begun by them in that town a decade earlier.

By the mid-Edwardian years the Baroque fashion, continental or otherwise, was nearly spent. A reaction was taking place in favour of a purer, simpler type of Classicism. Wren and Gibbs were being replaced as heroes of the architectural world by men like Chambers, Cockerell, and Elmes. France, too, was re-emerging as a potent influence, this time for the spare, elegant architecture of its eighteenth-century monuments, and a type of crisp and simple Néo-Grec detailing derived from the Louis Seize and Empire periods. This was, of course, the counterpart in exteriors of the trend, already alluded to, towards Louis Seize and Empire interiors. By the late nineties something of this simple French Classicism was beginning to appear in competition designs for public buildings, largely encouraged by much-publicised modern French exercises in this manner, such as the Musée Galliéra and the exhibition palaces

168A Also Gibson's Walsall Municipal Buildings (see below, p. 516).
Before looking at this new fashion (not fully launched until around 1905) it will be desirable to outline first the growth in late Victorian years of a concern amongst French-inspired buildings for Classical detailing and composition. The re-emergence of the Louvre as an inspiration for municipal buildings during the 1880s after the preceding Gothic decades has been noted in an earlier chapter. There was no serious investigation of other French seventeenth- and eighteenth-century architecture in civic design at this stage. In houses, on the other hand, progress towards a wider concern for French Classicism was quicker to appear. The private patron can afford to anticipate fashion where civic authorities cannot.

Not uncommonly the Français Premier vogue in the 1870s had enjoyed a certain cross-fertilization with more Classicizing features from late sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century France. Symmetry was rarely abandoned altogether, and the Baroque note to some detailing at houses like Waddesdon Manor, Impney Hall and Alford House has already been noted; so has the affinity which E. M. Barry’s Shabden, with its even skyline, bears with the Petit Château at Tanlay (begun 1568) and other architecture of the Henri II type.

A firm of architects who worked from time to time in this style was that of Goldie, Child and Goldie. They had been involved, probably in the early 1870s in the restoration and expansion of a genuine French chateau of late sixteenth-century origins. This was the Château de la Jouardaye, Morbihan, Brittany. In 1880 The Building News reported that the older Goldie (George) had made drawings "many years ago" for the north wing, as well as doing additions at the local church. At the same time a view was published for the restoration of the east wing by the son, Edward Goldie, in a rather dull version of the late sixteenth-century French style. During the next two years there were to appear in the architectural press two views of country establishments by the Goldies to be erected, presumably, in Britain, which suggested a fair debt to the Brittany chateau. The stated intention to use Elterwater slates on the residence of the Baron de Cosson suggests that the house was destined for this side of the Channel rather than the other. No other clue to its location was given. The second published project by the firm was the "marine residence" of Dr G. Wilfred Ward of Oxford Movement fame. This was named Weston Manor House and was situated at Freshwater on the Isle of Wight. This latter house was described as "late French domestic Gothic", and so it

3. Illus. EN 20 Jan. 1882, p. 74. See also EN, 20 May 1881, p. 569 & Archt, 7 May 1881, p. 316, where its roofs were felt to be too high.
4. Archt, 7 May 1881, p. 316.
was to a great extent with its Gothic hipped and tiled dormers and the simple label moulds and occasional Flamboyant ogee mould above its windows. Yet its bowed projections and its steep but even and unspectacular roof to some extent link it with the other work by the Goldies where Henri II detailing is predominant. At Baron de Cosson's the strident contrast between red brick and pale stone dressings set (as at Impney) a late sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century mood. The windows are framed by Ionic colonnettes such as were characteristic of the Henri II style and even some late Francois Premier houses like the Hôtel d'Ecoville (there is an Ecoville dormer in the centre of the entrance front); and the verticality of the window strips is interrupted by the use of segmental pediments above the lower windows such as were beginning to appear in mid-sixteenth-century houses like Ecouen. Unusually broad and shallow segmental pediments span paired dormer windows higher up and even the Ecoville dormer is topped by a pediment of this type in place of the more usual half circle with shell. The even ridgeline of the roof speaks also of source material around 1600.

An interest in even later French models was making an early appearance too amongst country houses. It has already been noted that as early as 1869 David Bryce and his client the Marchioness of Lansdowne had rejected a pair of picturesque Loire-chateau schemes

1. More picturesque late French Gothic by Edward Goldie was carried out at the Carmelite Monastery in Kensington, ca. 1893 (illus. BJ, 14 Dec. 1898, p. 296, as part of a general article on Edward Goldie).
for Meikleour in Perthshire in favour of a more subdued handling which gave to the garden front in particular a markedly eighteenth-century flavour. Only a few years later another house, this time in Surrey, was contriving a curious blend of eighteenth-century France and England with a touch of the more picturesque chateaux. This was Fetcham Park, Leatherhead, as remodelled for George James Barnard Hankey, a distant kinsman of the notorious Hankey of the Queen Anne Mansions. The architect was Edward I'Anson, junior. This house could equally be claimed by the Queen Anne or Neo-Georgian schools for it seems to look forward twenty years to Bryanston. It was in fact a remodelling of a genuine Queen Anne house by William Talman, 1705-10. Its French debts are nonetheless clear. Entrance is effected on the west front by means of a projecting pavilion with truncated pyramid roof. An oriel which is cradled in the angle of the pavilion to the right of the door derives from François Premier France; but the detailing of the entrance pavilion itself suggests later models. The oeil-de-boeuf in the pavilion roof, with abundant swag, the columned entrance itself and the window above with broken, elliptical pediment, again with swag, look like late sixteenth-century France. The pair of oval lights on each side of the door could be of the eighteenth

1. A watercolour of the Talman house by John Hassell is at the British Museum and is reproduced in F. B. Benger's "Pen sketches of old houses in this district: Fetcham Park", in Proceedings of the Leatherhead & District Local History Society, II, No. 1, 1957, pp 19-29. The remodelling is dated ca. 1870 by Pevsner (Surrey, p. 245) and ca. 1876 by Benger (p. 27). The building is now used as offices by a group of private companies.
century, and so, too, could the whole feeling of the garden front — the symmetrical, three pavilion composition, the mansard on the central corps de logis, the red brick with stone quoins or corner banding. The central pavilion is surmounted by a single, broad semi-circular pediment with round window — a feature much in use in late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France where the English would have used a triangular pediment and full entablature. Perrault intended such features for the top of the terminal pavilions at his Louvre additions¹. It was to be much in use in British Classical architecture in the late Victorian and Edwardian years.

Also of markedly seventeenth-century feeling was a pair of houses just north of London, dating from the 1880s. These belonged to the Rothschild brothers Alfred Charles of Halton, Bucka, and Nathan Mayer, 1st Lord Rothschild of Tring. Halton House has already been mentioned in relation to its interiors; Tring Park, Herts, was more soberly decorated within, mostly in the English eighteenth-century taste². Outside it bears some resemblance to Fetcham Park, and, like it, was a remodelling of a late Stuart original — this time by Sir Christopher Wren³. Actually Tring is more thoroughly French and more consistent than Fetcham Park. As at the latter

¹. See Grand Marot.
². There is only one Rococo room. The usual Rothschild out-door entertainments were indulged in to the full, however: teams of zebras, a kangaroo and even a giant, hundred-year-old tortoise populated the grounds along with orchid and palm-houses aplenty. The house is now the Arts Educational School.
³. See J. Badeslade and J. Rocque, Vitruvius Britannicus, IV, 1739.
house, there is a symmetrical, three-pavilion composition (except for a one bay extension at the right-hand extremity of the entrance front and the low smoking-room added to one side of the garden front). Vertical divisions marking the pavilions are made entirely by the regular banding of French Classicism rather than the uneven quoins which predominate at Fetcham; furthermore the roof surmounting both main facades is subdivided into three separate mansard sections, the broadest in the middle, after the manner of such seventeenth-century Classical houses as the Hôtel Carnavalet. This is punctuated by large, corniced, French chimneys. The side pavilions at Fetcham Park have, by contrast, low, hipped roofs of English rather than French provenance, only the centre being mansarded. To the left on the garden side at Tring is the smoking-room, a separate wing so to speak, only one storey high apart from the attic windows in the lower slope of the mansard. The main part of the house is two storeys high. The most impressive thing about the smoking-room is, the remarkable marble panels and chimney-piece inside — the work of the American sculptor, Ralph Waldo Story. Architect and date of the French remodelling of Tring remain in obscurity. The Story

1. By François Mansart, 1661. This appears in the Grand Marot; illus. also in A.A. Sketchbook, 3rd series, XIV, 1910, pl. 42-6; see also Appendix B below for appearance in journals.  
2. They are signed 'W.S. Rome, 1889'. CL, 5 Jun. 1897, p. 606, says these bas-reliefs are by G. A. Storey. This is quoted by Pevsner, Hertfordshire, p. 369. Archt, 18 May 1894 illustrates the chimney-piece and says it is by 'T. Waldo Story'. Ralph Waldo Story was much employed by the Rothschild world in that part of the country — Waddesdon & Ascott. Also at Clivedon for the Astors. He worked in Rome.
panels are dated 1889, and this fact plus a surviving letter of 1905 from the 1st Lord Rothschild’s agent to the Hertfordshire antiquarian, W. B. Gerish, indicate that at least the smoking-room wing dates from the second half of the 1880s. Another source maintains, however, that the recasing of the main body of the house (and possibly the addition of the French roofs as well) was begun immediately after the property was acquired by the Rothschilds in 1872 and was completed by 1874 when the family moved in. Cubitt’s, the contractors, it is suggested were responsible.

Cubitt’s (in the person of the firm’s design partner, William Rogers) seem most likely to have been responsible for Halton, too, the other Rothschild house. The property at Halton had been bought by Baron Lionel de Rothschild, Alfred Charles’s father, back in 1853. The new house in the French style dates from 1882–8.

1. Letter from Richardson Carr to W. B. Gerish, Hon. Sec. of the East Herts. Archaeological Society, Ivy Lodge, Bishops Stortford, dated 10 Nov. 1905. Held at the Herts. County Archives (Gerish Collection). It says: "Dear Sir, I am desired by Lady Rothschild to acknowledge your letter to Lord Rothschild, and to say that Tring Park has been altered since the engraving was made in Sir Henry Chauncy’s work. Two wings were added and the Mansion reoccupied in 1889 ... For illus. see C. Roth, Magnificent Rothschilds, p. 224.

2. Letter to myself from Mr R. G. Grace of Tring.

3. Girouard, VCH, p. 136, refers to an album preserved at the house (supposed lost at my visit) which is inscribed, "To Wm. R. Rogers with sincere gratitude from Alfred de Rothschild, May 1888"; and to a letter from Mrs E. F. Travers which says (according to Jill Franklin) Rogers "did the building". J. K. Fowler, Recollections of old country life, London, 1894, p. 170, says "Cubitt, the architect and builder, I am told, had carte blanche to make the house perfect". Halton was however, exhibited at R.A., 1896 (see BN, 8 May 1896, p. 665) and no appropriate entry under Rogers occurs in Algernon Graves’s Royal Academy of Arts: a complete dictionary of exhibitors, 1769–1904, 1905–6. Rogers did Leo de Rothschild’s London house (see above, p. 257).
though it was habitable from 1884. Apart from the zebras and the skating-rink, Eustace Balfour's rude remark that the outside of the house was like a "combination of a French chateau and a gambling house" must have been principally induced by the thoroughly brazen winter garden. Though undoubtedly a marvel of its time with its multiplicity of domes both big and small, it can hardly be said to have blended inconspicuously with the general tenor of the house. On the contrary, it bulged out towards the entrance drive demanding attention and was quite out of harmony with the rest of the house. This was in fact a not inelegant piece of pastiche French Classicism with François Mansart's Maisons the most prominent source. The composition of the front and back elevations (which are virtually identical except for a porte cochère in the centre front) is very close to that of the main front of Maisons, though somewhat compressed: there are three pavilions, the central one rising to a truncated pyramid roof and lantern (higher at Halton, suggesting the influence of the Hôtel de Ville) and with a pedimented central section here thrusting up into the roof. The elevation is articulated with free-standing columns arranged in pairs about the central focus. The differences lie in the extension of these columns

1. Built 1642-6 and illus. in Jean Mariette, L'Architecture française (Paris, 1738); Petit Marot; Sauvaget, Op. cit., II, pp 25-61. Not in architectural press until post Edwardian years (see Appendix B). Halton itself survives as the officers' mess of the Halton Division of the R.A.F. The interiors are well preserved, but the winter garden has gone, replaced by an ugly modern extension. House illus. in Girouard, VCH, pl. 276, 398. For exterior see also Archt, 3 Mar. 1893. For interiors see above, pp 477-8.
to the side pavilions as well, where Maisons employs pilasters only, and the fact that not only do the side pavilions bow outwards but they are capped also with octagonal cone roofs in lieu of truncated pyramids. These cone roofs hint perhaps at another French Classical house, illustrated like Maisons in Mariette: the Hôtel Moras (later Biron) by J. Aubert, 1728. The side elevation (south) at Halton to which the winter garden was attached is also dependent upon Maisons; but here the greater complexity of Halton is apparent. Halton has a double-pile plan with central hall (such as Baron Ferdinand had rejected for Waddesdon) whereas Maisons is a single-pile arrangement. Consequently at Halton there are twice as many pavilion roofs making their mark upon the skyline.

A house not dissimilar in feeling to Halton was the Renfrewshire home of Sir Charles Cayzer, Bt. This was Ralston as remodeled in the 1890s. The architect is not clear but may have been John James Stevenson. Ralston dated back to 1810 but had already been extended and modified in a rather feeble French style in 1864. The architect then had certainly been Stevenson during his partnership with Campbell Douglas¹; the client had been Thomas Richardson, a Glasgow merchant. The house at this stage is recorded in a couple of contemporary guides to the Glasgow area². Its Frenchness consisted

¹ According to David Walker. There seems to be no real evidence that Stevenson returned to the house in the 1890s. On the other hand, by that decade he was producing some decidedly French Renaissance work of a conventional type. (See above, p. 355)
in no more than a truncated and crested pyramid roof to an asymmetrical pavilion on the left of the main facade. One can see from these pictures, however, how the later transformation grew out of the house that was already there. The French pavilion to the left of the entrance has been preserved, while the centre pavilion has been raised and supplied with a matching French roof, from which rises as a central focus an extraordinary tallish, squared dome of Second Empire type with a veritable crown of cresting on top. To flank this central pavilion were added two semi-octagonal bows with their own cone-shaped roofs, again richly crested. The composition called for a third pavilion to the right to complete the symmetry, but a domed and arcaded conservatory served instead. The way in which the central dome rises out of its pavilion recalls both Halton and Maisons, while the garden front is even more reminiscent of the Rothschild house. Apart from a large block to one side, there is a symmetrical three-pavilion composition, the outer two being splayed bays from ground to roof. On the whole, though, it is a fussier house than Halton and also less homogeneous in its detailing. It has something of the air of a Parisian suburban house of the 1860s about its entrance front. The renewed zeal for Classicism and for Beaux-Arts ideals at this time was (as was seen in relation to the big competitions of the 1880s) inducing as a by-product a disconcerting tendency to revive forms which at first sight appear to be thirty years out of date. Yet a more determined concern for symmetry and the use of the orders makes the date ca. 1890 in relation to Ralston not altogether a surprise. Besides,
the bulls-eye windows on either side of the porte-cochère have a markedly eighteenth-century air.  

By the turn of the century the Victorian country-house building boom was over. Fewer houses of any sort were being erected and the influence of France in the exterior design of the country mansion had all but disappeared in these years. What little there was tended to suggest the influence of the formal Classicism of French eighteenth-century architecture, the quiet elegance of such buildings as the Grand and Petit Trianon and Bagatelle.  

1. The lodge was given a steep French roof too. House demol. 1934. Sir Charles Cayzer had his later residence, Gartmore House, Perthshire remodelled in a French style. See above, p. 289. Another house to undergo a double French transformation was Warter Priory, Yorks., seat of Charles Henry Wilson, shipping magnate and prohibitionist (later 1st Lord Nunburnholme). The seventeenth-century house was Frenchified first, ca. 1878. Morris, Seats, VI, pp 67-8 shows it as a symmetrical three-pavilion composition: crested hip roofs on the terminal pavilions, the centre one a canted bay, rather 17th-century French. Extended again in the 1880s or '90s, and illus. (garden front?) in advertisements for W. Richardson & Co., heating and ventilating engineers, Darlington: AR, XIX, Jan. 1906, p. xxxii; XXI, Jan. 1907, p. xxii. Steep hipped roofs over advancing symmetrical wings; further irregularly-placed and varied French roofs to the right. Architect not known. See Pevsner, Yorkshire: York and the East Riding, Harmondsworth, 1972, p. 359.

2. The Petit Trianon was illus. Bldr, 26 Aug. 1899, p. 191; BN, 6 Sep. 1907, p. 321 (being a review of Arnott and Wilson's book—see below). Bagatelle appeared in AR, XXX, 1911, pp 233-240: A.A. Sketchbook, 3rd series, XII, 1908 pl. 46 (drawn by George A. Ross); it was described in Bldr, 19 May 1906, p. 548; see also MDA, 1875, pl. 3, & 1877, p. 26 (re its restoration by L. de Sanges). Léon Deshaies wrote books on both Trianons, 1908; Guérinet published books on the Trianons and Bagatelle. See also Le Château de Bagatelle, Paris, 1909, and a host of books (for details see bibliography) on Versailles and its satellites by E. Baldus, G. Brière, E. N. L. Cazes, P. de Nolhac, A. Pératé, J. Roussel. See also the Count de Fels, Ange Jacques Gabriel, Paris, 1912.
Van Alstyne in Edith Wharton's *The house of mirth* (1905) said scornfully,

"I'm sure Mrs. Bry thinks her house a copy of the Trianon; in America every marble house, with gilt furniture is thought to be a copy of the Trianon."

The *Architectural Review* in 1910 published a fairly brazen copy of the Grand Trianon which had recently gone up at Colorado Springs. In Britain the fashion was less assiduously followed. Nonetheless figures like Marie Antoinette and the lost dauphin exercised a fair amount of influence upon the popular imagination in Britain as well as America in these years, while the Trianons can be seen lurking behind the occasional country villa design of the day, encouraged by the publication of Arnott and Wilson's meticulous book on the *Petit Trianon* in 1907.

---

3. Nettie Struther's baby in *The house of mirth* (p. 314) is named "Marry Anto'nette - that's what we call her: after the French queen in that play at the Garden." Pierre de Nolhac in addition to his many popular books on Versailles and the Trianons ran a veritable industry in books on the French queen also, many translated into English. See also Lucien Lambeau's *La question Louis XVII; le cimetièrè de Ste-Marguerite et la sépulture de Louis XVII*, Paris, 1905.
4. James Arnott and John Wilson, *The Petit Trianon*, Versailles, London, 1907-8. A review in *BN*, 6 Sep. 1907, p. 321 (accompanied by illus.) commented that "the value of the subject consists of this: that the building supplies a most complete example of French architecture of the best period of the eighteenth century. The whole of the drawings thus carefully measured and illustrated in so thoroughly a technical manner cannot fail to be of real use to all who practise in this style and seek information from its best examples. Other books contain at best but partial details and some views of the Petit Trianon ..." Reginald Blomfield, too, felt that the Petit Trianon and Gabriel's *École Militaire* represented the pinnacle of achievement in French architectural history (see below, p. 561).
The most convincing Petit Trianon derivative (or is it from Ledoux's Pavillon de Madame du Barry at Louveciennes (1771)?) was the Liverpool student design for a "villa for a man of Classical taste", by H. A. Dod. The Trianon is raised up on a platform with sculptures on pedestals below. Two smallish country houses which were actually built in the Home Counties and in which contemporaries detected a hint of the work of Ange Jacques Gabriel, architect of Marie Antoinette's favourite retreat, were Ditton Place at Balcombe, Sussex, and Charles Hill Court, Tilford, Surrey. The former dates from 1904 when it was built for A. B. Horne by Cecil Brewer and Dunbar Smith, a partnership better known for public than domestic work. Charles Hill Court was designed by Detmar Blow and Fernand Billerey for Miss Lily Antrobus, collector of ceramic birds and beasts. Country Life in 1910 described Charles Hill Court as

"a little woodland retreat, a lady's bower, designed in Classic spirit somewhat after the manner in which eighteenth-century French architects built pavilions and pleasure houses for the last of the Louis".

Both a "quiet English simplicity" and some kinship with the Petit Trianon were noted, as were Billerey's French origin and Beaux-Arts training. The same journal found that the round lines of the

---

1. Illus. Archt, 22 Oct. 1909, p. 258. See also the charming little pavilion erected for the Gramophone Co., at the Franco-British Exhibition, Shepherds Bush, 1908, designed by F. S. Swailes (the American Francis Swales?) of Bedford Park (BA, 25 Sep. 1908, p. 221). This actually has panels of treillage on the exterior but it is very much a Louis Seize pavilion in the spirit of the Petit Trianon.

