ON THE ANALOGY BETWEEN THE ARCHITECTURE OF FRANCE AND THAT OF SCOTLAND.[1]

BY JOHN HILL BURTON.

I FEEL it necessary to offer a word in explanation of the character and tendency of the casual notices which I have the honour to lay before the Institute. They do not profess to accomplish the rigid investigation and exhaustive analysis of results, necessary for making an addition, however small, to the materials of archaeological science. They are mere suggestions, the force of which the knowledge of the members of the Institute will enable them to estimate for themselves. I shall be content if what I am able to say may suggest to archaeological inquirers some new instances in which conquests, migrations, and revolutions may be traced or illustrated through the features of the architectural deposits which have survived them.

No Englishman can take a general survey of the baronial residences he meets in Scotland, without being forcibly struck by some national peculiarities which broadly distinguish them from the corresponding class of buildings in England. The peculiarities are varied, but their predominating characteristic is the spiral or rocket-shaped turret. I shall not say that this is a feature of which English architecture is totally divested. The luxuriant beauties of the English mansions are the spoils of every school, and where the Scots took their examples, English architects would study. The turret is a prolific architectural device, susceptible of infinite variety. The Gothic turret or pinnacle is common both in ecclesiastical and baronial edifices, but it is distinguished from our turrets by its angularity and its crocketed decorations. Some buildings in England show a nearer approach to the Scottish turret. For instance, at Knebworth, in Hertfordshire, the ancestral mansion of Sir Bulwer Lytton's family, there are narrow polygonal towers terminating in circular spiral roofs with that ogee curve which sometimes, but not frequently, is seen on the Scottish turret.

[1] Communicated to the Architectural Section, at the Meeting of the Institute in Edinburgh, July 25, 1856.

At Wollaton House, in Nottinghamshire, the angular buttresses swell into circular abutments with curved spiral roofs, which give them a strong general resemblance to some of the turrets in Scotland—for instance, to those of Pinkie. Perhaps there may be examples, either old or modern, in which there is a still closer incidental similarity to Scottish peculiarities. But it may safely be said that there does not exist on the English side of the Border even one of those Oriental-looking clustered masses, of tall chimneys, narrow crow-stepped gables, and numerous conical turrets, which are found strewed over Scotland from the Border to Inverness. While he notices these characteristics of the baronial residences of a comparatively late age—many of them still habitable—the stranger will find that the deserted and ruinous castle of the preceding period is often a simple, rude, square block, which will remind him of the Norman keep or donjon. On inquiry, however, he will find that the two are separated from each other by centuries, and by radical differences both in the external conditions in which they arose, and the internal character of their architecture. To account in some measure for these two phenomena—for the bare, square towers of the older period; for the fantastical, turretted mansions of later times—is the object of these notices.

I must throw myself upon the charity of archaeologists if, in my method of exposition, I go back to generalities of a very simple and trite character. It is necessary to keep in view the historical character of European castles generally—of feudal castles, as they have aptly enough been called. Other times and other nations have had their fortresses, but the *castle* belongs to the feudal age alone. It is not a work of refuge, but a work of aggression, or perhaps it would be less open to misconstruction to say, that it was raised, not by the people of the country for their protection against invaders, but by strangers who came among them, and, whether to their advantage or their detriment, held rule over them. In this way the castle is as distinct in its social as in its structural character, from the class of fortresses of an earlier age of which there are still abundant specimens scattered over Britain. These hill forts, and other very ancient strongholds, were places to which the people fled for refuge from an enemy; but the feudal castle was built by a conquering enemy to keep down the subdued people. True, there have been conquests before

those of the Normans, and means of all kinds taken to keep the subdued people in awe; but the conquests of Cyrus, of Alexander, of Cæsar, of Mahomet, and of Tamerlane, were all made for the monarch himself, who kept the people down by means of his own garrisons and his own fortresses. That peculiarity of the feudal conquests whence arose the feudal castle was, that many chiefs besides the highest had their territorial interest in the conquest, which they resolved to keep with their own hand; and hence the feudal lord, who had acquired a district, built for himself what was alike a dwelling-house and a fortress. This is the peculiarity of the feudal castle. It is a private dwelling-house, with all the amenities which a dwelling-house had in its age, and, at the same time, it is a fortress for containing a garrison. It is important