2. CL, 26 Nov. 1910, pp 7*-11*. See also H. Dalton Clifford, "Charles Hill Court, Tilford, Surrey" in CL, 23 Jan. 1958, pp 164-5. Billerey contributed articles on the Parisian scene to AR (e.g. AR, XXI, 1907, pp 266-9) and read a paper to the RIBA, 1913, on "Modern French architecture" (BA, 21 Mar. 1913, pp 226-7, 237-9; Bldr, 21 Mar. 1913, pp 342-5).
pediments at Ditton Place lent it too a French accent (as at Fetcham Park) 'reminding one of Gabriel's (Bruant's?) treatment of the Invalides in Paris'\footnote{See CL, 1 Jly. 1911, pp 18-24. "When curved instead of straight pediments were used in the English Renaissance work, segments were generally adopted rather than half circles, as by Wren at Morden Castle", it was observed.}. There is greater justice in the claims for the Frenchness of Charles Hill Court, however, than for that of Ditton Place, which is pretty much an exercise in Neo-William-and-Mary and Neo-Georgian as Pevsner points out\footnote{Pevsner, Sussex, pp 73, 402. See also AR, XXII, 1907, pp 187 - 197.}. The former house, on the other hand, though highly original – indeed perversely so in many details – is overtly French not only in its mansard roofs (into which the upper floor windows project), its oval windows, its curiously detached semi-circular pediment and its French doors, but also in its plan\footnote{Apart from the curious way in which the service quarters are housed in what amounts to virtually a separate establishment to one side, joined by a low corridor to the main house. For plan see CL, 26 Nov. 1910, p. 775.}.

A much more conventional house than Charles Hill Court where the influence of the Petit Trianon is partly discernible is Esher Place in Surrey, 1895-8. This house, near the more famous Waynflete's Tower, was a drastic extension of a house of 1805. The architects were G. T. Robinson and Duchêne; the client Sir Edgar Vincent, later Lord D'Abernon. In the centre of the entrance front is a raised pavilion with truncated pyramid roof, pierced with an œil-de-bœuf window. Oval windows also punctuate the lower roof.

1. See CL, 1 Jly. 1911, pp 18-24. "When curved instead of straight pediments were used in the English Renaissance work, segments were generally adopted rather than half circles, as by Wren at Morden Castle", it was observed.
2. Pevsner, Sussex, pp 73, 402. See also AR, XXII, 1907, pp 187 - 197.
3. Apart from the curious way in which the service quarters are housed in what amounts to virtually a separate establishment to one side, joined by a low corridor to the main house. For plan see CL, 26 Nov. 1910, p. 775.
covering the splayed wings. Classical balustrades, Ionic pilasters and vertical banding articulate the facade in a combination suggestive of the period of Louis XVI. It is the centre of the garden front, however, which suggests a Louis Seize pavilion such as Petit Trianon or Bagatelle, with its neat and symmetrical two-storey arrangement of three bays, flanked on each side by rounded projections similarly fenestrated (legacies of the older Regency house), the whole topped by a horizontal parapet. Inside was much imitation Louis XVI decor of varying quality - as well as a small round boudoir the ceiling of which is drawn directly from that of Boffrand's oval saloon at the Hôtel de Soubise in Paris (ca. 1735). There is also a very fine Louis Seize staircase, no doubt inspired by that at the Petit Trianon. From a typically spreading foot it sweeps up around the wall of the vestibule accompanied by an elegantly turned metal rail.

Such stairways were to become popular in the Edwardian era and even later. Blow and Billerey included one in their Louis Seize decor for Viscount Ridley at No. 10 Carlton House Terrace.

1. Illus. in CL, 16 Aug. 1956, p. 340. There was a Classical portico between the bows. This was removed in the remodelling.

2. A hall-theatre was added to the end of the west wing, financed by the Prince of Wales, a frequent visitor. In the garden Lutyens designed a tiny sunken amphitheatre in the lawn where Anna Pavlova amongst others performed. The house is now used as a residential training college for the Electrical Electronic Telecommunication and Printing Union. See CL, 6 Jan. 1900, pp 16-21; Pevsner, Surrey, p. 223; EETPU official leaflet by Arthur Melton; Archt, 23 Oct. 1908, pp 267-9 on the history of the estate.
1906-7. Some twenty years later Billerey was doing the same thing at Bute House, 75 South Audley Street. None, however, surpassed for proficiency and elegance the Louis XVI interiors of Charles Mewès and Arthur Davis. Mewès, the older man, was a Parisian with an international practice; Davis, after training at the École des Beaux-Arts became his London partner. A particularly sumptuous Louis Seize staircase was the pièce de résistance of their interior remodelling (1903) at Luton Hoo, Beds., for the diamond magnate, Sir Julius Wernher. A number of Mayfair residences received similar treatment. In relation to one such, No. 8 Grosvenor Square, house of the Hon. Henry Coventry, The Builder in 1913 obligingly published plans of the building in its original state (1908) and as modified by the fashionable Beaux-Art team. A confused and jumbled plan was replaced by an arrangement with carefully controlled progression from front door and vestibule by way of a 'Grand Gallery' to an elegantly-shaped dining room, and ultimately to a roof garden of exquisite simplicity and grace.

1. See Bldr, 6 Oct. 1911, p. 391. The Ridleys, we are told, directed the work with greatest interest and insisted on great simplicity of design. The drawing-rooms were panelled, "the mouldings and ornaments being gilt and "patinés" in order to give them the appearance of old work." See also CL, 26 Oct. 1912, pp xxvii-xxxii.  
3. Low mansard roofs were added to the Adam exterior (see above p. 282). See also Pevsner, Bedfordshire, pp 120-2; CL, 5 May 1950, pp 1282-5. AR, XVII, Jun. 1905, p. xiii, comments that the stair itself was of Echaillons, a "superb natural marble stone in various colours, the product of the quarries and work of M. Biron ... It is curious that the stone has not, until the present day, been introduced into England." It had been much used in France (the Opéra, the Palais de Justice, the Pont Alexandre III). Mewès and Davis later used it at the Ritz. 
4. Bldr, 26 Sep. 1913. See also Bldr, 2 May 1913, p. 510. A similar
There was also a number of sophisticated and elegant first-class saloons in the Louis XVI style for ocean liners, particularly of the Cunard Line by Mewès and Davis, but their greatest fame arose from a sequence of prominent buildings erected in the West End during the reign of Edward VII. Their London career had begun (as has been mentioned) with a lavish palm court for the Carlton Hotel (1899); after that followed the Ritz Hotel, new offices for The Morning Post, and rooms for the Royal Automobile Club. In all three buildings the influence of Louis XVI France is very prominent. The hotel and the club-rooms in particular reflect the rapid decline which had taken place at the end of the century (and which had characterised also the architecture of the late eighteenth century in France) in a concern for plastic massing and the picturesque skyline. The Ritz (1904-6) is actually a Louvresque, three pavilion

Footnote continued from page 502

comparison can be made in relation to No. 27 Grosvenor Square (see Bldr, 15 Jan. 1915, p. 62). See also Lowndes House, Lowndes Place (Bldr, 15 Jan. 1915) and unexecuted plans for No. 42 Upper Brook Street (Archt, 4 Apr. 1919, reproduced in SL, XXXIX, fig. 24c). The V & A holds a large collection of Mewès and Davis designs for interiors: E.864-7 - 1975.

1. Mewès and Davis did the Cunard Steamship Co.'s offices, Cockspur Street; also S.S. Aquitania (Bldr, 8 Jan. 1915, p. 35), S.S. Berengaria and others. Davis published an article on "The architecture of the liner" (AR, XXXV, 1914, pp 87-110): other ships of the Cunard Line with French decor were the Lusitania (decor by James Miller, see also Bldr, 9 Jly. 1915, p. 30) and the Mauretania (decor by H. A. Peto); the Orama and Orvieto (Orient Line) both got Louis Seize interiors. None of these English vessels could vie with the France, however, with its dining saloon copied from that of the Hôtel du Comte de Toulouse by Robert Decotte. French interiors for ships were not new: the grand saloon of the Great Eastern Steamship had been fitted out with French eighteenth-century panelling by Crace back in 1859 (see ILN, 20 Aug. & 15 Oct. 1859, pp 183-4, 378-9).
composition, but variation of skyline has been much reduced and all
advance and recession has been dispensed with. There is copious
use of French Classical banding, and the ridges of the roof are
decorated with the Roman fasces motif which had been much used on
French eighteenth-century buildings such as J. J. Gabriel's Bordeaux
Bourse (ca. 1740)\(^1\). The chimneys are from the Louvre; the dormers
which jut up into the roof are from the Petit Palais with many
precedents in Classical France. Most striking feature of the
hotel's exterior is the covered arcading along the Piccadilly front
as at the rue de Rivoli in Paris. This apparently was an expedient
to acquire more space for the hotel when a decision to widen the
thoroughfare threatened to considerably reduce the size of the
site. The rue de Rivoli offered a precedent where a building was
extended out over the public footpath\(^2\).

The lack of plastic advance and recession (in which, combined
with the banding, it much resembled the high-class blocks of flats
of the next few years by Frank T. Verity\(^3\)) was rather disliked by

---

1. Usually without the leaf patterning which would make it into a
bay-leaf garland.
2. See Bldr, 3 Mar. 1906, pp 228-9. See also below, p. 558.
3. Verity was trained at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. His father
before him (Thomas Verity of Verity and Hunt) had been a great
francophile and was responsible for, amongst other French-style
buildings, the Criterion, Piccadilly Circus. F. T. Verity contributed
a section to Shaw Sparrow's book Flats, urban houses and cottage
homes, London, 1907. Albert Richardson published an article on
Verity's flats, "Some recent 'mansion flats' in London" in AR, XXIII,
1908, pp 286-296. Verity's "flats de luxe" as he liked to call
them were increasingly simple renditions of the Néo-Grec style and
included ones in Cleveland Row, St James's (see Archit, 4 May 1906
& 14 Jun. 1907; AR, XXIII, 1908, p. 287; BN, 27 Sep. 1907; Service
EA, pl. 209; BIAE, 30 Dec. 1908, pp 135-9); Cleveland Square (see
critics of the day still more attuned to the plastic forms of Victorian architecture. There is only slightly more relief to the facade of the Royal Automobile Club, Pall Mall, built 1908-11.

The Parisian source here is less complicated: it is a fairly straight crib from A. J. Gabriel's twin palaces in the Place de la Concorde, now the Ministère de la Marine and the Hôtel Crillon, except that where Gabriel's buildings have terminal pavilions separated by a range of columns and arcading the London building has a single pavilion in the middle. There are also differences

---

Footnote continued from page 504

1. Bldr, 30 Sep. 1905, p. 342, a very unfavourable review, wished at least for balconies to relieve the flatness of the Piccadilly facade, but even more for "bolder projections of the end and central blocks". Bldr, 3 Mar. 1906, p. 229, again found the flatness of the main facade "devoid of interest" but "the strong and massive handling of the stone work is good". The exterior was illus. Archt, 19 Oct. 1906, p. 260; EN, 3 Mar. 1905, p. 313; 1 Jun. 1906, p. 767; BJA, 11 Jul. 1906, suppl. For view of the steel framework during construction see BJAR, 22 Mar., 12 Apr., 24 May 1905. For interiors see Bldr, 25 Apr. & 2 May 1913, pp 480, 510. See also Bldr, 15 Nov. 1902, p. 437; Bldr, 13 Aug. 1904, p. 185; Bldr, 2 Jun. 1906, p. 612; Service, EAIO, pp 435-5; Service, EA, pp 161-2. RIBAD holds drawings (V18/29(1-2)) by Rickards for an hotel, possibly the Ritz. They bear some resemblance to Mewès and Davis's building.

2. Illus. AR, XXXVI, Sep. 1914, pl. IX. It appears also in Pierre-Patte's Monuments érigés en France à la gloire de Louis XV. The Bordeaux Bourse appears in this latter source also.
between the two in matters of detail; but the overall conception is very close. Mewès and Davis's principal deviation from the Paris original was in the substitution of tasselled Ionic columns for the Corinthian order used by Gabriel. Also, though the columns of the club-house's central pavilion are free-standing, allowing a deeper balcony than on the Paris building, those of the flanking ranges are attached which is not the case in Paris. Urns have replaced armorial emblems along the skyline, and statue niches below the oval panels of the pavilion have been excluded. Otherwise, in rusticated arcade below, colonnades above, pavilion pediments and details of fenestration, the debt is clear. The back of the club-house, looking towards the Mall, is French also but, with its separate, convex pavilion roofs is more Louvresque, or perhaps owes something to Gabriel's monumental Ecole Militaire in Paris.

Inveresk House, home of The Morning Post, also drew a good deal on Louis XVI France and minimized the projections and recessions.

---

1. The R.A.C. was illus. in BJAE, 31 Dec. 1909, pp 651-4; Bldr, 12 Nov. 1910, p. 569 (front); Bldr, 28 Apr. 1911, p. 514 (interiors); Bldr, 5 May 1911, p. 535 (back); Bldr, 28 Nov. 1913, p. 582 (sculpture); AR, XXIX, 1911, pp 247-264; BA, 30 Dec. 1910, 13 Jan. & 10 Feb. 1911; BN, 23 Apr. 1909, pp 609, 628; Service, EATO, p. 437; Service EA, pp 161-3; Peter Fleetwood-Hesketh, "The Royal Automobile Club", CI, 14 Oct. 1971, pp 966-9. See also Bldr, 17 Dec. 1910, p. 743; Pevsner, London I, p. 614. The Ecole Militaire (illus. in AR, XXIV, 1908, p. 278, and in the Comte de Fels's Ange Jacques Gabriel, Paris, 1912) was more certainly the inspiration for the Waldorf Hotel (see below) and might even be the source of the rather unusual Edinburgh College of Art by J. M. Dick Peddie, 1906-9, though that building more closely resembles the little-known Château de Champlatreux (Ile de France) by J.-M. Chevotet, 1757 (illus. in Henri Lemaître, French chateaux, London, 1949, pl. 14), with its massive pavilion roofs and Classical portico. For the Art College see Bldr, 12 Jan. 1907, p. 42; 21 Mar. 1908, p. 343.
beloved of the Victorian approach to the French Renaissance. This is somewhat compensated for, on the other hand, by the peculiar situation of the building on an acute angled site formed by the newly laid down Aldwych, with strong emphasis given to the corner in the Parisian way, recalling the taste of the 1850s and '60s.

The small dome, which looks back to the Petit Palais or other Parisian prototypes such as the Magasins du Printemps, afforded a degree of skyline movement which the other two buildings by Mewes and Davis did not have. But, as with them, much effort has been made to achieve a degree of light and shade by means of deeply recessed windows and arches, and the walls are liberally coated with lush Louis Seize decoration, some of which had probably been borrowed from the pattern books of Jean Charles Delafosse.


2. Regent Palace Hotel, Piccadilly, 1913-5, by Henry Tanner, jr., F. J. Wills, and W. J. Ancell, is another excellent example of French planning making the most of an acute angled site - not outside so much as within, the angle entrance leading to an axially arranged marche of reception rooms. Subdued French pavilion treatment outside. Illus. AR, XXXVIII, 1915, pp 15-8; Bldr, 4 Jun. 1915, p. 530. See also Bldr, 2 Aug. 1912, p. 140; Pevsner, London I, p. 635.


4. Which in no way admits of the steel framework (as with the other Mewes and Davis buildings and the Waldorf Hotel, one of the earliest cases in Britain) which lies beneath the surface. Archt, 26 Oct. 1906, published a view of the as yet unconcealed framework in place. See also BJAЕ, 27 Feb. and 27 Mar. 1907 (concrete and steel supps.).

5. E.g. Iconologie historique, 1768. Reprints of this and other collections of Delafosse's work were published several times in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see bibliography). BA, 1 & 8 Mar. 1912, pp 164-5, 183, published designs by Delafosse.
The round window with fine wreath closely draped across the top, a ubiquitous feature in neo-Louis Seize architecture, was a prominent detail here. Though having its origin in Lescot’s Louvre it had been given fresh impetus in France by Perrault’s east front to the Louvre (1667-70) and is more associated with eighteenth- than with sixteenth-century French architecture. It is essentially different from Lescot’s bulls-eye windows with associated bas-relief female sculpture (re-used in the New Louvre) and also from the oeil-de-boeuf attic windows so common to both later French Renaissance architecture and its revived off-spring of the nineteenth century\textsuperscript{1}. It had appeared at Ralston and at Esher; in blind panel form on the Royal Automobile Club facade and also in the sumptuous winter garden interior at the Ritz. There a nymph-filled grotto (like that on the roof garden at No. 8

\footnote{Footnote continued from page 507
and remarked that such work was "now of the greatest interest for sculptors and architects. We give examples ... showing a grace and fertility which, with some simplification and broadening of effect, might be admirably adapted to modern use."

1. Eighteenth-century examples of the motif appear on Gabriel’s buildings in the Place de la Concorde and the Petit Trianon. Perrault’s Louvre received its greatest homage in the isolated design by James.Salmon and Son for the first competition for the Glasgow Municipal buildings back in 1880, though even this had been unable to resist pavilion mansard roofs (see above, p. 398n ). Perrault’s Louvre was much praised by AR, (XXIX, 1911, p. 25) for its "stately magnificence of proportion combined with richness and controlled embellishment". It was illus. AR, XXIV, 1908, p. 277; Bldr, XCIX, 1910, p. 751; Bldr, 22 Sep. 1911 (reproduction from Grand Marot) It was also in Blondel’s Architecture francaise, IV, vi, I, 7; and Mariette’s L’architecture francaise.}
Grosvenor Square) is the focal point for a symphony of cherubs and trellis-work. The inspiration for the total conception (grotto apart) is probably to be found in J.-H. Mansart’s Salon de l’Oeil de Boeuf of 1701 at Versailles. The trellis-work which fills the cove of the glass-topped ceiling is a nice compromise between eighteenth-century feeling and a certain geometric simplification which is more appropriate to its actual date. A similar but less elegant effect was achieved in the palm court at the Waldorf Hotel, Aldwych (1906-8) by A. Marshall Mackenzie and Son¹, and at the Hotel Cecil too – an addition by E. Keynes Purchase, of 1912². Particularly interesting for their modernistic handling of such trellis-work interiors were Belcher and Joass, and nowhere better than in the restaurant at William Whiteley Ltd., Queens Road, Bayswater, where John P. White & Son, "Treillageurs", of New Bond Street excelled themselves with such refinements as "perspective treillage"³.

¹. Illus. Archt, 20 Aug. 1912; AR, XXIII, 1908, pp 176-183; Service, BA, pl. 201. On the Waldorf generally see below, p. 544.
². Illus. BN, 3 May 1912, p. 648; Bldr, 14 Mar. 1913, pp 321-5. Purchase had been associated with the building of the Royal Automobile Club perhaps in relation to the interiors, though they, particularly the sumptuous Louis XIV Great Gallery, have the mark of Mewès and Davis. Fleetwood-Hesketh (CL, 14 Oct. 1971, pp 966-9) suggests that his employment was for his practical skills in surveying and legal matters. For an example of Purchase’s earlier, rather busy Franco-German work, à la Ernest George, see premises in Bond Street, illus. BA, 29 Aug. 1902.
³. See AR, XXXI, 1912, pp 164-178 & BA, 12 Apr. 1912, pp 270-1. Belcher had delivered a paper on the subject of treillage, ca. 1900, and the attention which he paid to that feature and to garden terraces and balustrades when he largely rebuilt the French house of M. M. Ulcoq at Wimereux, the Château Mauricien, drew much praise (illus. Bldr, 15 Sep. 1900, p. 235; see also Bldr, 16 Jun. 1900, p. 584). The house was treated in a "French Empire mode". Belcher’s talents at modernising and geometricising French features
Belcher's Whiteley's and Mewès and Davis's Royal Automobile Club belong to the final phase of the French Renaissance Revival in Britain. At long last all concern for picturesque skyline was gone, and British architects, even in the field of civic building, were looking back with growing interest to national monuments of the Neo-Classical era such as Somerset House and St George's Hall, Liverpool, and to French Classicism at its purist as in Perrault's Louvre, the chateaux of Marly and Compiègne, and the more overtly Greek architecture which belonged to the reign of Louis XVI and the period of the First Empire. Motifs from French buildings such as these were in characteristic fashion plundered freely in schemes which were perhaps taken to be homage to Somerset House. Very often the motifs were received by way of the Paris Exhibition palaces of 1900, which equipped British architects of the pre First World War years with a battery of details to be rotated in an endless series of combinations.

Footnote continued from page 509 can also be seen on the exterior of the premises for the Royal Society of Medicine, Henrietta Street, amongst many of his buildings (see AR, XXXI, 1912, pp 365-370, & BA, 12 Apr. 1912, pp 270-1).

The architect of the Petit Palais was Charles Girault. He was also co-ordinator of the architects (Henri Deglane, Albert Louvet and A.-F.-T. Thomas) responsible for the Grand Palais. The influence of these two buildings (centre-pieces of the great 1900 Paris Exhibition and results of a competition held in 1895) was enormous upon world architecture; yet it is interesting to note that it was to the more sober and Classical features of these buildings that the British responded than to the more obvious and ostentatious detailing which was to catch on like wild fire across the Atlantic. That the great curbed roofs of the Grand Palais had some slight influence upon British exhibition halls and seaside pavilions has already been noted. Otherwise this feature and the daintier ribbed domes of the Petit Palais (from some paradigm like the Hôtel de Salm by P. Rousseau, 1782–6) were pretty well ignored in this country. Similarly the extraordinary and over-sized, arched entrance of the Petit Palais, like some great, gaping mouth (with its origin in such buildings as Libéral Bruant’s Hôtel des Invalides (1675) and more especially Jean Aubert’s stables at Chantilly (1719–35)) had few and under-sized offspring in Britain compared with the gargantuan progeny it spawned in America. Those most prone to include these

1. One spectacular American child of the Petit Palais which received publicity in Britain was part of the University of California at Berkeley. (See BN, 30 Mar. 1900, & Archt, 16 Mar. 1900, p. 179). See also the St. Louis World Fair buildings (1904), illus. AR, XVI, 1904, pp 162–174; BN, LXXXVII, 1904, passim; BN, 26 Aug. 1904; BJAR, 15 Oct. 1902, pp 149–152 (proposed buildings).
more obvious Petit Palais features were students working in the increasingly Beaux-Arts atmosphere of the various architectural institutions up and down the country. One such was William Friskin, sometime pupil of the Glasgow School of Architecture, who received honourable mention in the Soane Medallion competition of 1911 for his design for a guildhall with dome and door from the Petit Palais. Another was Cyril A. Farey who carried off the R.I.B.A.'s Tite Prize the following year with a design for a royal palace, again with these features. Neither was ever built of course.

A very stylish and unexpected use of the Petit Palais entrance arch in England (amongst schemes which were actually built) was a provincial example to be seen in Cambridge at the Norwich Union Insurance Building, the work of the Norwich architect, George J. Skipper. Equally stylish and even more surprising was a house in Mayfair: more surprising because it actually preceded the designing of the Petit Palais by five years and its completion by ten.

This is No. 37 Charles Street, now Dartmouth House, the headquarters of the English Speaking Union. Dating from 1890, this was a remodelling by W. Alwright of three older houses. The client was

3. Illus. Bldr, 23 Jun. 1911, p. 779. Skipper in the 1890s had been responsible for a series of hotels in Cromer, Norfolk, which hovered on the dividing line between the French Renaissance and the Queen Anne fashions. They were given French names. The Hotel de Paris had very obviously French roofs (steep hips, pyramids, domes), diamond panels between round-angled windows, and much Queen Anne red brick and terracotta (see Bldr, 18 Dec. 1897, p. 522). The Hotel Metropole was rather less (though still somewhat) French (see Bldr, 7 Dec. 1895, pp 418–9; EN, 27 July 1894, pp 100–1; Girouard Sweetness and light, pl. 179). See also the Grand Hotel (EN, 28 Aug. 1897).
Lord Revelstoke. The facade to Charles Street is surprising enough: in the centre is a miniature Petit Palais (or perhaps we should say here Chantilly stables) arch, coved and banded (though here filled with fenestration). Above this is a Perrault oval window, while to either side are incongruous pediments half-way down the facade, choked with Baroque cornucopiae and surmounted by curling rocaille which quite envelope two smaller oculi. The courtyard is more startling still. Here Marie Antoinette would quite happily have played at milk-maids. The Chantilly entrance arch is simpler and clearer, and swoops up from the single storey elevation into the tiled roof, which is mansarded and pavilioned. Chantilly is also the source for the oeil-de-boeuf windows fringed with rocaille, the swags over the door, and (as on the outside) the Ionic pilasters with tassels pendant from the volutes.

The tasselled Ionic order has already been noted at the Royal Automobile Club, where it was preferred to the Corinthian. Including the Chantilly stables, it had many precedents in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France. Like the Chantilly arch it received its major publicity in Edwardian England, in spite of Dartmouth House, from the Grand and Petit Palais. It was the long ranges of recessed and tasselled Ionic columns at these two buildings,

1. This building seems to have been ignored by the contemporary press and by modern critics alike, except for Pevsner (London I, pp 559-560). There are some ornate neo-Rococo interiors with some genuine eighteenth-century fireplaces. Much of the decor is Georgian, however, à la Kent.
2. E.g. Versailles, the Hémicycle at Nancy, the Bordeaux Bourse, the Toulouse Capitole, to name a few.
surmounted by balustrades and urns, which chiefly pre-occupied
British architects. The domed skylines would usually be ignored in
the new vogue for the discreet elegance of the Néo-Grec. Certainly
Somerset House was a powerful force behind Edwardian architecture
but the colonnades of the Paris Exhibition halls are unmistakable
in the competition designs for civic buildings and in student
work from the late '90s onwards, more especially when the tasselled
Ionic order is found in combination with terminal pavilions whose
pediments betray by the break in the cornice from which they spring
their origin again in the Petit Palais. The contribution of
the Grand Palais to such designs was usually the slight raising
of the skyline of these same pavilions above the level of the main
range by means of simple, squared blocks. Cockerell's early Beaux-
Arts inspired work had often treated pavilions in this way. At the
Grand Palais the device is most easily appreciated where minor
entrances are placed diagonally across the corners of the building:
again the French passion for angle entrances, in this case with
a look of Gabriel's Pavillon Française at the Petit Trianon about
it.

One of the first widely publicised competitions to bring forth
a few designs with strong horizontal composition and a look of the

---

7. This is a Baroque feature to be found occasionally in the work
of Wren and Hawksmoor but current in French architecture from the
late sixteenth century onwards. Neo-Baroque architects were using
it in the '90s with English Baroque in mind. By the Edwardian era
its context—more usually looks like the Petit Palais.
Paris Exhibition buildings to them, was that held in 1899 for the Cartwright Memorial Hall, Lister Park, Bradford. Waterhouse judged the competition; the winning design was not at all French. Third prize, however, went to William A. Pite and R. Shekleton Balfour for their design which hinted not only at the Paris Exhibition palaces but (when seen from the side) at the Paris Opéra as well. A large, central hall which stretches along behind the principal facades (south and north) without impairing their essential horizontality presents (when seen from the east) a gabled end rising up, Opéra-like, behind the main building block. The south entrance front displays an elegant Classicism with no concession to the old cult of the Picturesque. For 1899 this was novel. This front is arcaded, the arches separated by paired columns; there is much French banding (though some applied to the central pavilion columns has a Gibbsian look); much use of cartouche and swag decoration; and in the centre of it all a pavilion which is very much of the Grand and Petit Palais type. Another design for the same competition which likewise strove for a monumental character, broad, simple and dignified in the modern French manner, was that of Lanchester, Stewart and Rickards (already mentioned).

1. North, south and east elevations illus. Bldr, 15 Jly, 1899, p. 64. The plan was simple and logical after modern French ideas, and because of the building's dual function as art gallery and venue for municipal entertainments an en suite grouping of apartments on the first floor was deemed "not only desirable but practically essential as a means of affording a complete circulation throughout and obtaining a dignified effect in the internal vistas".

2. Illus. BA, 25 Jun. 1899. An elegantly eighteenth-century design with apsidal projection in the centre. The horizontal skyline is raised a step in the centre to contain large oval light above the apse.
Further early exercises in this type of design were to be published in the following years and included the Soane Medallion prize design for a school of fine art by Cyril E. Power, and, more importantly, the accepted design in the Walsall (Staffs.) Municipal Buildings competition. The architect was James Glenn Gibson. Here the Victorian foible for an over-sized tower has been indulged in, destroying the otherwise perfect symmetry and horizontality of the Lichfield Street entrance front. Apart from this the building's relationship with the Petit Palais is fairly straightforward and the whole is carried off with an exuberant Baroque handling of the detail which not only captures the vigour of the model more closely than was common amongst these English imitations, but suggests also a rare allegiance to the style of Lanchester and Rickards and their recent Cardiff success. There is a towering Petit Palais entrance arch in the middle of the main front, and the window openings of the terminal pavilions are coved and banded like simplified mini-versions of the arch in its Chantilly form. Other details quote also from the exhibition palace - the pavilion pediments, the tasselled Ionic columns, the copious banding. The facade to Dawall Street even has small squared domes.

1. Illus. Bldr, 10 Feb. 1900, p. 139. Horizontal skyline; three pavilions with segmental pediments (except for the centre one where there is a straight pediment); paired Ionic columns; banding; cartouches etc.

2. Built 1902-5. The competition designs were illus. Bldr, 6 & 13 Oct. 1900; EN, 19 Oct. 1900. On completion of the building further illus. appeared (BA, 24 Nov. 1905; Bldr, 28 Oct. 1905, p. 446; Bldr, 13 May 1905 (staircase). See also Pevsner, Staffordshire, p. 254. A rather similar scheme, but simpler, was entered in the same competition by W. A. Pite and R. S. Balfour again (see Bldr, 20 Oct. 1900).
Gibson made further and similar use of the Petit Palais in his competition design for the Keighley Public Library, 1901\(^1\). Libraries as well as municipal buildings seemed to find the details and compositional devices of the Paris Exhibition buildings particularly appealing during the remaining years before the war, the treatment becoming sparer and more overtly Greek. Very often the Petit Palais is left far behind as the architects concerned themselves with the increasingly fashionable compositional type which eschewed all skyline effects in favour of a long, low, columned range with modest pavilions, and which was as likely as time went on to have its source (if specific source there still was) in the Hemicycle at Nancy or the designs for orangeries in eighteenth-century pattern books. Charming examples of this sort of thing were Edwin T. Hall's competition design for the Cornwall County Offices\(^2\), and the modest little design for a "library under single control" by Butler Wilson and Oglesby\(^3\). It was the Grand Palais's angle entrance, however, which inspired the design by Edwin Cooper which carried off the commission for the St Pancras Library. Cooper was to use the angle entrance in later years\(^4\). For the Birkenhead Library the selected

---

2. Illus. Archit, 4 Jun. 1909. It has a bowed central section like Bagatelle, topped by a double-sloped dome like those at Wren Park and Oxon Hoath of the early Victorian period. There is much elegant, rather Rococo detail.
4. E.g. for the Port of London Authority, 1912. The St Pancras Library was illust. BN, 27 July. 3 Aug. 1906, & 31 July. 1908; BIAE, 1 Aug. 1906, pp 50-52; BA, 24 Aug. 1906. There is very French treatment of eighteen-century detailing; the Ionic columns are tasselled. Much of Cooper's work (with his partner S. B. Russell)
design (by W. Edwardes Sproat and Eldon Warwick) displayed a complicated interpretation of the idea, more like the old Hôtel de Montmorency. Simplicity on the other hand was the keynote of a pair of very fine Dundee libraries by James Thomson of that town.

By the accession of King George V competition entries were dominated by this sort of design just as twenty or so years previously it was the Louvre and Hôtel de Ville types which had dominated civic architectural competitions.

It will be noticed from all the foregoing that, while occasional mention has been made of a concern for the French Classical approach to planning, most emphasis has been given to motifs, indicating that to a considerable extent the Victorian tendency to crib details and forget overall concept spilled over into the architecture of the
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looked rather French in this sort of way, e.g. Middlesbrough Library (BA, 4 Mar. 1910); 2nd prize design in Hartley University (Southampton) competition (Bldr, 26 May 1911, pp 638-641); unsuccessful design for Lambeth Municipal Buildings (BA, 20 Oct. 1905).

1. Illus. BA, 29 Nov. 1907; Archt, 1 Nov. 1907; BN, 23 Aug. 1907. Much French detail: tasselled Ionic columns, depressed arches to the windows, round windows, etc.

2. The Blackness Library has a corner entrance; the Coldside Library uses the same French motifs in a highly original and coolly elegant, curved scheme with main entrance in the centre of the curve while Grand Palais pavilion treatment is given to the ends of the curve. There is a central lantern. Both were illus. AR, XXIX, 1911, pp 25-9 & Bldr, 25 Jun. 1915. Coldside appeared also in BA, 28 Jun. 1912, p. 484. Another fine Scottish library with horizontal emphasis, Ionic columns, banding and the rest was that for Clydebank by A. McInnes Gardner and Robert Whyte (BN, 17 Nov. 1911).

3. Competitions which produced a particularly good crop of French Classical designs and got much publicity include those for the Marylebone Municipal Buildings (1911), the Port of London Authority (1912), the Manchester Library and Art Gallery (1911), Glamorgan County Hall (1909), National Library of Wales (1908). There were many more.
following reign. By the late Edwardian years, however, the approach of the average architect to planning was becoming as much influenced from Paris as were the specific details and formulae which fashion inclined him to adopt. Indeed it should be said that the influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts upon British planning was a far more potent and wide-ranging one than any of the previous stylistic influences which Renaissance or nineteenth-century France had exerted upon British architecture.

The great battle of the Edwardian years was against motif-mongering and the sketching mentality which had bedevilled British architecture since the rise of the Gothic Revival, and which had its roots in fact way back in the eighteenth-century Grand Tour. In 1898 F. T. Baggallay addressed the Architectural Association on "Composition in public buildings", bewailing the concern in past years in England to pay too much attention to detail at the expense of composition. The Gothic Revival had begun it, and pundits like Ruskin and Fergusson had perpetuated it. Fergusson, he declared, had

"looked at architecture from the outside only, and with all his careful comparison of photographs and book illustrations, never seems to have succeeded in seeing anything but a number of different systems of ornamentation which he could number and ticket and criticise for the astonishment of the public and the confusion of students."

Not long afterwards Beresford Pite in his famous address to the R. I. B. A., December 1900, noted the same tendency:

"When ... the lamp (of the Gothic Revival) went out there was no residuum of framework, method, or principle; only the inchoate notion of the wild but real beauty of all old work and a new delight in picturesque draughtsmanship."

Years later, Reginald Blomfield in his Academy lectures still felt obliged to warn students that

"sketch-book architecture, the habit of collecting merely attractive details of carving and the like, is one of the most disastrous legacies of the Gothic Revival."

Men like Ernest George had been particularly renowned (and were ultimately despised) for their "sketch-book architecture". But it is interesting to observe how the profession clung to the habit: year after year the architectural press would publish the picturesque sketches sent back by members of the Architectural Association's or the Building News Sketching Club's annual jaunts which with great frequency managed to fit in parts of Normandy or the Loire. Only the war put a stop to it. The architectural establishment in Britain fostered the habit by awarding bursaries, not as in France to go to Rome for prolonged and careful study of the antique, but

to travel and sketch where the fashion of the moment dictated.
Thus, a succession of students, winners of the Architectural
Association's Pugin Travelling Studentship or of the R.I.B.A.'s
Soane Travelling Studentship, likewise kept the press in copy with
their plentiful pen essays from the picturesque corners of Europe.
Beresford Pite himself had been of their number.

The emphases in French architectural education were quite
different. The Beaux-Arts approach to architecture is encapsulated
in the treatise which appeared 1901-4 by Julien Guadet, Professor
at the Ecole since 1886. The book shows no concern at all for
matters of style. Even the question of axial planning was not dealt
with in depth, so much was it taken for granted as a basis for
French architecture. Guadet concentrates on composition and the

1. They were usually French corners. See Beresford Pite, Soane
Travelling Student sketches of Blois (Bldr, 21 Feb. 1885) and Prague
(BN, 26 Oct. 1883). Others who toured France, sending back sketches,
1880 onwards include: Edwin Seward, the Loire (EN, 12 Aug. 1880);
Henry Walton, Pugin Travelling Student, the Loire (EN, 23 & 30
Oct., 20 Nov. 1885; BA, 28 May 1886); Arnold B. Mitchell, Pugin
Travelling Student, Normandy (Bldr, 19 Feb. 1887; EN, 4 & 25 Mar.,
23 Sep., 18 Nov. 1887; AR, III, 1897-8, pp 134, 142); Francis
Masey in Normandy (BN, 14 Oct. 1887, 20 Jan., & 8 Jun. 1888); Banister
F. Fletcher, the Loire (more technical in his approach - see BN, 5
Jly. 1889); A. E. Bartlett, Pugin Travelling Student, the Loire
(EN, 4 Apr., 1890; Bldr, 5 Apr. 1890); Aston Webb, the Touraine,
1886 (BA, 12 Jun. 1891); Heber Rimmer, Soane Travelling Student,
at Chambord (BA, 7 Sep. 1894); Edward W. Jennings, the Loire (BN,
5 Jly. 1895); E. B. Hawes, cycling in Normandy (EN, 15 Nov. 1895);
J. Edwin Forbes, Loire and Normandy, with some sketches also by
Arnold Mitchell (BA, 10 Nov. & 7 Dec. 1898, pp 259-260, 277); Ernest
T. Marriott, north France (BJAR, 22 Aug. 1900, pp 43-6); J. A.
Forbes Smith, Pugin Travelling Student, Normandy (BA, 5 Apr. & 31
May 1901); A. H. Haig, the Loire (Archt, 24 Feb., 10 & 17 Mar.
1905); A. H. Hallam Murray, south of the Loire (BN, 24 Feb. 1905);
A. N. Prentice, the Loire (Archt, 7 Jan. 1910). See also "On the
logical assembly of a building from its component volumes. The different approaches between the two countries can readily be observed by a comparison of the exhibits seen each year at the Salon and the Academy. One reviewer in 1902 remarked that one could not

"but be struck on each occasion that one visits the architectural exhibition at the Salon, with the curious change that one finds as to the point of view from which architectural design is regarded, as compared with that which prevails in general, and even more than usually this year, in the architectural exhibits at the Royal Academy. With us, the object seems to be the picturesque and even the unexpected in architectural design. With the French, the unexpected is about the last thing that happens; the feeling of the 'school' predominates."

Equally telling was the view of a critic in 1908 who saw that

"to go from the Academy architectural room to the long galleries devoted to architecture at the Salon is to go, in a measure, from the real to the ideal."

Whereas in London the space had been shared in the last years of Victoria's reign between picturesque projects which had been (or were about to be) built and picturesque views of the scenes of their inspiration, in Paris attention centred on carefully measured drawings of ancient art, schemes for the restoration of same, and upon vast and ideal conceptions and projets which were hardly likely to be built but which allowed the architect to dwell on broader concepts of design. At the Academy show the perspective view reigned supreme, but was too often unaccompanied by any plan. At the Salon the perspective view was hardly known (elevations were deemed

2. Bldr, 16 May 1908, p. 563.
quite sufficient), but huge plans and sections drawn with great precision abounded. Whole series of drawings would relate to a single project. In size they would dwarf their English counterparts — but, the English complained, there was never any scale shown: an indication of the abstract and theoretical approach of the French who, unlike the English, did not expect their designs to be immediately translated into stone blocks so many inches square¹.

All this was a direct reflection of the fundamental differences between the two countries in their approach to education within the profession. The English architectural student was characteristically articled to the office of an experienced man and learned his trade from observation and participation in the preparation of working drawings for the firm's various commissions. This, particularly as the nineteenth century wore on, was likely to be supplemented by attendance at night classes run by the Architectural Association, or at the Royal Academy School of Architecture which had been opened in 1870. The desirability or otherwise of an organised examination system was a long debated point². At the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris, by contrast, there existed a system

¹. The call for plans to be included by Academy exhibitors was much repeated. For one of many cases see Bldr, 25 Feb. 1899, p. 185. Likewise the complaint about non-indication of scale at the Salon was frequent, e.g. Bldr, 10 Mar. 1900, p. 240, & Bldr, 12 Feb. 1910, p. 173. See also AR, XXVII, Jun. 1910, p. xviii.
of architectural education with an unbroken tradition back to the
time of Louis XIV. Young men spent something like five (often more)
years in full-time training. The system was a curious one which
involved (once admission to the Ecole had been achieved) a certain
amount of formal tuition at the Ecole itself and participation in
regular examinations there; but the bulk of the student's time was
spent working upon projects in an atelier of his choice. Though these
ateliers worked in close co-operation with the Ecole they were for
the most part not officially of it. Each was under the surveillance
of a prominent architect of the day who might appear at the atelier
to pass judgement as seldom as once a week. It was the communal
spirit, the co-operation of a body of young men all working towards
a common goal, which gave to the French architectural profession a
unity of approach, a sense of belonging to a "school" which was
totally absent amongst their British fellows. The ultimate goal
of the French system was to win the Prix-de-Rome which meant for
the successful student not only a period of time in Rome to study
at first hand the antique, but also a guarantee of work for the
government on return from Rome.¹

On this matter of governmental patronage of the arts and archi-
tecture in France (the Prix-de-Rome was run not by the Ecole but

¹. A succinct account of the intricacies of the Ecole system of
education appeared in *Bldr*, 4 Jly 1908, pp 1-4, & 31 Oct. 1908,
pp 449-451. See also Richard Chafee, "The teaching of architecture
by the Académie des Beaux-Arts of the Institut de France) that indefatigable secretary of the R.I.B.A., W. H. White, had a good deal to say. In 1884 he published a brochure in which he compared the attitudes which prevailed on the two sides of the Channel. In London, he pointed out, it was the First Commissioner of Works (Ayrton by name) who had control over what in Paris formed the prizes of professional eminence. Here, so long as economy prevailed, everyone was satisfied:

"Until the English public is equally well educated in art with the French public there (will be) an opportunity for Ayrtonism."

1. W. H. White, Architecture and public buildings: their relationship to School, Academy and State in Paris and London, London, London, 1884. This was reviewed in Archt, 20 Sep. & 4 Oct. 1884, pp 179-180, 211-212. For White's reply see Archt, 11 Oct. 1884, pp 238-240. See also the view of a Frenchman on the subject, Archt, 16 Oct. 1891, pp 234-5; see also Bldr, 7 Jan. 1899, p. 14. White further addressed the RIBA with "A brief review of the education and position of architects in France since the year 1671" (see RIBA Trans, 1883-4, pp 93-120 - there were lengthy remarks by Spiers and Cates). White, who had lived and worked in France in the 1860s and died in 1896, enjoyed some posthumous acclaim from his contemporaries when it was discovered that a collection of his drawings (some of which were presented to the RIBA by his brother, 30 Nov. 1896) included designs whose discreet brand of French Classicism coincided with the new ideas of taste, though they had been executed some thirty years earlier. The style had "come round again in the whirligig of time," as J. M. Brydon put it (Bldr, 5 Dec. 1896, p. 466). The Château de Bizy at Vernon, Eure (a rebuilding on a grander scale, 1864-7, for Baron Fernand Schickler) was of this type. The drawings were returned to the owner, but were illus. first in Bldr, 26 Dec. 1896, p. 540. The Château de Martinvast, nr. Cherbourg, (RIBAD W15/35(1-7)) is in a French mediaeval style. Other drawings by White at RIBAD include ones of Bagatelle, 1861, (Y11/17), Blois, 1866 (Y11/20), and the Rouen Palais de Justice, (Y11/34). White had been early in the fray against sketch-book architecture and stylist. See his paper to A.A. on "The present state of thought concerning architecture" (Archt, 31 Jan. 1874, pp 62-6): "Taste is the demon to whom the practitioner sacrifices when he enquires what style his client will be pleased to adopt. Taste has reduced architects to seek their models for ornament in old curiosities." (p. 63).

That this was a fair estimation of the situation will be appreciated shortly when the fates of one grand civic scheme after another are discussed.

As awareness of the inadequacy of the whole pupillage system upon which the profession was based increased in Britain, attention focused more and more upon the French Ecole. To many it seemed a hopelessly unpractical training which produced architects already nearing thirty years of age who were still totally unfamiliar both with the technical procedures necessary for the construction of a building and the economic issues which lay behind the running of a successful business. Others saw that such skills were quickly learned but that there was no short-cut to an understanding of the art of architecture such as was to be found amongst graduates of the Ecole system. Two critics in 1910 show how this division persisted. One, reviewing the Architectural Association's exhibition in London noted that:

"The Beaux-Arts and Néo-Grec influences are not so predominant here as in other parts of the kingdom: this may be due to the fact that in the South of England, at any rate, we do not design naturally in terms of stonework: when all is said and done, the average student in his future career will have to deal with brick at least as much as with stone."

The second critic, reviewing the architecture at the Salon, praised the predominating ideal projects and drafts for the restoration of the antique, because such drawings gave the young architects, he felt, the opportunity

"of acquiring the utmost degree of skill in the rendering of essentials of architecture as distinguished from any adventitious accretions such as structural technicalities and economics, these latter being made the servants and not the masters of architecture.

... The dominant note is architectural expression and all other considerations are seen through this medium, whereas our students' work at home generally suggests that the architecture hangs on, rather precariously, to the fulfilment of technical and practical requirements."

Right until the First World War the profession in Britain thrashed out the question of architectural education and the press augmented the controversy by publishing a certain amount of material on the subject from America as well (not always favourable to the French system). Not only was the United States producing actual buildings which more thoroughly and boldly echoed contemporary French paradigms, but the principles of Beaux-Arts education also had been embraced there with a fervour never paralleled in Britain, and it is interesting to note during the Edwardian decade this Beaux-Art influence being felt in Britain indirectly via America. As well as copies of papers on Beaux-Arts theories and techniques taken

2. In addition to the account of the Ecole already referred to (see above, p. 524) the press published the following articles on the French system: Francis Hooper's address to the A.A. (BN, 25 Jan. 1889, pp 128-130; a note in Bldr, 1 July 1893, p. 6; "How construction is studied at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts" (BA, 11 Oct. 1895, p. 256); article by J. Guadet of the Ecole itself (AR, XIV, 1903, pp 136-144); Alfred W. S. Cross's series on "Architectural education at home and abroad" (Bldr, v. 99, Jly-Dec. 1910, passim); Theodore Fyfe's address to the A.A. on "The Atelier versus the Builder's Yard" (Archt, 27 Jan. & 3 Feb. 1911, pp 61-2, 82-8); Bartle Cox, student at the Atelier Leloux, Paris, on the atelier system (Bldr, 2 May 1912, p. 506). See also "The practice of architecture in France" (Bldr, 8 Aug. 1913, pp 134-5), being a review of Albert Louvet's L'Art d'architecture et la profession d'architecte (1910-13). From America came articles by Barr Ferree (BA, 15 Mar. 1895, pp 181-2); Ernest Flagg (Archt, 5 Jan. & 21 Sep. 1894, pp 18-20, 191-2); Ralph Adams Cram (Archt, 15 Jan. 1897, pp 51-3); John Galen Howard (Archt, 24 Jun. 1898, pp 405-6); and a series of papers read to the 33rd annual convention of the American Institute of Architects at Pittsburg, 1899: by Cram (Archt, 12 Jan. 1900, pp 29-31);
from American journals, the press continued the policy it had followed throughout the second half of the nineteenth century of publishing American designs of French inspiration. Direct influence from an American architect even produced one very Beaux-Art building in London, which, with its inflated proportions, betrayed the indirectness of its link with Paris. This was Selfridges of Oxford Street.

Footnote continued from page 527

H. Langford Warren (Archt, 19 Jan. 1900, pp 53-5); Flagg (Archt, 30 Nov. 1900, pp 339-340); A. L. Brockway (Archt, 22 & 29 Dec. 1899, pp 395-7, 411-2). See also Claude Bragdon's "Beaux-Arts architecture in America" (Archt, 23 Dec. 1904, pp 410-1); Francis S. Swales on "Architecture in the U.S." (AR, XXVII, 1910, pp 144-152; AR, XXIX, 1911, pp 13-18) and on the American John Merven Carrère (AR, XXIX, 1911, pp 283-293); J. Stewart Barney on "French academical planning" (Archt, 15 Nov. 1907, pp 316-7); "Modern American architecture", BJAE, 31 Dec. 1909, pp 527-610; and other instances of individual U.S. and Canadian designs too numerous to list.

1. In French classic style with immense range of recessed Ionic columns - fluting cabled and decorated with vines as at the Grand Palais and sundry French buildings temps Louis XIV onwards. First ten bays, 1907-9, nominally by Robert Frank Atkinson with Daniel H. Burnham of Chicago as consultant on the steel frame structure. The Beaux-Arts trained Francis S. Swales of America was responsible for the elevation according to Service (EA, p. 168). The building was continued by Burnet and completed 1928. The first part was illus. in the press: Bldr, 3 Apr. 1909, p. 409; BJAE, 31 Dec. 1909, pp 636-9; AR, XXV, 1909, pp 292-301; BN, 2 Jly. 1909; Service, EA, p. 168. The original scheme with the top floor recessed to allow space for a roof deck was published BN, 8 Nov. 1907, p. 637.

See also Bldr, 23 Jan. 1909, pp 92-3; BA, 21 May 1909, p. 361, where it is praised. Atkinson was responsible for the Midland Adelphi Hotel, Liverpool, in Beaux-Arts Néo-Grec style and with excellent French period interiors (see AR, XXXI, 1912, pp 291-310; AR, XXXV, May 1914, pp 127-151 & pl. IX-XII; BA, 5 Apr. & 27 Sep. 1912; Archt, 3 & 10 May 1912; Bldr, 10 May 1912, pp 553-4. Atkinson was principal of the A.A. school, 1912-20. J. Summerson, The Architectural Association 1847-1947, London, 1947, p. 44, writes: "Robert Atkinson, as head of the school, provided the curriculum with those broad academic standards, drawn largely from France and America which no English school, with the possible exception of Liverpool, had previously possessed."
All this was not without results upon the mode of training of the British architect. Although the R.I.B.A. had introduced examinations for admission to associateship of that body back in the 1880s, it was Liverpool University which first established a full-time, examinable degree course in architecture which could stand comparison with that of the Ecole. The school opened in 1894 under Professor F. M. Simpson's direction, the degree course itself commencing in 1899. In 1904 Charles H. Reilly took over and was responsible for the very Beaux-Arts oriented teaching programme which emerged in the ensuing years. In due course similar schools opened in Glasgow, London and other centres. In 1903 A. N. Prentice made a plea not only for a national school or architecture but for a British school of architecture in Rome - to "in short assimilate the whole education of the architect in England to that existing in France". By then the French school in Rome, established by Colbert in the seventeenth century, had been joined by American and German equivalents. It was not for almost another ten years, however, that Prentice's recommendation bore fruit and the British School at Rome, founded in 1901 for the study chiefly of archaeology, was reconstituted on a broader footing to embrace painting, sculpture and architecture. Efforts were initiated in 1911 to this end.

3. J. M. W. Halley wrote (AR, XXXI, 1912, pp 371-2) that it had long been a reproach to Britain that America, Germany and France between them spent £22,000 p.a. on artistic and classical studies in Rome. Britain spent only £1100 and all that went to archaeology. The U.S. school of architecture in Rome opened in 1895.
May 1912 the draft charter of the new school was published, with the Royal Academy, the R.I.B.A., the Royal Society of Sculptors, and the Commissioners of the 1851 Exhibition as joint sponsors. The first meeting of the new school took place the following month 1.

The following year another major step forward was taken in the struggle for parity with the French system: an atelier of the Parisian type was opened (February 1913) in Wells Mews, London, under the guidance of a newly formed body calling itself the Beaux-Arts Committee. Charles Mewès and Arthur Davis were the first professors or patrons; J. P. C. Chaurès was sous-patron; the committee included Lanchester and Lutyens 2. The following precis was issued, outlining the aims of the atelier:

"Although such progress has been made in building up schools to replace the pupilage system, it is generally recognised that however excellent they may be in other respects, they fail in the logical and systematic teaching of those principles of design which are essential if a community of ideas and generally accepted standard of criticism, so necessary to a vital school of architecture, is to be maintained."

"Such logical system of teaching and standard of criticism

---

1. The first members of the architecture faculty were: Blomfield, Lethaby, Lutyens, Lorimer, Ernest Newton, C. H. Reilly, J. W. Simpson, Leonard Stokes, Aston Webb (BN, 3 May 1912, p. 621; see also BN, 24 Nov. 1911, p. 722; AR, XXX, Dec. 1911, pp xvii-xviii; BN, 25 Jun. 1912; Bldr, 2 May 1913, p. 501). On the school's functioning see Bldr, 28 Feb. 1913, p. 266; Bldr, 16 & 23 Jan. 1914 (Rome scholarship competition designs by Louis de Soissons for a "modern technical university"); Bldr, 29 May 1914, p. 635 (describing the Rome Scholarship Competition to be held in two stages - an open preliminary one, and a second for ten finalists to be held en loge as in Paris); Bldr, 10 & 17 July 1914, pp 32, 61-5 (the Rome scholarship won by Philip Dalton Hepworth; the Rome Studentship won by Ernest Cormier - both were ex-Beaux-Arts students and their designs, illus. here, showed much influence from the Ecole).

exists at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, where the principles and theory of architecture have been preserved by unbroken traditions since the time of Louis XIV. It is believed that the establishment of the definite architectural principles with which the Beaux-Arts atelier system is intimately connected is the first necessary step in this country toward placing architecture on a sound theoretical basis."

It should be noted, however, that by 1915 it was being stressed that

"while due regard is given to the merits and claims of the French school there is no undue weight given to French architectural methods and design, but the work of the Atelier shows a very well-balanced regard for English tradition unencumbered by insular prejudice."

It should also be noted that although more than one recent critic has claimed that this First Atelier (as it was called) proved an early casualty to the war, closing in 1914, there is plenty of evidence to the contrary. Certainly a second atelier which was expected to open in the autumn of 1914 under the patronage of A. R. Jemmett seems never to have materialised. The architectural press

4. See Bldr, 24 July 1914, p. 108, where it is said that the First Atelier had its full complement of students. Bldr, 7 Aug. 1914, p. 157, declared that premises for the second atelier had been found. The war did cause the closure of a third atelier also, it seems - that of the Architectural Association. It was reported (Bldr, 27 Dec. 1918, p. 435) that it would reopen on 6th Jan 1919. According to summerson (Architectural Association, p. 44) This (["one of a group of ateliers affiliated to the R.A."]) flourished under Howard Robertson and then H. Charlton Bradshaw until 1922 when it merged with the A. A. Design Club. The A. A. School itself (under Atkinson) had by this stage absorbed a great deal of Beaux Arts principles (see above, p. 528).
repeatedly reported, however, that the First Atelier was struggling manfully on despite the decimation of its membership by the war, even the enlistment of its patrons, Davis and Chaures. The principles involved in the ateliers's teaching were not to be affected, but the monthly exhibitions of work would take place only once every two months. Far from completely succumbing to the war, the atelier emerged from it triumphant. At a luncheon given by the Society of Architects (under whose auspices the atelier had devolved) Sir Alfred Mond and Sir Lionel Earle spoke in eulogistic terms about the recent "wonderful exhibition of students' work" on view at the society's headquarters, 28 Bedford Square, and agreed that the government should be urged to give a boost to the system by granting the atelier state recognition.

The probability that the French bias of these developments had some lasting and significant results upon British architecture seems

1. Adrian Berrington and Leonard Holcombe Bucknell, as senior students, were to take over some of the instruction (see Bldr, 27 Nov. 1914, pp 510-511; Bldr, 10 Mar. & 7 Apr. 1916, pp 192, 260. See also Bldr, 26 Sep. 1913, p. 320; 11 Sep. 1914, p. 251; 6 Oct. 1916, p. 210). Published atelier designs included those by Bucknell, Bryan Watson, and W. G. Newton for a "commemorative monument on a battlefield" (Bldr, 29 Aug. 1913, pp 220-1); by Bucknell and E. R. Jarrett for a "monumental fountain" (Bldr, 26 Mar. 1915). French techniques were much to the fore.

2. Referred to in a letter from Edwin J. Sadgrove, President of the Society of Architects, printed in Bldr, 8 Aug. 1919, p.137. Sadgrove said that it was the intention of the society to take steps "at the earliest moment" to place these proposals before the Minister of Education. The Rome school, by contrast, seems to have been hard hit by the war (Bldr, 25 Dec. 1914, p. 595; Bldr, 17 Dec. 1915, p. 438 – only twelve students left) though it too survived it.
to have been a point not readily conceded by the generation between the wars. They were able to claim for their Classical approach to planning genealogies stretching back through British architecture — and certainly a good deal of attention was paid in the pre-First World War years to men like Elmes, Cockerell, and the Scot, Alexander Thomson. But Nicholas Taylor has pointed out that today

"We can see that a significant group of English modern pioneers — Burnet, de Soissons, Robertson, Goldfinger — did their best work directly under the influence of a Parisian training. Moreover, in the world of prefabrication and precasting, such vital things as the correct detailing of a joint require the kind of mental discipline and expertise which the Beaux-Art training once gave to the historicist detailing of cornices and drip mouldings."  

Besides, we have already seen that Cockerell, at least, was directly influenced by French architecture.

As well as the revolutionizing of British architecture during


2. N. Taylor, "Richardson", in Service EAIT, p. 448. Examples of modern French-inspired work given are: the "Classical modern" Kodak House, Kingsway (1910-11) by Burnet; the Shredded Wheat Factory, Welwyn (1925) by de Soissons; the British Pavilion at the 1925 Paris Exhibition by Howard Robertson; and the Ministry of Health at the Elephant and Castle (1961-3) by Goldfinger.

3. His scheme for a Waterloo Palace for the Duke of Wellington could almost be a Beaux-Arts exercise of the Edwardian era (see AR, CXLV, 1969, p. 102).
the Edwardian decade towards a new Classicism in design and an axial approach to planning (which, in spite of Greek Thomson and the rest, did owe a good deal to Paris) there were more immediately obvious signs of Beaux-Arts influence to be discerned in the work which was coming out of the newly established architecture schools and ateliers of Britain. These were simple matters of drawing techniques. Ever since Phene Spiers (who had trained at the Atelier Questel) had been installed as lecturer at the Royal Academy school in 1870, he had done his best to foster French techniques. It was an up-hill struggle in the early years, and the following review of one of his own drawings, exhibited at the Academy in 1885, gives an indication of the resistance he encountered. The drawing, a detail of a portion of a public building,

"strikes one at first sight as the work of a French architect," wrote the critic "but upon examination it turns out to be by Mr Phene Spiers who has adopted the French system of drawing and shading which he has so often advocated by public speech. It has, no doubt, some technical advantages; but it is not without some artistic drawbacks. We are glad to see one drawing of the kind in the room and should be sorry to see many; partly because we do not want to be Frenchified even to our advantage, and the advantage in this instance is at least doubtful."

Others in these years who employed the French techniques appear to have themselves trained at the Ecole rather than absorbed them from Spiers. No doubt the Academy would not have tolerated

1. Eldr, 23 May 1885, p. 721. The drawing in question was illus. Archt, 6 Aug. 1886. Archt, 2 May 1885, p. 260, liked the design but feared it was "unfortunately never likely to be produced in any other form in this country. It will bear comparison with the best pavilion of the Louvre."
2. E.g. Lawrence Harvey's "Design for a staircase" shown at R.A.,
the actual teaching of such techniques in their classes in the 1870s. Spiers dealt with the different methods of architectural drawing in his book of that name, published 1887, pointing out that a system very close to the French one had prevailed in England as well, until it had been superseded by the Gothic Revival's preference for a linear technique. By 1912 so establishment a figure as Reginald Blomfield was able to reiterate all this:

"The habit of outline drawing of architecture, introduced by the elder Pugin, has much to answer for," he declared, "It has taught architectural students to look at buildings not as masses, as compositions of solids and voids, but as arrangements of abstract lines; and it has withdrawn their attention from that study of form in the round which is the province of the architect not less than of the sculptor."

An attempt to elucidate the processes and aims of the Ecole technique of drawing was hazarded by George Drysdale who had employed them for his prize-winning designs of 1907, already referred to in an earlier chapter:

"Broadly the system is - leave your circulation portions (corridors, etc.) white, toning down the rooms or resting departments, and by means of mosaics or careful pieces of drawing, arresting the eye at important or axial points.

Footnote continued from page 534.
1879: "We recognise the results of Academic training in the French manner of washing tinted drawings and even to a certain extent in French composition and design" (Archt, 24 May 1879, p. 302). H. L. Florence's student designs of the 1870s (see above, pp 454, 457) demonstrate Beaux-Arts techniques which he would have learned at the Atelier Questel. Another early example was A. R. Jemmett's prize-winning design for the R.A. Travelling Studentship, Dec. 1888 (BN, 11 Jan. 1889, p. 66). He was a pupil of Fasnacht.
Surely this is a better method than the haphazard way English plans are generally presented, and much easier for the public to follow than the usual architectural maze called a plan. As to the drawing of the elevations, surely it is better on drawings like those, which always remain simply drawing, by means of shadows, joints, backgrounds, etc., to try and express a building, rather than a few architectural lines intelligible only to the few."

182A The French plan was more pictorial than the English one in the sense that it looked very much like a bird's eye view of a building in its setting, but with the superstructure chopped off about a foot above the ground so that the interior was revealed. Washes were applied to much of the plan, specific colours being used for specific purposes by common consent. Walls, trees, columns, all cast a short shadow at an angle of forty-five degrees, lending to the drawings a three-dimensional, veristic effect. Similarly, upon the elevations the depth of advancing or receding sections of a facade was indicated by the extent of the cast shadow which was washed in upon the adjoining section, so that, as Spiers pointed out, what it took two or three drawings to convey by means of the linear technique could be incorporated into a single drawing by means of tinting and scisagraphy, as the projecting of shadows was called. Elevations like the plans, set the building in its environment with paths, roads

2. Address to RIBA, "Remarks on the foreign system of shading and tinting drawings", RIBA Trans, new series, I, 1884–5, pp 86–9. See also address to A.A. (Archt, 25 Apr. 1874, p. 244) where he conceded: "I think it right to state that it is not every design which can be explained by shadows and that as a rule all irregular and picturesque compositions in opposition to what I may call architecturesque can only properly be represented in perspective".
and vegetation indicated. As to facility of interpretation of these drafting techniques by the uninitiated, this was by no means universally conceded. By the turn of the century, however, they were winning an increasing amount of support, and from some surprising quarters. In relation to exhibits at the 1903 Academy exhibition, Norman Shaw was reported to have "thrown his weight rather into the scale of highly-finished drawings, such as are made by French Prix-de-Rome students". By 1909 it was noted that sciagraphy

1. From 1899 onwards the British journals quite often published Prix-de-Rome and other French designs, thus aiding dissemination of the techniques. Prix de Rome designs included: Tony Garnier (Bldr, 30 Sep. 1899), Jean Hulot (Bldr, 12 Oct. 1901), E. Hébrard (AR, XVI, 1904, pp. 255-8), G.-F. Janin (Bldr, 3 Sep. 1910, pp. 258-9), René F. H. Mirland and André J. L. Japy (Bldr, 15 Sep. 1911, pp. 298-9). See also article on Henri Paul Nenot (Bldr, 19 Nov. 1910, pp. 609-615); and design by R. Rousselot (AR, XVI, 1904, pp. 110-114); article on recent French architecture (Bldr, 9 Jul. 1910, pp. 30-1). Also an exhibition of French architectural drawings organised by the Société des Architectes Diplômés de France and the Architectural Association opened in London, 6 May 1913, and toured Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dublin (see Bldr, 2 May 1913, p. 503; Bldr, 13 Mar. 1914, p. 328; BA, 16 May 1913, pp. 373, 375, 385). A return exhibition of British work went to Paris (see Bldr, 29 May 1914, p. 635). The work of British and American students successful at the Ecole was published also: the admission esquisse (taking first three prizes) by Hirons, Francis Swales, and Bontrand (Bldr, 1 Oct. 1910, pp. 369-370); also A. F. Adams, of the Atelier Prevot's prize-winning design in the Paris Prize Competition (Bldr, 15 Oct. 1910).

2. "We do not know that the French system renders the plan any more intelligible than the English system, though it has no doubt a more artistic effect," wrote Bldr, 22 Feb. 1908, p. 215, concerning Drysdale's designs.

3. AR, XIII, 1903, p. 49. In 1902 Shaw had written that "The departure from old tradition in architectural drawing which insidiously crept in some years ago (i.e. with the Gothic Revival) and which in England has now become almost universal has, no doubt, something to do with our decadence." (AR, XII, 1902, p. 125).
was being taught at the Liverpool University School of Architecture. Certainly student designs about this time (and not only from the Liverpool school) began fairly consistently to use the Beaux-Arts drafting techniques. It is also interesting to note how often student projects of these years (like the Prix-de-Rome designs) were for grandiose and improbable schemes such as few architects get an opportunity to build in their entire careers. The year 1910, for instance, witnessed a design for a "National Valhalla for Explorers" done by Philip Hepworth at the Architectural Association's school, and a "Memorial to a great peace-loving Monarch" by Albert H. Hodge; while the subject for the Tite Competition that year was a "Campo Santo on a rocky island". When it is observed that in 1897 the subject for the Premier Grand Prix at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts had been "Une église votive dans un lieu de pèlerinage", the degree of direct influence from Paris is clear. The ultimate in Beaux-Artiness was perhaps achieved when Prentice Mawson won the Soane Medallion in 1910 with his design for "An Entrance Gateway to a Capital City" complete in its Beaux-Arts presentation with gold borders and a

carefully-composed frontispiece of details.\(^1\)

The tradition of the typical Beaux-Arts plan and elevation to place a building in its environment was symptomatic of a wider French tradition which caused many an Englishman to pale with envy. This was the concern for town-planning. In all Europe France had no

\(^1\) See Bldr, 24 Feb. 1911, p. 241, for Prof. Reilly's commentary on the design which is referred to by Mawson's motto "Civitas". The prize was withheld in the end as it was said Mawson had had help. It was illus. at the above reference and also BN, 20 Jan. & 10 Feb. 1911. Second prize went to C. Percival Walgate for belated Loire-style essay (see above, pp. 357-8). Other entrants in this competition with Beaux-Arts features were those by "Mafie" (Bldr, 28 Apr. 1911) and by J. Nixon Horsfield (Archt, 24 Feb. 1911). For other student designs of the period displaying Beaux-Arts drafting techniques and Parisian looks see: Walter Cave, country house, AR, VII, 1900, p. 216; Claude Kelly, Art Gallery, BN, 7 Nov. 1902, p. 651; C. Lovett Gill, British Embassy in a foreign capital, BA, 23 Feb. & 2 Mar. 1906; Alick George Horsnell, Open air swimming bath, BJAE, 14 Feb. 1906, and Shakespeare Theatre (see above, p. 455); Harry H. Jewell, Nobleman's mansion, Bldr, 18 & 25 Dec. 1909, pp 660, 695-6; William A. Robb, Sunken garden surrounded by loggia, AR, XXVII, 1910, pp 214-7; Harold Hughes, BN, 16 & 23 Sep. 1910; Adrian Berrington, Nobleman's house, Bldr, 14 Apr. 1911; Leonard Holcombe Bucknell, also Alan Binning, designs for hall of a city company, Bldr, 22 Dec. 1911, p. 744; G. Wyville Home, Concert hall in a county town, Bldr, 6 Oct. 1911, p. 401; James M. Whitelaw, River facade of Charing Cross Station, Bldr, 17 Feb. 1911, and Terminal railway station, Bldr, 24 & 31 Jan. 1913, pp 102, 147-8; Piet de Jong, also William Friskin, Guildhall, Bldr, 2 & 9 Feb. 1912, pp 122-3, 196; Edgar Bunce, Guildhall, Archt, 16 Feb. 1912; William A. Ross (Robb?), Public place upon bank of river, BN, 9 Feb. 1912, pp 143-5; Louis de Soissons, Covered courtyard of Royal Exchange, Bldr, 9 Feb. 1912 & BN, 2 Feb. 1912; Leslie Mansfield, Guildhall, Archt, 23 Feb. 1912; S. Clough, Royal palace, Bldr, 3 May 1912, p. 516; A. B. Llewelyn Roberts, Royal palace, Bldr, 4 Apr. 1913, p. 404; Cyril A. Farey, Royal palace, Bldr, 21 Feb. 1913, p. 242, & Official residence for a royal personage, Bldr, 6 Feb. 1914; John Eadred Lutyens, Monument to commemorate the bringing of water to a town, Bldr, 29 Aug. 1913, pp 223-4.
equal for her ability to carry through grand schemes for the laying out of her cities in the Classical manner. Henri IV's projects for Paris, only partly fulfilled, had been the first such in Europe since the fall of Rome. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had seen the quite small towns of Richelieu and Nancy transformed into show-places of town-planning. Pierre Patte's *Monuments érigés en France à la gloire de Louis XV* (1765) recorded (and the Edwardians of course knew the book) not only the work done at Nancy, but many similar schemes, not all of which were executed, for other centres like Bordeaux and Rennes, and, not least in importance, the competition designs for the Place Louis XV (now the Place de la Concorde) in Paris. Most extensive urban development in Paris, however, was that carried out by Baron Haussmann during the Second Empire.

London's history of civic design was, by contrast, a history of what might have been. Only Nash's Regent Street had become a reality, and that was a triumph of British empiricism over formalism. In spite of the opportunity offered by the Fire of London nothing had come of the great schemes of Evelyn and Wren. The government's later failure to grasp at the great plan by Sir Charles Barry for the unification of Whitehall in the 1850s was recalled in 1901 by Heathcote Statham:

"We are now building Government buildings piecemeal on isolated and inadequate sites and have lost irretrievably the whole architectural and administrative value of concentration."

---


W. H. White's attack upon the lack of state control in British urban design, the petty economies and the confusion of politicking which bedevilled most British endeavour, has already been noted. He compared France with Britain in these terms:

"On the one side are conspicuous the evidences of method, refinement and care; on the other, of inexperience, hurry and confusion."

Ever since the Embankment had been laid down in the '60s a certain amount of public attention had been focused on urban development; Holborn Viaduct, Northumberland and Shaftesbury Avenues had followed and there had been mounting pressure for some sort of governmental intervention to secure a degree of uniformity in the associated new architecture. The farce in relation to Northumberland Avenue will be recalled. There was less concern for the grand effects to be achieved by careful planning of the streets and open spaces themselves. In the mid-1880s the laying down of Shaftesbury Avenue caused a minor scandal, so insensitive was it to such matters: far from aiding the formation of any sequence of grand vistas, the new street had destroyed the perfect round of Nash's Piccadilly Circus. At the time a few voices were raised in protest but it was not until the new century that ways to mend the damage were considered. This late reaction was partly prompted by the fact that it was not until the 1890s that the great developments inaugurated by Baron Haussmann in Paris were completed. Also, this Parisian influence

coincided with the rising interest in *Beaux-Arts* education and architectural planning concerns generally; and then, it was recognised that for a nation at the peak of its imperial power some sort of effort to achieve grand and pompous effects in the urban environment should be made. At any rate, the Edwardian era introduced a new phase in British town planning: much was planned, but much less was achieved. The long tradition of the sanctity of the individual was equal to any governmental bid to secure uniformity. Equally potent was the English disapproval of anything that might look like extravagance. Behind it all Paris loomed as a perpetual inspiration and reproach. This is how it seemed:

"The Haussmann regime took the French Renaissance as a starting point and remodelled the principal streets into a prevalent and consistent style which showed indeed little variety, and little of the more refined quality of Renaissance architecture, but had nevertheless the element of style and a prevailing civic dignity which, if it did not rise above a certain level, at all events did not sink below it. The city acquired thus that palatial aspect in its streets which led an English novelist to remark that while Paris was a city, London was only a collection of villages."

In due course Liverpool University instituted the first chair of civic design in the country, 1909, with Stanley Adshead as professor. The following year saw a major town-planning conference and exhibition promoted by the R.I.B.A. and the Academy. "Town

---


Planning Notes" became a regular feature in The Architectural Review. Even an act of Parliament on the subject was passed. Changes certainly took place in London, but no new Paris rose to dazzle the world.

Apart from a design for an "Ideal town to the entrance of the proposed submarine English and French tunnel" (the work of a Bohemian architect resident in London, Jan Kotéra) which attracted some comment at the Academy in 1900, the first urban improvement scheme which the new town-planning vogue and the new century jointly ushered in was that for the junction of Holborn and the Strand. This was to be achieved by means of the broad thoroughfares (road widths it will be recalled had long been a matter of controversy) known eventually as Kingsway and Aldwych. The latter crescent-shaped street, when finally laid down and built upon, was widely agreed to be a "rather striking piece of architectural scenery" - and this can be appreciated in the views of Aldwych as seen from the Strand by Waterloo Bridge published at the time. The only unity that could

2. Housing, Town planning &c. Act, 1909, 9 Edw. 7, ch. 44, Part II: Town Planning. This provided for town-planning schemes to be enacted by local government boards.
3. Archt, 18 May 1900, p. 315, called it a "fantasy although sufficiently pleasing as a study". Bldr, 5 May 1900, p. 434, commented that it was "more French than anything else in style and idea, and is in fact just the kind of thing we are accustomed to see at the Salon, only on about four times the scale of this drawing. It is not an ideal 'town' in the usual sense of the word, but a kind of pompous architectural frontispiece to the entrance to the tunnel ... It is a conception on paper only, for it could never be carried out, and though ambitious in conception is too odd and eccentric in detail to be admired here at all events; it may suit French tastes better". The author, it was assumed, had trained at the Ecole.
4. Bldr, 25 Apr. 1908, pp 484-5; Archt, 29 May 1908; Service, EAIO,
be claimed for the view, however, lay in the universally French inspiration of the buildings, despite their different architects. On the left-hand corner was the Morning Post building; opposite it, a cruder Baroque echo in the fatter dome of the Gaiety Restaurant and Theatre\(^1\). Further up Aldwych Sprague’s two identical and rather Parisian theatres, the Waldorf (now the Strand) and the Aldwych, flanked the towering Waldorf Hotel. This, a rather elegant building, was the last of the great hotels in the Louvresque tradition\(^2\), though here the more likely source would have been A. J. Gabriel’s Ecole Militaire in Paris, judging by the banding to the corners of the domes and the predominantly Louis Seize detailing. Designed by A. Marshall Mackenzie and Son, the Waldorf dates from 1906-8. Less constricted than the lumpish Cecil and the Northumberland Avenue hotels, it avoided also the formless extensions of the Grand and the Royal. Like the buildings of Mewès and Davis it was an early one in London to use a steel frame, which it, too, took pains to conceal behind its rank of giant columns and pilasters. Inside (as out) it

Footnote continued from page 543

pp 426-7. All the chief buildings survive except for Runtz’s Gaiety. The Morning Post building has been altered by addition of an extra floor and changes to the dome.


2. Except perhaps for the Regent Palace Hotel (see above, p. 507n). There was also the A.A. student design for a “Covered carriage-way entrance to a large hotel” by H.J. Tebbutt (Eldr, 13 Mar. 1914). This had Louvresque pavilion roofs.
was decorated entirely in the "restrained style of Louis XVI". On the eastern corner of Aldwych and the Strand the Mackenzies were further involved, this time with the Australian Commonwealth Buildings, 1913. This was in the more severe French Néo-Grec style and included another example of a Grand-Palais-inspired angle entrance.

"Striking architectural scenery" all this was to some extent. What was passed over might have been more striking. There had been talk of a Holborn-Strand link for some years. Henry Clarke, first chairman of the Improvement Committee of the London County Council, wrote to The British Architect in 1900 when controversy was at a height pointing out that the idea of such a scheme first

1. AR, XXIII, 1908, pp 176-183, where it is illus., as also in Bldr, 29 Dec. 1906, p. 752; BA, 21 Feb. 1906, p. 438; BJAE, 25 Dec. 1907, p. 17 & 30 Dec. 1908, pp 126-130; Archt, 30 Aug. 1912; BN, 4 & 11 Jan. 1907, pp 13, 60. For the steel structure see BJAR, 5 Apr. 1905, pp 172-6; BJAE, 27 Feb. & 27 Mar. 1907 (concrete and steel supps). See also Bldr, 5 & 12 Dec. 1903, pp 577, 598 (at which early date the Mackenzies got the commission); Bldr, 1 Feb. 1908, p. 127; BA, 5 Jun. 1908, p. 401; Pevsner, London I, p. 346. Each room was to have its own bathroom, a rare convenience in Britain "in spite of the proverbial fondness of our countrymen for the 'morning tub'".

2. Illus. BA, 1 Aug. 1913; Bldr, 1 Aug. 1913; 8 & 29 May 1914; 21 May 1915. Prior to this a scheme by the Mackenzies, fit to dwarf St Mary-le-Strand, and much indebted to the Paris Opéra, was published (BN, 13 Sep. 1907, p. 357) as the Canadian Government Offices for the quadrant site between the Strand and Aldwych, where Bush House now stands. Other French designs by the firm include the Northern Assurance Co., Aberdeen (Archt, 5 Jan. 1906, & BJAE, 4 Mar. 1908, p. 207) - Néo-Grec but with Pailly brackets; Recreation hall for Otto Monsted Ltd., margarine manufacturers of Southall (Bldr, 22 Sep. 1911, p. 330) - very elegant eighteenth-century French, an inflated version of the Wrest Park lodges (Silsoe); Swinfen Hall, Lichfield, (Bldr, 12 Jun. 1914) - Néo-Grec.
came before the council back in June 1891. Then it had been suggested that

"this being designed as a first-class thoroughfare the council might be disposed to consider some novelties in London street architecture".

One of the novelties suggested was an array of arcading as at the rue de Rivoli and the Palais Royal in Paris. A certain William Woodward, who had a facility for town-planning schemes which everybody ignored, capped this by declaring in a paper read to the Society of Architects that as far back as 1884 he had written the prize Westgarth Essay on the subject of "The reconstruction of Central London" in which he had anticipated the idea of a street from Southampton Row to Waterloo Bridge: there was to be a circus at the junction with Wellington Street, the whole, furthermore, being rather better handled (in Woodward's opinion) than any of the council's current schemes. These latter were the fruit of a limited competition held in 1900. They were to be ignored as well. The competition was mismanaged from the start: the terms of entry were most unreasonable, £250 being the compulsory purchase price for all drawings without any commitment being undertaken on the part of the council. Plans were not required since functions had

1. BA, 23 Nov. 1900, pp 361-2.
2. This he read to the RIBA and the Surveyors' Institute (see BA, 1 Jun. 1900, p. 391). Other Woodward schemes included a pre-cocious one to formalize the junction at Trafalgar Square of the Mall and the Strand (see BA, 26 Jan. 1894, p. 58). He was also voluble in his denunciation of the Mall fiasco (AR, XXIV, Oct. 1908, p. xxxii) on which more below.
not been decided upon; the style of the elevations was to be "Palladian, freely treated, and of simple character". Most contestants took their note from nearby Somerset House, but second prize went to William Flockhart for a very French affair with steep, hipped roofs. Though much more florid, it looks as if it might have had something like the Place des Vosges as its starting point. In any event, the critics found it "too Parisian in manner for London".

Like all the rest of the competition designs this sank rapidly into oblivion despite the concern of men like J. G. S. Gibson who raged at the lost opportunity. When Kingsway was opened in 1905 and official speeches simpered on about the council's "earnest care and consideration to the architecture of the new streets", it was left to the editor of The Builder to snarl that the competition had failed "through sheer commercial greed on the part of the less educated majority of the Council, who found that it would be more difficult to let plots for building on if there were a demand made for keeping the facade subservient to a general design. Architectural dignity, in the avowed search for which £2000 had been paid was abandoned for mere considerations of business".

1. "And, pray, would the Improvement Committee define what 'Palladian freely treated' means?" sneered the BA, 2 Mar. 1900, pp 143-4. See also BA, 13 Apr. 1900, p. 251. It had been suggested for a time that the new County Hall be built in the Aldwych quadrant. The only certain requirements were the rehousing of The Morning Post, the Gaiety Restaurant, and two theatres.

2. Bldr, 24 Nov. 1900, p. 466, where the design is illus. (as design no. 27). It was also illus. Archt, 18 Jan. 1901; AR, VIII, 1900 (Dec. supp.); EN, 16 & 23 Nov. 1900; Bjar, 28 Nov. 1900. It was not liked in the general article in Bldr, 21 Jun. 1902, p. 615. Bldr, 3 Nov. 1900, p. 380, found that, though it had "a good deal of go about it", it also had "the defects of French taste without the French finish in detail".


By this stage attention had been diverted to a far more splendid project. In 1901 the old queen had finally died. It was quickly seen that a combination could be made of a monument to Britain's longest reigning sovereign and a piece of town-planning which might in its magnificence celebrate appropriately the pinnacle of imperial power which the nation had achieved during her reign. The site for this scheme was the Mall. A processional way was called for from the junction with Whitehall near Trafalgar Square right up to Buckingham Palace itself. In front of this a sculptural memorial would be sited as focus of a round point terminating the avenue. Naturally the Champs Elysées were upper-most in everybody's mind. The commission for the sculpture was given immediately to Thomas Brock, but, for the town-planning aspect a competition was held, limited to five invited architects and judged in August 1901.\(^1\)

\(^1\) The contestants were Rowand Anderson, Thomas Drew, Ernest George, T. G. Jackson, Aston Webb. Heathcote Statham, as editor of The Builder regretted this limitation: an initial open competition might have brought forth a scheme of genius; this could have been followed up by a competition with six finalists. "Some such system is undoubtedly what would have been adopted in France where they understand better how to manage these matters". He then proceeded to outline his own scheme of genius (Bldr, 13 Apr. 1901, pp 359-361). See also Bldr, 27 Apr. 1901, p. 413.
straight line, was to "give greater privacy and form a forecourt to the palace" itself. The Mall was to be widened and straightened, its existing line of trees to be replaced by new ones more regularly spaced and alternating with pedestals for sculpture, more massive at two points. The feature which won Webb the commission was his handling of the awkward junction between the Mall and Whitehall. This he later changed; but at the time he recommended a circular place with fountain in the Mall to mask the oblique angle of the junction.

By the time construction was completed in 1912 the scheme was, characteristically, a pale reflection of all this glory.

"The necessary funds for this effect ... were not forthcoming," it was reported, "and the scheme had to be shorn of many of its features, the enclosing colonnades being represented in the finished work by low balustrades and the parterres reduced to a quite commonplace gardener's affair. But the greatest mistake in the alteration of the scheme was undoubtedly the bringing of the roadways from Buckingham Palace Road and Constitution Hill within the enclosure ..."

Thus the spectator must stand "in a whirl of traffic". As early as 1905 the circle at the Whitehall end of the Mall had been abandoned in favour of the Admiralty Arch, which, while grand, might serve the added function of supplying the Admiralty with extra accommodation. Webb showed his design for this at the Royal Academy that year.

1. BA, 2 Aug. 1901, p. 71.
2. For Webb's winning design see Bldr, 2 Nov. 1901, pp 388-9; AR, X, Dec. 1901, p. 200 & supp.; BA, 8 Nov. 1901, p. 327; Archt. 8 Nov. 1901; EN, 1 Nov. 1901, pp 579-580; BJAR, 6 Nov. 1901, pp 213-5.
As with Kingsway the whole project was a saga of haste and folly from the start. In 1901 The Builder was remarking that

"it is a curious example of the manner in which this important work has been hurried through by the Committee and the total want of ordinary common-sense in artistic matters which distinguishes the English official mind, that Mr Webb (and we presume, all the other architectural competitors) had to make his design without any knowledge of the form or the proportions of the sculptural monument which was to form the central feature. Could there be a more typical example of English fatuity about public works of art? ... It seems almost incredible: it would be, anywhere but in England."

Also a clear problem from the start was the palace itself. An undistinguished building of heterogeneous composition, Georgian in origin but titivated dully by Blore in the 1840s, Buckingham Palace as chief residence of the sovereign was an embarrassment to all chauvinistic Britons. A new palace was regarded as inevitable:

The Architectural Review in 1908 was regretting that a

"new imperial palace was not designed at the same time as the Queen Victoria Monument so as to form the dominant feature of a complete and congruous Mall Improvement Scheme."

William Woodward pointed out that

"Sir Aston Webb's design for the monument must have been influenced by the present palace; and therefore the future palace, if we are to have one, must, if it is to agree with the monument, perpetuate certain features that are perhaps undesirable, and might have been eliminated, if the architect had been free to design a complete scheme."

One architect, Sir Thomas Drew, did design a complete scheme. The profession was impressed, but the civic authorities were not. As

2. AR, XXIV, 1908, p. 162.
culmination of his scheme for the Mall, Drew had included a view of the palace transformed. While looking rich, the scheme would be economical:

"My proposition is to recast the facade architecturally without changing its fenestration or altering the internal arrangement," commented Drew. Recast it he did with copious sculpture and swags and oeil-de-boeuf windows; Corinthian columns were strung across the front and three pavilions were raised and advanced beyond the rest of the facade to break the monotony. Each was capped by a fat, squared dome, flanked with ornamental chimneys from the Louvre. It was really a bit passé and would not have looked out of place in the Admiralty competition of twenty years earlier.

The competitors had not been asked to alter the palace, and none but Drew made an issue of it. Webb did, however, indicate his dissatisfaction with the building as it then stood by a more tactful and modest hint. The palace behind his screens bears simple, un-enriched, pavilion roofs — from the Louvre again. The rest of the palace remains unchanged. It was Webb who got the commission when the time came. Belatedly, but rapidly (it took only three months), the palace was refaced in 1913. By then the days of pavilion roofs were well gone. Instead the treatment was a cool, conventional

1. Archt, 8 Nov. 1901, where the scheme is illus. It was also illus. Blér, 9 Nov. 1901; AR, X, 1901, p. 204; EN, 8 Nov. 1901; BJAR, 6 Nov. 1901, p. 211. See also Blér, 2 Nov. 1901, p. 378.
2. For references to this see above, p. 349. The added roofs (square domes) are also to be seen on the model palace behind Brock’s sculpture model (AR, X, 1901, p. 198; BJAR, 6 Nov. 1901, p. 205).
Classicism which recalled so many of the competition designs of the preceding decade. Elegant yet unostentatious, it seems a faded echo of the pomp of Selfridges and the beauty of the Royal Automobile Club.

Albert Richardson, sometime ghost for Frank Verity and enthusiastic exponent of Parisian urban planning and the Néo-Grec in architecture, railed against the mismanagement of the Mall scheme, comparing it unhappily with the lavish Beaux-Arts memorial to Victor Emmanuel in Rome:

"On the one hand we see the puny work of a wealthy people, and on the other the gigantic efforts of a poverty-stricken nation."

But Aston Webb's scheme for the Victoria Memorial was only part of the story of ambition and failure which involved members of the

---

1. Blore's palace was illus. Bldr, 1 Nov. 1912, pp 496-8; & EN, 1 Nov. 1912, where it is compared with Webb's scheme. That was further illus. Bldr, 9 May 1913, p. 538; 14 Nov. 1913, p. 517; 21 Aug. 1914, p. 196; EN, 25 Oct. 1912; BA, 1 Nov. 1912; Archt, 14 Nov. 1913; Service, EAI0, p. 336, & EA, p. 166. See also Bldr, 20 Sep. 1912, p. 333, & 2 May 1913, p. 497. For student schemes for royal palaces clearly inspired by the controversy, see above, p. 539n.

2. AR, XXX, 1911, p. 28. On Richardson see Nicholas Taylor in Service, EAI0, pp 444-459. Numerous rather French exercises in civic planning by him and his partner Lovett Gill were published, including one for the regularisation of Trafalgar Square and transformation of the National Gallery into a Néo-Grec palace (AR, XXIV, 1908, pp 55-7; BA, 25 Dec. 1908, p. 455-6); the Euston Station complex in Beaux-Arts style (AR, XXVIII, 1910, pp 308-9); and Waterloo Place (BA, 70 May 1907, p. 329). He contributed articles to the architectural press on French Classical architecture, e.g. on J. C. Krafft and J. L. Hittorff (AR, XXXVI, 1914, pp 54-8, 106-9); Duc's Palais de Justice (AR, XXVII, Jan. 1914, pp 7-10 & pl. IV-VII, & AR, XXXIV, Nov. 1913, pp 95-4 & pl. I-III). See also his article on "The style Néo-Grec" (AR, XXX, 1911, pp 25-8).
architectural profession in a remarkable set of plans for a truly "Imperial London". The Academy school held a competition in 1911 for "a public place situated upon the bank of a river". Most prominent contestant was Adrian Berrington. He did not limit himself to one public place but embarked upon grander things, probably as a result of direct encouragement from H. V. Lanchester who, as editor of The Builder from 1910 to 1912, ensured the publication of much material on town-planning at that time. For Berrington, Webb's Mall was only the beginning. The coronation of George V had brought to mind notions of an imperial federation. Berrington rose to the occasion with a scheme which aimed at transforming the entire face of London: clearly he considered this more than a simple student exercise. Great emphasis was put on the development of the South Bank which, with its scruffy array of warehouses and factories, was an area ripe for clearance. From Webb's rond-point at the gates of the palace an "Imperial Processional Way" was to proceed direct to Parliament Square and thence across the bridge past County Hall ("where an open place is provided for the ceremonies connected with the presentation of addresses to the sovereign"). Behind County Hall (which had recently and at last found its site after the usual sequence of abandoned projects) the Imperial Way was to advance in

1. The commission for County Hall was won in competition, 1908, by Ralph Knott. The design (which was slightly altered in execution) is a massive and simplified interpretation of the Néo-Grec formula (Ionic columns, bound tassels, banding, etc.) with a boost from Piranesi. It was copiously illus: Bldr, 8 & 15 Feb. & 1 Aug. 1908, 10 Sep. 1910, 16 Apr. 1915; BN, 7 Feb. & 24 July 1908, 29 Apr. 1910; AR, XXIII, 1908, pp 156-160; Archt, 7 & 14 Feb. 1908; BtAE, 5 Feb.
stately fashion to the Imperial Parliament itself, to be situated where the South Bank arts complex now stands. This it seems was to be a vast Neo-Grec edifice, a "double-decked city" in fact, with Imperial Way and Parliament House on the higher level, the whole surmounted by a huge squared dome, rather like the Central Hall but a good deal bigger. An obelisk in front was to be aligned with Cleopatra's Needle and an "orchestral" open space beyond in the Adelphi. As if this were not enough, the royal progress was to continued along the South Bank to Blackfriars Bridge and a further monumental place. A new St Paul's Bridge was to carry the monarch, with suitably axial orientation, to the cathedral, and on to the Guildhall or Mansion House. Berrington's pencil (which was much in the vigorous Baroque tradition of Rickards) proved inexhaustible with fresh details for the project. Others joined in with drawings for the new bridge. But the idea never got official consideration, and even if the war had not once and for all put the lid on such romancing it seems unlikely that Berrington's Imperial London would ever

Footnote continued from page 553
& 22 Jly. 1908 (suppa); BA, 21 Feb. & 6 Mar. 1908, & 3 Jan., 28 Mar. & 2 May 1913. See also AR, XXIV, Aug. 1908, p. xii. Most of the other contestants offered Neo-Grec designs. Belcher's was particularly French with Perrault's Louvre providing motifs (BN, 17 Apr. 1908). In 1901 Knott had won second prize in the Tite competition for a design for "an entrance gateway to a public parkway" of Nancy Hemicycle appearance (see Bldr, 9 Feb. 1901, p. 138). Concerning the abandoned ideas for the County Hall, the Aldwych was one such (see above, p. 547n) Earlier still had been Runtz's Louvre scheme, 1889 (see above, p. 147).
have got far. Nor did another grand scheme to complement Webb's Mall get very far. In 1909, R. F. W. Speaight (who had been responsible for the Marble Arch improvement) devised a plan, with all the usual axial formality, for an "Avenue of Historical Military Heroes" to join the Horse Guards with the Mall at Marlborough Gate:

"It is suggested that, thus improved, the new Horse Guards Parade would be a worthy rival of the Tuileries Gardens, and of the Place du Carrousel in Paris."

But the pruned Webb scheme and Brock's monumental sculpture were all that "Imperial London" and the memorial to Queen Victoria ever got.

Her son fared scarcely better. All the student schemes for a "Monument to a great peace-loving monarch", doubtless prompted by his death, remained on their drawing boards. More success, though

1. The scheme was exhibited at the R.A., 1912, and published in Eldr, 5 Jan. 1912, pp 11-3. The St. Paul's Bridge part got more detailed attention in Eldr, 3 Jan. 1913, and included a circular place on the city side near the cathedral, with buildings like those at Oxford Circus with French Empire detailing. Suggestions by Berrington for the development of Whitehall appeared in Eldr, 7 Jun. 1912, pp 666, 668-9. Amongst drawings for the proposed St. Paul's Bridge itself, L.H. Bucknell's, which won a silver medal at the R.A. were particularly Beaux-Arts in technique and design (AR, XXIX, 1911, pp 118-20). For other student schemes associated with the 1911 competition, see those by William A. Ross (Beaux-Arts plan, Eldr, 9 Feb. 1912, pp 143-5) and by W. H. Gummer (Eldr, 12 Apr. 1912, pp.425-6) cf. schemes by older men: W.D. Carde's northern approaches to London Bridge (BA, 14 Oct. 1910, p. 257); also his, Adshead's and Edwin T. Hall's later ideas for a peace memorial and imperial bridge at Charing Cross (Eldr, 26 Jan., 9 Mar., 20 Jul., 19 Oct. 1917).


3. See above, p. 538.
again only partial, attended another scheme in honour of the king and begun in his own life-time. This was the extension to the British Museum, the Edward VII Galleries, added to the north front. The foundation stone was laid by the king himself on 27th June 1907. The galleries were opened by his successor on 7th May 1914. The architect was J. J. Burnet. Like Selfridges (upon which Burnet was later to be employed) the Edward VII Galleries suggest the receipt of Beaux-Arts principles by way of America, despite the fact that Burnet had trained at the Ecole himself. The giant Ionic colonnade which constitutes the front to Montague Place is simple and monumental; internally there is a clear and logical progression from vestibule to stairs and the galleries themselves which demonstrates the best Beaux-Arts principles. But the building was to have been more complex, and not altogether symmetrical. To either side of the colonnaded section built, the museum was to have extended two extra bays to a small, pedimented pavilion each with two Ionic columns and framed by vertical, banded strips. Further to the right, towards Bloomsbury Street, an extra extension would have housed a small lecture theatre under a modest, ribbed dome of Parisian appearance. Additional pavilions, separated by a colonnade, stretched part of the way down the Bloomsbury Street facade. Similar additions were intended for the main front of the museum too. Aligned with the centre of the range that was built was a small-scale exercise in town-planning: a street was to run directly northward to Torrington Square with a circular space at Keppel Street with a fountain in the middle and houses about it flush with Néo-Grec
detailing. Beyond was a triumphal arch. The scheme appears not to have acquired the Keppel Street trimmings, and subsequently itself gave place to the London University.

Nor did another suggestion for a monumental open space in memory of King Edward VII fare better. This was an idea of John Murray's to salvage the wreck of Piccadilly Circus: and here we may return to a question already alluded to. Piccadilly Circus and the Regent Street Quadrant had been a source of controversy since the insensitive laying down of Shaftesbury Avenue in the 1880s. The history of the attempt to set things right according to Beaux-Arts principles was the last of the great pre-war fiascos in British town-planning, the last in the sequence of good intentions which left observers still asking, "Where are our Champs Elysées?"

---

1. A bird's eye view of this bit of urban design was published BN, 12 Mar. 1909, p. 396. The full scheme for the museum as originally planned was illus. AR, XXII, 1907, pp 55-9; AR, XXIII, 1908, p. 136; Archt, 12 Jly. 1907; BN, 19 & 26 Mar., 2 Apr. 1909. What was built was illus. Bldr, 15 May 1914, p. 588; AR, XXXIII, May 1913, pl. XIII; AR, XXV, Jun. 1914, pl. XI-XIV & pp 150-4; Archt, 1 Apr. 1913; Service, EAIO, p. 208; & EA, p. 167. Some of Burnet's earlier French inspired work was mentioned in a previous chapter. Two other works deserve mention. These are The Bank of Scotland, Lerwick, 1904-6, with a virtuoso Beaux-Arts entrance; and the very elegant Elder Library, Govan, Glasgow, 1907 (illus. Archt, 17 Mar. & 7 Apr. 1905; Service, EAIO, p. 205; Andor Gomme and David Walker, Architecture of Glasgow, London, 1968, pl. 190). To the main front there is more than a touch of the typical eighteenth-century French garden pavilion like the Grand Trianon. Another ribbed dome (à la the Hôtel de Salm) only slightly breaks the horizontal skyline as it rises above the apsidal entrance portico which swells out gently in the centre of the entrance facade. The back is a severer exercise in Neo-Grec detail.

2. Frederick J. Stevenson asked this question (Bldr, 12 Jun. 1914, p. 705).
Murray's Edward VII Square was drawn up with the intention of its harmonising with Norman Shaw's grand scheme for the Piccadilly Hotel and the Regent Street Quadrant (drawings for which dated from 1904 onwards). Shaw's and Murray's designs were in a sort of Imperial or Piranesian Georgian with little French about them, apart, perhaps, from the rows of dormers high in the roof, and, in Murray's design, the taste for covered loggias at street level which owed as much to the rue de Rivoli as to the piazza at Covent Garden. The history of how Murray's square and even Shaw's quadrant (apart from the hotel) were not executed is fully told by The Survey of London. It is a familiar story: Regent Street and Piccadilly were added (as a contemporary put it)

"to the roll of thoroughfares which, like Kingsway, have started with good intentions for dignified and harmonious architectural

1. The relationship between these two paradigms in nineteenth- and twentieth-century architecture is interesting. Clearly the Beaux-Arts firm, Mewès and Davis would have looked to the rue de Rivoli when constructing the Ritz. The 1891 Holborn-Strand scheme specifically mentioned the Paris example. When Clutton (whose interest in the French Renaissance will be recalled) built the Bedford Chambers in Covent Garden itself (1877-9) and simply repeated the existing piazza, he insured that we be reminded at the same time of the rue de Rivoli by topping the building with a high roof with very French Classical oeil-de-boeuf windows (see SL, XXXVI, The Parish of St Paul Covent Garden, London, 1970, pl. 45a & b, 49a, p. 85; also Bldr, 24 Aug. 1878, p. 875). The loggias therefore suggested by Murray (and more so those actually built by Blomfield) would not have been done without a nod in the direction of the Paris examples.


It was also illus. BA, 17 Feb. 1911.
treatment and ended in our characteristic English fashion in a patchwork of charming but incongruous bits."

Shaw's hotel had gone up before any of the leaseholders of the rest of the area had been consulted as to the design of the properties they were to inhabit. Height and street windows proved insuperable problems. By 1912 Shaw had resigned and shortly was dead. It was clear that a new start would have to be made, though the Piccadilly Hotel was there now in the middle of it all, an inescapable presence to be accommodated. More as an academic exercise than in any real spirit of hope, The Builder sponsored a competition that year for the completion of the complex. Predictably, this brought forth some rather French elevations. More French than Richardson and Gill's winning scheme was Albert W. Moore's which came second. There were high pavilion mansards, oeil-de-boeuf windows and huge segmental pediments on top of the pavilions.

No more than the quadrant in Regent Street was ever considered. The rest was being rebuilt piecemeal behind many and different elevations. The ironic part was that in many cases the designs were not so very different from one another - but, sadly, just different enough for the street to fall short of a Parisian harmony. Prominent amongst the architects responsible for Regent Street and Oxford Circus were Frank Verity (or his assistant, Richardson) and

2. Illus. Bldr, 12 Jly, 1912, p. 46. Also French was the design of Whitelaw and Tait (James M. Whitelaw had worked under Burnet). See Bldr, 11 Jly, 1913, p. 31. For other competition designs see Bldr, 18 Jun. 1915, p. 568.
Henry Tanner, junior. There was a pronounced preference for the French Néogrec: high, but even, roofs, ribbed with the fasces motif; vertical banded strips; oeil-de-bœuf windows; Ionic columns; tassels; and so forth. At least Oxford Circus, though taking fifteen years before all four quadrants were complete, was treated as a single stylistic entity. The architect was Henry Tanner. It is hardly distinguished architecture, but at least there is unity.

Further down Regent Street Tanner was responsible for such French-roofed stores as Harvey Nichols & Co and Dickins and Jones. Verity or Richardson designed the rather superior block between Conduit and New Burlington Streets, which houses, amongst other things, the Regent Street Polytechnic. The matter of the Regent Street Quadrant itself wrangled on through most of the war years. Eventually it was Reginald Blomfield who got the job. He found a nice compromise between the austerity of the Piccadilly Hotel and the demands of the shopkeepers, in a rather delicate and personal version of French eighteenth-century architecture. Many of the features were inspired by Shaw's hotel but Blomfield gives them a French twist. Light,

---

1. The quadrants were erected in this order: SE (1913), NE (1923), SW (1925), NW (1928), according to Pevsner, London I, p. 606. Illus. of the scheme appeared in Bldr, 15 Sep. 1911, p. 302; EN, 13 Sep. 1912; BA, 10 May 1912; Archit, 5 July 1912.

2. Illus. EN, 24 May 1912.

3. Taylor in Service, EAIQ, pp 452-3, attributes it (façade only) to Richardson, 1907. The contemporary journals always said Verity. The body of the building was the work of George A. Mitchell. The façade was illus. EN, 5 Nov. 1909, p.679; EN, 26 May 1911; AR, XXXI, 1912, pp 104-15; Bldr, 16 Jun. 1911, p.750 (detail). See also Bldr, 5 May 1911, p.536; AR, XXX, Nov. 1911, p. xxii.
banded rustication marks the ground-level arcading of Swan and Edgar's Piccadilly Circus front instead of the Piranesian massive-ness of Shaw's rustication. Rue de Rivoli loggias front the County Fire Offices across the street. Vertical banded strips separate each range of windows on both the Fire Office and Swan and Edgar's, in a way which reminds us of earlier Blomfield exercises in restrained French Classicism such as the United University Club in Pall Mall East (1906-7). Most delicate of all in the quadrant design is the swagged top storey above the cornice line and the strange, French roofs which strike a vague eighteenth-century note, but are not quite like any known original. For all his enthusiasm for François Mansart and Ange Jacques Gabriel, Blomfield was no copyist. Maybe it is all rather "effeminate" (as certain critics have dubbed it) but the shop-keepers knew what they were about when they denounced Shaw's scheme as "very suitable for

2. With his Academy lectures of 1907 (collected as The mistress art, London, 1908) and his further lectures which led up to the publication of his books on The History of French Architecture, and Architectural drawing and draughtsmen, Blomfield did more than anyone else to draw attention to the history of the French Renaissance generally and to foster an appreciation of the perfection which he saw in the work of men like Mansart and Gabriel. Individual lectures appeared in the press over the years on: Delorme (AR, XV, 1904, pp 40-53, 93-105; AR, XVII, 1905, pp 12-23); Early French Renaissance architecture (Archt, 5, 12 & 19 Feb. 1909, pp 103, 111, 126; EN, 5 Feb. 1909, p. 209); Lescot and Goujon (Bldr, 10 Dec. 1910, pp 712-5; BA, 9 Dec. 1910, pp 413-4); French draughtsmen of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Bldr, 9 & 16 Feb. 1912, pp 148, 175; Archt, 16 Feb. 1912, pp 108-9).
Newgate, but utterly absurd for commercial purposes”¹. Blomfield’s designs were done in 1917-18; building lasted 1923-8. From 1928 to 1936 Blomfield harboured aspirations to be allowed to complete the whole of Piccadilly Circus in harmony with the part already done. His sketch designs for this were shown at the Royal Academy in 1936 and must surely be amongst the last to thus overtly display so French an influence both in the elevations of the buildings and the principles of urban design². Paris itself had long since been reported to be lowering its own standards and succumbing to the new wave of “scientific commercialism” in architecture³.

Something of a legacy of Beaux-Arts principles lives on, however, into contemporary architecture. Blomfield may seem outdated in the way he clung to the French eighteenth-century mode in which he had long worked; but he insisted always that what the French had to offer which was valuable above all else was a method, a set of architectural principles to work by. French eighteenth-century architecture might, in his opinion, best demonstrate this set of principles but it was not necessarily the only style of architecture that might do so. In 1912 he wrote of the danger that students, and modern architects generally might,

¹. SL, XXXI, p. 92. See p. 95 for jibe of effeminacy.
². See SL, XXXI, p. 96, & XXXII pl. 153b. For Blomfield’s Swan and Edgar and the County Fire Office, see SL, XXXII, pl. 151b; & Service,EA, p. 165.
³. Bldr, 25 May 1911, p. 633, observed this trend when reviewing the Salon. See also AR, XXV, 1909, pp 56-7; & AR, XXVI, Jly, 1909, p. xxviii.
"Instead of learning to become good draughtsmen — that is, instead of acquiring the power of drawing anything by study of buildings, of natural objects and of life — tend to concentrate on the fashionable manner of the time. At present it is the French Manner — excellent, accomplished, and within narrow limits perfectly adequate; but it had been my object in these essays to show that the modern French manner is only one among many others, a manner too, which, though it expresses the habit of mind of French designers, does not necessarily respond to the differences of temperament and tradition of the Anglo-Saxon."

What he saw at the 1925 Paris Exhibition appalled him. Art must move in a continuous progression, he parried; to ignore the past is futile:

"It is for this reason that I take the work of Ange Jacques Gabriel, in the middle of the 18th century, as typical of French architecture at its best and of all that it stands for. Its lesson is that architecture is the art of form, of rhythm, and proportion, and that its problem is to translate into terms of ordered beauty the requirements of civilised life as it moves on from age to age ... The spirit of Classical architecture does not rest in orders and entablatures, but in a clearness of conception that controls the whole design from first to last and excludes everything that is not essential to the expression of the dominant idea."

What he failed to appreciate was the extent to which modern architecture and what he saw at the 1925 Exhibition answered these conditions, and owed a debt to Beaux-Arts principles. In the last analysis, Blomfield could not completely divest himself of the nineteenth-century historicist approach which he himself so deprecated.

1. Blomfield, Architectural drawing and draughtsmen, p. 90
CHAPTER TWELVE: Conclusion

1914 was when the war began, not when the French Renaissance Revival ended. By 1914 the concern for French historic stylisms was pretty well done already. The war made further exercises in historicism irrelevant to the main stream of development.

Even so, just as aspects of the French systems of education, drafting, town-planning, and so forth, popular before 1914 (and all with their roots in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Classicism), survived the war to become absorbed into the native tradition, so also did hints of French historic styles linger on another decade or so. There was the Worthing Pier Pavilion, and the work of Blomfield; there was the decor at the town-houses of Chips Channon and the Duke of Marlborough. Cinemas and theatres often chose a geometricised version of dix-huitième ornament for their exteriors, like that pioneered by Belcher and Joass.

Undoubtedly twentieth-century British architecture has owed many and various debts to the many and various aspects of the French Renaissance Revival which had pre-occupied Victorian and Edwardian architects in rapid succession. But we do not have to evaluate things in terms of enduring influence. That the French styles pre-occupied the Victorians and Edwardians to the extent they did is in itself an important fact which has been too long overlooked. In most cases the French styles were not so much an influence upon the course of Victorian and Edwardian architecture, as a response to a set of circumstances which had been worked out in more native terms.
Clutton boosted the early French Renaissance because compositionally (if not decoratively) it fulfilled the demands of Puginism. Godwin boosted François Premier architecture because it brought a greater elegance to the compositional ideas which men like Butterfield, Street and ultimately the Queen Anne-ites had been developing for some years. Blomfield boosted the work of Mansart and Gabriel because it brought a consummate elegance to the revived Classical taste which was already directing the attention of British architects to the work of Chambers and Adam.

The French Renaissance Revival was rarely revolutionary or pioneering. On the contrary it appealed time and again to the conventional and conservative members of the profession, even if it did have the capacity (as an occasional exponent such as Godwin or Douglas indicated) to supply powerful answers to contemporary questions. More readily the French styles supplied easy and comfortable solutions to both the theoretical and practical questions of the day. They were ever adaptable and convenient. Their built-in eclecticism made them the quintessential Victorian styles. The very fact that they were espoused by the masses more than by the pioneers ensured a profusion of monuments, by no means without value, to remind us that if since the heyday of the French Renaissance Revival some critics have despised this Gallic interlude in the history of British architecture, there were many at the time who found in it all they could wish for.

There were always opponents too, of course. Henry James might call Chambord "an exaggeration of an exaggeration"; and William

1. *Archit.* 1 Sep. 1883, p. 132.
Morris its modern replica "an imitation of an imitation of an imitation"\(^1\). But such voices belonged to the select minority. From the French Renaissance Revival we may learn something of the Victorian age. And there is much to enjoy in such monuments as Holloway College and Whitehall Court, Wykehurst and Waddesdon.

\(^1\) BA, 22 Feb. 1889, p. 137.
**RULERS**

Charles VIII, 1483-1498

Louis XII, 1498-1515

Francis I, 1515-1547

**ARCHITECTS**

Francis I, 1515—1547

**BUILDINGS**

- Maison de Jacques Coeur, Bourges (1445-51)
- Manoir des Andelys
- Rouen Palais de Justice
- Hôtel de Cluny, Paris
- Château d'O
- Martainville (1485)
- Amboise (begun 1496)
- Gaillon (1497-1510)
- Josselin, alterations (ca. 1500)
- Maison d'Agnès Sorel, Orléans
- Fontaine-Henri (old part)
- Ducal palace, Nancy (1501-12)
- Compiègne Hôtel de Ville (1502-14)
- Blois, Louis XII wing (1503)
- Bury (1511-24)
- Maintenon
- Blois (1515-24); N.W. facade (1520-4)

APPENDIX A: Chronology of French rulers, architects, and buildings, 1150 - 1500, referred to in text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chenonceaux (begun 1515)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azay-le-Rideau (1518-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambord (begun 1519)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel du Bourgtheroulde, Rouen (1520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de Diane de Poitiers, Rouen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Pincé, Angers (1523-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaugency Hôtel de Ville (1526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moret villa (Maison de François Premier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontainebleau, Cour du Cheval Blanc (1528-40); Galerie François Premier (1533-40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid (begun 1528)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantilly (1530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Bernuy, Toulouse (1530-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Écouen (1531-40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villandry (1532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Hôtel de Ville (begun 1532)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHITECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francesco Primaticcio, 1504-5-70, &amp; Giambattista Rossi (Il Rosso Fiorentino), 1494-1541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RULERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis I, 1515-1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis I, 1515-1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri II, 1547-1559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis II, 1559-1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles IX, 1560-1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles IX, 1560-1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri III, 1574-1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri IV, 1589-1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis XIV, 1643-1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis XIV, 1643-1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis XV, 1715-1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe, Duc d'Orléans, Regent, 1715-1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis XV, 1715-1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis XVI, 1774-1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Convention, 1792-1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory, 1795-1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulate, 1799-1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoléon I, Emperor, 1805-1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis XVIII, 1815-1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles X, 1824-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Republic, 1848-1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoléon III, Emperor, 1852-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commune, 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Republic, 1871-1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B: Index of illustrations of French Renaissance buildings in British periodicals, 1860-1914.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMBOISE, Château d'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archt, 9 Oct. 1869, EN, 13 Aug. 1880; Eldr, 1 Nov. 1884; EN, 8 Mar. 1889.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBOISE, Tombe des Cardinales d' (Rouen)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN, 21 Dec. 1883.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDELYS, Manoir des</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archt, 29 Nov. 1895.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANET, Château d'</td>
<td></td>
<td>PA, 20 Sep. 1878; Eldr, 10 Dec. 1910.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGO, Manoir d'</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN, 27 Feb., 3 &amp; 10 Apr. 1874.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZAY-LE-RIDEAU, Château d'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archt, 4 &amp; 11 Jan. 1879; Eldr, 30 Mar. 1889; EN, 5 July. 1889; EN, 4 Mar. 1892; Archt, 10 &amp; 17 Mar. 1905; Archt, 18 &amp; 25 Aug. 1911; Eldr, 7 Sep. 1911.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGATELLE, Château de</td>
<td></td>
<td>AR, XXX, 1911, pp 233-440.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRAULT, Logis (Angers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN, 20 Nov. 1891, p.716.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUGENCY, Hôtel de Ville de</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archt, 29 Nov. 1879.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOURGTHÉROULDE, Hôtel du (Rouen)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eldr, 21 Feb. 1885; Eldr, 7 May 1887; Eldr, 28 Nov. 1913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSSY-RABUTIN, Château de</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN, 1 &amp; 29 Nov. 1895.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARNAVALET, Hôtel de (Paris)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archt, 26 Jun. 1880; Eldr, 9 Apr. 1887; PA, 10 Feb. 1911; AR, XXXIII, May 1913.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAMBORD, Château de.

CHANTELoup, Château de.

CHANTILLY, Château de.

CHATEAUDUN, Château de.

CHAUMONT-SUR-LOIRE, Château de.

CHENONCEAUX, Château de.

CHEVERNY, Château de.

CLUNY, Hôtel de (Paris).

COMBOURG, Château de.

COMPIÈGNE, Hôtel de Ville de.

CUJAS, Hôtel (Bourges).

DIANE DE POITIERS, Maison de (Rouen).

ECOLE MILITAIRE, (Paris).

ECOVILLE, Hôtel d' (Caen).

ELYSEE, Palais de l' (Paris).

FONTAINE-HENRI, Château de.

PONTEVRAULT, Château de
FONTAINEBLEAU, Château de.  
EN, 25 Feb. 1874; BA, 26 Apr. & 18 Oct. 1878; Archt, 12 Nov. 1881; Archt, 16 Apr. 1886; Eldr, 26 Feb. 1887; AR, XII, 1902, pp 201-23; BJAE, 23 Jan., 6 & 27 Feb., 3 Apr. 1907; BJAE, 27 May & 17 Jun. 1908 (supps); AR, XXXIII, Apr. 1913.

GIEN, Château de.  
Archt, 14 Dec. 1872; EN, 3 Apr. 1874.

IFS, Château des.  
EN, 1 & 29 Nov. 1895.

INVALIDES, Hôtel des (Paris).  
BJAE, 18 Mar. 1908.

JACQUES COEUR, Maison de (Bourges).  

JEAN D'ALIBERT, Maison de (Orléans).  
Archt, 18 Apr. 1874; Eldr, 26 Feb. 1880; EN, 22 Nov. 1895; Archt, 19 Dec. 1902.

JOIGNY, Château de.  
EN, 29 Nov. 1895.

JOSSELIN, Château de.  
BA, 17 May 1878; BA, 18 Jan. 1884; BA, 15 Dec. 1899; BA, 5 Jan. 1900; Archt, 13 Sep. 1901.

KÉROUZÈRE, Château de.  
Eldr, 7 Dec. 1907.

LA FERTE-MILON, Château de.  
EN, 26 Dec. 1873.

LANGEAIS, Château.  
Archt, 17 Dec. 1886.

LOUVRE, Palais du.  

LUDE, Château du.  
EN, 28 Mar. 1872.

LUXEMBOURG, Palais du.  

MADRID, Château de.  
EN, 18 Jly. 1873; BA, 7 Jun. 1878; Archt, 21 Sep. 1906; BA, 3 Sep. 1909.

MAINTENON, Château de.  
Eldr, 29 Nov. 1890.
MAISONS, Château de.  AR, XXX, 1911, p.225; EN, 6 Sep. 1912.

MARTAINVILLE, Château de.  Archt, 29 Aug. 1913.


MESNIL GUILLAUME, Château de.  EN, 1 Nov. 1895.


OYRON, Château d'.  BA, 17 Feb. 1882.


PAU, Château de.  EN, 20 Feb. 1874.

PETIT TRIANON (Versailles).  EIdr, 26 Aug. 1899; EN, 6 Sep. 1907.


PLACE DE LA CONCORDE (Paris)  AR, XXXVI, Sep. 1914.

ROCHERS, Château des.  EIdr, 7 Dec. 1907.


ROUGEMONT, Château de.  EIdr, 22 Sep. 1911.

SAINT CLOUD, Palais de.  EIdr, 8 Apr. 1893.


SAINT MACLOU, Eglise de (Rouen), Stair.  EN, 23 Sep. 1887; AR, III, 1897-8, p.134; BJ, 30 Nov. 1898.
TANLAY, Château de. BA, 20 Jly. 1884.
TUILLERIES, Palais des. ILN, 2 Feb. 1867; ILN, 15 May 1869; BA, 11 Oct. 1878; Bldr, 19 Jly. 1879; BJAR, 18 Sep. 1901; Bldr, 6, Jan.-Jun. 1911, pp 79-81, 728-9; Bldr, 20 Oct. 1911.
VILLANDRY, Château de. Bldr, 1 Sep. 1911; Archt, 8 Sep. 1911.
A. SELECTED FRENCH PATTERN BOOKS TO 1800

ANDROUET DU CERCEAU, Jacques, see DU CERCEAU, Jacques Androuet

BERAIN, Jean, Oeuvres de Jean Berain, Paris, 1711.

BERAIN, Jean, Ornemens inventez par J. Berain et se vendent chez Monsieur Thuret aux Galeries du Louvre, Paris, 1711.


Fac-similé des Oeuvres de Jouanès Berain dessinateur ordinaire de Louis XIV, par Midart, Paris, Caudrilier, 1860?


BLONDEL, Jacques François, Cours d'architecture, ou Traité de la décoration, distribution & construction des bâtiments, Paris, 1771-77.


Reprints: L'architecture française ... executée sous les auspices du Ministère de l'instruction publique et des beaux arts sous le contrôle de MM Guadet et Pascal, Paris, Lévy, 1904-5.

Cours d'architecture, Paris, Guérinet, 1913.

De la distribution des maisons de plaisance et de la décoration des édifices en général, Dourdan, Thézard, 1884?

Décorations extérieures et intérieures des XVIIe & XVIIIe siècles - décoration des
appartements - boiseries et plafonds - mobilier - ferronnerie - jardins ... etc., Paris, 1913.


Motifs de ferronnerie ancienne des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, par J. F. Blondel et C. E. Briseux, Paris, Massin, n.d. (19-?).

BOFFRAND, Germain, Livre d'architecture, Paris, 1745.

BRISSEUX, Charles Etienne, Architecture moderne; ou L'Art de bien bâtir pour toutes sortes de personnes, tant pour les maisons des particuliers que pour les palais, Paris, 1728.

BRISSEUX, Charles Etienne, L'Art de bâtir des maisons de campagne ...

Reprints: See BLONDEL, Jacques François.

DELAFOSE, Jean Charles, Nouvelle iconologie historique, Paris, 1768.

Reprints: Iconologie historique par J. C. de la Fosse, 1775; Paris, Guérinet, 1859?

Iconologie historique de Delafosse; reproduction intégrale de l'ouvrage du temps, Paris, Guérinet, 190-?

La Nouvelle iconologie historique; réimpression, Paris, Contet, 1911.

L'Oeuvre de Delafosse: style Louis XVI, Paris, Guérinet, 190-?

DELORME, Philibert, Architecture, Paris, 1567.

DELORME, Philibert, Nouvelles inventions, Paris, 1571 (First complete edition, 1576).


Reprint: L'Oeuvre de Philibert de l'Orme ... reproduction en fac-similé ..., Paris, 1894.


Reprints: Collection de meubles de Jacques Androuet du Cercéeau; réproduction des gravures de l'époque, Paris, Guérinet, 189-?


Grandes arabesques de Jacques Androuet Du Cercéeau, Paris, Guérinet, 18-?


Oeuvre de Jacques Androuet dit Du Cerceau, reproduit par les procédés de l'héliogravure de Edouard Baldus, Paris, 1869?

LAMOUR, Jean, Recueil des ouvrages en serrurerie, que Stanislas le Bienfaisant, roy de Pologne ... a fait poser sur la Place royale à Nancy, à la gloire de Louis le Bienaimé, Paris, 1767.

Reprint: Recueil des ouvrages en serrurerie ... Paris, 1860?


Reprint: Les œuvres d'architecture d'Anthoine Le Pautre, Paris, Jombert, 1854?

LE PAUTRE, Jean, Oeuvres d'architecture de Jean Le Pautre, Paris, 1751.

Reprints: Collection des plus belles compositions de Lepautre, gravée par Decloux, architecte, et Doury, peintre, Paris, Noblet, 1854?

L'Oeuvre de Lepautre: Décorations intérieures, plafonds, alcoves, meubles, cheminées ...; reproduction en fac-similé et de la même grandeur que les gravures de l'époque, Paris, Guérinet, 1850?

MARIE-ETTE, Jean (Publisher), Oeuvres d'architecture, Paris, 17-? (copy at R.I.B.A. Library).

MARIE-ETTE, Jean (Publisher), Vêles des plus beaux bâtiments de France, Paris, 1685.

MAROT, Daniel Nouveau livre d'ornements pour utilité des sculpteurs et orfèvres, inventez et graves à la Haye par Daniel Marot, architecte de Guillaume III, roy d'Angleterre, ca. 1700. Reprint: Nouveau livre d'ornements pour utilité des sculpteurs et orfèvres ... Paris, 189-?


MAROT, Jean, Le magnifique Château de Richelieu, Paris, 1660.

MAROT, Jean, Recueil des plans, profiles et élévations de plusieurs palais, châteaux, églises, sépultures, grotes, et hostels bâtis dans Paris (Le Petit Marot), Paris 1654-60.


MEISSONNIER, Juste Aurèle, Recueil des œuvres de J. A. Meissonnier; L'art décoratif appliqué à l'art industriel, Paris, 1888.

Livre de fragments d'architectures, recueillis et dessinés à Rome d'après les plus beaux monuments, Paris, Guérinot, 190-?

Oeuvres de Gilles Marie Oppenord, Paris, Guérinot, 1888.

Oeuvres de Gilles Marie Oppenort; 2e recueil: frises, panneaux, pendules, &c. ... Paris, Huquier, 18-?


WATTEAU, Antoine

Reprint: *Ornamental designs; collected and lithographed from his works by W. Nichol of Edinburgh*, London, Ackermann, 1839.
B. FRENCH LITERATURE 1800-1914

ADAM, G. L. (ADAMS, L. G.), see DELALANDE, -; and LEVEIL, J. A.


L'ARCHITECTURE française: Le Château de Chambord, le Château de Chaumont-sur-Loire, le Château de Maucreux, restaurés par M. Samson, architecte à Paris; extérieures, intérieures, détails de sculpture; phototypiés d'après nature, Paris, Guérinette, 190-?

L'ARCHITECTURE française: monuments historiques depuis le Xlle siècle jusqu'à nos jours, Paris, Guérinette, 189-?

L'ARCHITECTURE moderne à Paris; concours de façades de 1901, Dourdan, Thézard, 190-?

L'ARCHITECTURE moderne aux expositions des beaux-arts, 1902; Société des artistes français; Société nationale des beaux-arts; Maisons style moderne - villas - maisons de campagne, etc., Paris, Guérinette, 190-?
L'ARCHITECTURE nouvelle, 1 série, choix de petites constructions économiques, maisons de campagne et de plaisance, pavillons, chalets, villas, petit hôtels, dépendances et maisons de rapport; exécutées par divers architectes aux environs de Paris, en province, sur les plages, etc., Dourdan., 1896.


ARCHIVES de la Commission des Monuments historiques, publiées sous le patronage de l'administration des Beaux Arts par les soins de MM A. de Baudot (et) A. Perrault-Dabot ... assistés d'une délégation de la Commission des Monuments historiques, Paris, 1898-1904.

BADEL, Emile, Nancy, Paris, Guériné, 189-?

BALDUS, Edouard, Palais de Versailles; motifs de décoration, Paris, 1891.

BALDUS, Edouard, see also LEFUEL, H. M.; and BALLU, T.

BALLU, Théodore and P.-J.-E. DEPERTHES, Reconstruction de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris; motifs de décoration extérieure; Soixante planches en héliogravure par E. Baldus, Paris, 1884.

BALTARD, Louis Pierre, see PINEUX-DUVAL, P. A.


BERTY, Adolphe, La Renaissance monumentale in France, Paris, 1864.


BLOCQUEL DE CROIX, H. O. J. B., see WISMES (Baron) Olivier de


BOURASSÉ (L'Abbé) J. J., La Touraine; histoire et monuments, Tours, 1855.

BOURASSÉ (L'Abbé) J. J., Résidences royales et impériales de France; histoire et monuments, Tours, 1864; 2nd ed., entitled Les Châteaux historiques de France; histoire et monuments, Tours, 1876.


CAILLEUX, Alphonse de, see NODIER, Charles.


CALLIAT, Victor, Parallèle des maisons de Paris construites depuis 1830 jusqu'à nos jours, Paris, 1850-64 (Vol. II: "depuis 1850 jusqu'à nos jours").

CATTOLIS, F., see VERDIER, A.


CHAILLOU DES BARRES, (Baron) C. E., Les châteaux d'Ancy le Franc, de Saint-Fargeau, de Chastellux et de Tanlay, (Illus. by Victor Petit), Paris, 1845.


LE CHATEAU de Chantilly: reproduction phototypique des intérieurs des appartements et des détails de sculpture ornementale et peintures décoratives, meubles, etc., Paris, Guérinet, n.d.

LE CHATEAU de Fontainebleau, Paris, E. Cornely, 189-?

LE CHATEAU de Fontainebleau; domaine de la couronne, Paris, 1837.


COMMISSION DES MONUMENTS HISTORIQUES, Archives, see under ARCHIVES

COMPTES DES BATIMENTS DU ROI, see LABORDE (Marquis) Léon de; GUIFFREY, Jules.


Daly, César, *Motifs historiques d'architecture et de sculpture d'ornement: Ière série (Décorations extérieures, empruntées à des monuments français du commencement de la Renaissance à la fin de Louis XVI)*, Paris, 1869, 2e série (*Décorations intérieures ...*), 1880.


Deperthes, P.-J.-E., see BALLU, Théodore.

DESHAIRS, Léon, Le Château de Bercy; architecture et décoration fin du règne de Louis XIV, Paris, 1911.

DESHAIRS, Léon, Le Château de Maisons (Maisons-Lafitte) architecture, sculpture, décoration, 1645-1781; notice historique et descriptive, Paris, 1907.


DESJARDINS, Tony, Monographie de l'Hôtel-de-Ville de Lyon, restauré par Tony Desjardins, Paris, 1863.

DESTAILLEUR, H. A. G. W. Catalogue de livres et estampes relatifs aux beaux-arts ... provenant de la bibliothèque de feu M. Hippolyte Destailleur, Paris, 1895.


DUVAL, A., see PINEUX-DUVAL, Pierre Amaury.

ENLART, Camille, Rouen, Paris, 1904.

ENLART, Camille, see also MARTIN, Camille.


FAULTRIER, Victor Godard, see GODARD-FAULTRIER, Victor.


FOUQUIER, Marcel, Les grands châteaux de France, Paris, 1907.
FRISCH, Edmond de (Comte de Fels), see FELS (Comte) Edmond de.


GEYMÜLLER (Baron) Heinrich von, Les Du Cerceau, leur vie et leur œuvre, Paris, 1887.

GILBERT, A. P. M. G., Château de Chambord, 1821.

GIRAULT, Charles, see L'ARCHITECTURE et la sculpture à l'Exposition de 1900.


GOUPLIER, Charles Pierre et al., Choix d'édifices publics projetés et construits en France depuis le commencement du XIXe siècle, Paris, 1825-50.

GRANCSAINE, Henry de, see DUCHESENE, H. G.

GUÉDY, Henry, ed., Le Palais du Louvre, extérieur et intérieur ... architecture, sculpture, décoration, ensembles et détails, Dourdan, 1905.


GUILLAUMOT, Auguste Alexandre, Château de Marly-le-Roi, construit en 1676, détruit en 1793, Paris, 1865.


INTERIEURS D'APPARTEMENTS; styles Louis XV, Louis XVI, Paris, Guérinet n.d.

INTERIEURS DE PALAIS & CHATEAUX: 3e série (le Palais de Versailles, le Grand et le Petit Trianon), Paris, Guérinet, 189-?
LES INTERIEURES et les boiseries sculptées du Château de Rambouillet, Paris, Guérinet, 190-?


JOLIMONT, F. G. T. B. de, Monumens les plus remarquables de la ville de Rouen, Paris, 1822.


LANCE, Adolphe Etienne, Dictionnaire des architectes français, Paris, 1872.

LANDON, L. P., see LEGRAND, J. G.

LA QUERIERE, Eustache de, Description historique des maisons de Rouen, les plus remarquables par leur décoration extérieure et par leur ancienneté, Paris, 1821-41.

LA QUERIERE, Eustache de, Notice sur diverses antiquités de la ville de Rouen, Rouen, 1825.

LA SAUSSAYE, Louis de, see PETIT DE LA SAUSSAYE, J.

LEBLANC, -, see DELALANDE, -.

LEFUEL, Hector Martin, Palais du Louvre et des Tuileries, motifs de décorations tirés des constructions exécutées au Nouveau Louvre et au Palais des Tuileries; héliogravure de E. Baldus, Paris, 1865-75.

LEFUEL, Hector, see also ROUYER, Eugène.

LEGRAND, J. G. and L. P. LANDON, Description de Paris et de ses édifices, Strasbourg, 1808.

LE ROUX DE LINCY, A. J. V., see CALLIAT, Victor.


LEVEIL, Jean Arnaud, and G. L. ADAM, L'architecture moderne, Paris, ca. 1851.

LEVEIL, Jean Arnaud, see also DELALANDE,-.

LOISELEUR, Jules, Les résidences royales de la Loire; avec gravures sur bois représentant les châteaux de Chambord, Blois, Chaumont, Amboise, Chenonceaux, dessinées par A. Racinet d'après Androuet du Cerceau, Israël Silvestre, etc. Paris, 1863.


MARCEL, Alexandre Auguste Louis, see LAFON, Albert Jean.

MARTIN, Camille and Camille ENLART, La Renaissance en France; l'architecture et la décoration, Paris, 1911-21.

MILLOT, Auguste, Chambord: photographié par Mieusement, avec un texte descriptif et historique par Auguste Millot, Paris, 1875.


LE MONITEUR DES ARCHITECTES, Palais, châteaux, maisons historiques; 100 planches extraites du Moniteur des architectes, Paris, 1867-97, Paris, 1898?

MONOGRAPHIE du Château de Bagatelle, ancienne propriété de Sir Richard Wallace, propriété actuelle de la ville de Paris; intérieurs, extérieurs, style Louis XVI, Paris Guérinet, 190-?

MONOGRAPHIE du Palais de Compiègne, Paris, Guérinet, 190-?

NARJOUX, André, Restitution du Château de Marly-le-Roi, Paris, 1902.

NARJOUX, Félix, Architecture communale: Ière série (Hôtels de ville &c.), Paris, 1870.

NARJOUX, Félix, Paris; monuments élevés par la ville, 1850-80, Paris, 1881-3.

NICOLLE, Henri, Le Château de Maisons, Paris, 1858.


PALAIS DE FONTAINEBLEAU, Paris, Berthaud, n.d.


LE PALAIS DES ARCHIVES NATIONALES, ancien Hôtel de Rohan, Prince de Soubise. Recueil des vues d'ensemble & détails des appartements du Prince et de la Princesse ... vues intérieures et extérieures, Paris, Guérinet, 190-?

LE PALAIS DU GRAND TRIANON, extérieurs - intérieurs: sculptures décoratives, meubles et bronzes, Paris, Guérinet, 1907.

PALAIS DU LUXEMBOURG (Palais du Sénat); intérieurs et extérieurs, Paris, Guérinet, 190-?
LE PALAIS DU PETIT TRIANON; extérieurs-intérieurs; sculptures, décorations, meubles, (fin Louis XV et Louis XVI), Paris, Guérinot, 1902.

PALUSTRE, Léon, L'architecture de la Renaissance, Paris, 1892.


PÉRATÉ, André, Versailles: le château, les jardins, les Trianons, le musée, la ville ..., Paris, 1904.


PERRET, Paul, see EYRIÈS, Gustave.

PETIT, Victor, Architecture pittoresque; ou monuments des XVe et XVIe siècles, Paris, 1865.

PETIT, Victor, Châteaux de France des XVe et XVIe siècles, Paris, ca. 1860.

PETIT, Victor, Châteaux de la vallée de la Loire des XVe, XVIe et XVIIe siècles, Paris, 1861.

PETIT, Victor, Maisons de campagne des environs de Paris; choix des plus remarquables maisons bourgeoises nouvellement construits aux alentours de Paris, Paris, 185-.

PETIT, Victor, see also CHAILLOU DES BARRES (Baron) C. E.

PETIT DE LA SAUSSAYE, Jean François de Paule, Blois et ses environs; par L. de la Saussaye; 2e éd. du guide historique dans le Blésois, Blois, 1860.

PETIT DE LA SAUSSAYE, Jean François de Paule, Château de Chambord, par L. de la Saussaye, Chambord, 1823.

PETIT DE LA SAUSSAYE, Jean François de Paule, Histoire du Château de Blois, par L. de la Saussaye, Blois, 1840.


PFNOR, Rodolphe, Études de décorations des XVIe, XVIIe, XVIIIe et XIXe siècles, Paris, 1873.


PFNOR, Rodolphe, see also CHAMPOLLION-FIGEAC, J. J.; and DESTAILLEUR, H. A. G. W.

PINEUX-DUVAL, Pierre Amaury, Paris et ses monuments; mesurés, dessinés et gravés par Baltard avec des descriptions historiques par ... A. Duval, Paris, 1803-5.

PLANAT, P., and E. RÜMLER, Le style Louis XIV; recueil de motifs d'architecture au XVIIe siècle ... palais, châteaux ... etc. Vues extérieures et vues intérieures ..., Paris, ca. 1912.

PLANAT, P., Le style Louis XVI; recueil de motifs choisis d'architecture au XVIIIe siècle ... Préface historique, biographies des principaux architectes français du XVIIIe siècle, Paris, 1907.

PROST, Gabriel Auguste, J.-F. Blondel et son ouvrage, Metz, 1860.

QUATREMER DE QUINCY, Antoine C., Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de plus célèbres architectes du XVie siècle jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIe, Paris, 1830.

RAMÉE, Daniel, and F. ROGuet, Palais de Fontainebleau depuis les XVIe et XVIIe siècles, Paris, 1859-61.

RANSONNETTE, N., see KRAFFT, J. K.

ROGuet, F., Choix de châteaux, palais et maisons de France du XVe au XVIIIe siècle, Paris, 1858.

ROGuet, F., see also RAMÉE, Daniel.


ROUZER, Eugène, La Renaissance de François Ier à Louis XIII; Décorations intérieures; lambris, panneaux, portes, cheminées, meubles, plafonds, Paris, 1883-7.

ROUZER, Eugène, sae also DARCEL, Alfred.


SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE, L'architecture des châteaux en Touraine et en Anjou aux XVIe et XVIe siècles; (proceedings of the) XXIXe Congrès archéologique de France, 1862.

TAYLOR, (Baron) J. S., see NODIER, Charles.


VACHON, Marius, Philibert de L'Orme, Paris, 1887.

VATOUT, Jean, Le Château d'Eu illustré, depuis son origine jusqu'au voyage de sa Majesté Victoria Reine d'Angleterre, par J. Skelton, avec un texte rédigé par Jean Vatout, Paris, 1844.


VISCONTI, Louis Tullius Joachim, Description du modèle à l'échelle...
des 5 millimètres par mètre représentant l'achèvement du Louvre, Paris, 1853.


VITRY, Paul, Tours et les châteaux de Touraine, Paris, 1905.

WISMES (Baron) Olivier de, Le Maine et l'Anjou historiques archéologiques et pittoresques, Paris, 1862.
C. BRITISH LITERATURE 1824 - 1914

ALLOM, Thomas, see WRIGHT, George, N.


ART JOURNAL Illustrated Catalogue: The industry of all nations
1851, London, 1851.

ART JOURNAL Illustrated Catalogue of the International Exhibition,
1862, London, 1862.

ASHPITEL, Arthur, and John WHICHCORD, Town dwellings; an essay
on the erection of fire-proof houses in flats;
a modification of the Scottish and continental
systems, adapted to the smallest or to moderate

BARRY, (Rev.) Alfred, The life and works of Sir Charles Barry,
London, 1867.

BARRY, Edward M., Lectures on architecture delivered at the Royal
Academy, edited (with introductory memoir) by

BECKETT, (Sir) Edmund, A book on building; civil and ecclesiastical,
London, 1876.

BERESFORD-HOPE, Alexander J. B., The conditions and prospects of

BILLINGS, Robert W., The baronial and ecclesiastical antiquities of
Scotland, Edinburgh, 1845-52.

BLOMFIELD, (Sir) Reginald, Architectural drawing and draughtsmen,
London, 1912.

BLOMFIELD, (Sir) Reginald, French architecture and its relation to

BLOMFIELD, (Sir) Reginald, A history of French architecture, 1494-
1661, London, 1911.

BLOMFIELD, (Sir) Reginald, A history of French architecture 1661-
1774, London, 1921.

BLOMFIELD, (Sir) Reginald, The mistress art, London 1908.


BRYCE, David, Catalogue of books in architecture and allied subjects which belonged to the eminent Scottish architect, the late Mr David Bryce, R. S. A., F. R. I. B. A. ..., compiled by George Berry, Edinburgh, 1928.


CHAMBERS, William, Improved dwelling houses for the humbler and other classes; based on the Scottish dwelling house system, London, 1855.

CLUTTON, Henry, Remarks with illustrations on the domestic architecture of France from the accession of Charles VI to the demise of Louis XII, London, 1755.

CONEY, John, Engravings of ancient cathedrals, hôtels de ville and other public buildings of celebrity in France, Holland, Germany and Italy, London, 1832.


CURRIE, Bertram W., Recollections, letters and journals, Roehampton, 1901.


DILKE, Emilia (Lady), Art in the modern state, London, 1888.

DILKE, Emilia (Lady), The French architects and decorators of the eighteenth century, London, 1901.

DILKE, Emilia (Lady), French engravers and draughtsmen of the eighteenth century, London, 1902.
DILKE, Emilia (Lady), The renaissance of art in France, by Mrs Mark Pattison (i.e. Lady Dilke), London, 1879.

DU MAURIER, George, English Society at home, London, 1880.

DU MAURIER, George, Society pictures, London, 1891.


ELLER, (Rev.) Irwin, History of Belvoir, 1871.

FERGUSSON, James, History of the modern styles of architecture, London, 1862.


FLEMING, J. S., Ancient castles and mansions of the Stirling nobility, Paisley, 1902.


GREAT BRITAIN, Parliament, House of Commons, Select Committee, on arts and manufactures; Reports from Committees (1) 1835, V; (3) 1836, IX.

HALL, Edwin T., see SPARROW, W. Shaw.

HAMEKTON, Gilbert, Paris in old and present times, London, 1885.


JENNINGS, H. J., Our houses and how to beautify them, London, 1902.


KING, Thomas, Fashionable window cornices and hangings ... as manufactured by Messrs. Haselden & Co., London, ca. 1840.


KING, Thomas, Upholsterer's sketchbook of original designs for fashionable draperies, London, 1839.


LOUDON, John C. Encyclopaedia of cottage, farm and villa architecture, London, 1833.

LOUDON, John C. A treatise on country residences, London, 1806.

MILLAR, A. H., The castles and mansions of Renfrewshire and Buteshire, Glasgow, 1889.


NASH, Frederick, Panorama of Paris, a series of thirty-eight views of the most interesting buildings, monuments, etc. ... London, 182-?

NASH, Frederick, Picturesque views of the city of Paris and its environs; consisting of views on the Seine, public buildings, characteristic scenery, etc., literary department by John Scott and P. B. de la Boissière, London, 1823.

NICHOLAS, Thomas, Annals and antiquities of the Counties and County families of Wales, London, 1872.

NOBLE, Percy, Park Place, Berkshire; a short history of the place and an account of the owners and their guests, London, 1905. (For private circulation only).

OLD COUNTRY HOUSES of the Glasgow gentry, 2nd ed., Glasgow, James Maclehose (publisher), 1878.


PATTISON, (Mrs) Mark, see DILKE, Emilia (Lady).


PUGIN, Augustus C., see also BRITTON, John.


PUGIN, Augustus W. N., Details of antient timber houses of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, selected from those existing at Rouen, Caen, Beauvais etc., London, 1836.


ROBERTS, Askew, The gossiping guide to Wales, Oswestry, 1872.

ROBERTS, Askew, Wynnstay and the Wynns, Oswestry, 1876.

ROTHSCHILD, Ferdinand de, Catalogue des livres français de la bibliothèque du Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild à Waddesdon, London, 1897.
ROTHSCHILD, Ferdinand de, "French eighteenth century art in England", in Nineteenth century review, March, 1892.

ROTHSCHILD, Ferdinand de, The Red book, 1897. (For private circulation).

THE ROYAL HOLLOWAY COLLEGE (with woodcuts from The Art Journal) 1887.

RUSKIN, John, Seven Lamps of architecture, London, 1849.


SCOTT, John, see NASH, Frederick.

SEDILLE, Paul, Architecture moderne en Angletterre, Paris, 1890. (First published in GBA, 2e période, XXXIII and XXXIV, 1886).

A SERIES OF picturesque views of castles and country houses in Yorkshire, Bradford Illustrated Weekly Telegraph (publisher), 1885.


SMITH, George, The cabinet maker and upholsterer's guide, London, 1826 (i.e. 1828?).


TRENCH, (Col.) Frederick W., A collection of papers relating to the Thames Quay; with hints for some further improvements in the metropolis, London, 1827.


TURNER, Dawson, see also COTMAN, John Sell.

VERITY, Frank T., see SPARROW, W. Shaw.


WHICHOORD, John, see ASHPITEL, Arthur.

WHITE, William H., The architect and his artists; an essay to assist the public in considering the question: is architecture a profession or an art? London, 1892.


WILD, Charles, Twelve etched outlines selected from the architectural sketches made in Belgium and France, 2nd series, London, 1836 (Reprinted with 1st series as Select examples of architectural grandeur in Belgium, Germany and France; a series of 24 sketches drawn on the spot, London, 1833).


WILSON, John, see ARNOTT, James A.
WOODS, Joseph,  

WORNUM, R. N.,  
"The Exhibition as a lesson in taste", in Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue: the industry of all nations, 1851, London, 1851.


WYATVILLE, Jeffry,  

YOUNG, William,  
Town and country mansions and suburban houses, London, 1879.
D. LITERATURE SINCE 1914


ARMSTRONG, Walter, Royal Holloway College n.d.


BALFOUR, (Lady) Frances, Ne obliviscaris; dinna forget, London, 1930.


BUILDINGS OF ENGLAND series, edited by Sir Nikolaus Pevsner.


BUSH, D. see TAYLOR, D.


DESTAILLEUR-CHANterAiNE, Philippe, see ESTAILLEUR-CHANterAiNE, Philippe d'.


GEORGE IV and the arts of France (catalogue of exhibition held at the Queen's Gallery, Buckingham Palace), London, 1966.


GIROUARD, Mark, Sweetness and light, the 'Queen Anne' Movement 1660–1900, Oxford, 1977.


HARRIS, John, ed., A catalogue of British drawings on architecture,

HARRIS, John, see also COLVIN, Howard.


HOWELL, Peter, "Wyfold Court, Oxfordshire", in Howard Colvin and John Harris, eds., The country seat, London, 1970.


HUSSEY, Christopher, "Foreign Office's threatened glory", CL, 6 Feb. 1944.

HUSSEY, Christopher, "Highcliffe Castle, Hampshire", CL, 24 Apr., 1 May, 8 May 1942.


LINSTRUM, Derek, Sir Jeffry Wyatville, architect to the King, Oxford, 1972.


MUTHESIUS, Stefan, see DIXON, Roger.


PEVSNER, (Sir) Nikolaus, ed., Buildings of England series


PRITCHARD, T. W., see HOWELL, Peter.


ROWAN, Alistair, see FIDDLES, Valerie.

RUSSELL-COTES, (Sir) Merton, Home and abroad; an autobiography of an octogenarian, Bournemouth, 1921 (privately printed).


THE STORY OF Thomas Holloway, 1800-1883, Glasgow, Robert Maclehose (the University Press), 1933.


SUMMERSON, (Sir) John, The turn of the century: architecture in Britain around 1900, Glasgow, 1975.

SUMMERSON, (Sir) John, Victorian architecture; four studies in evaluation, New York, 1970.


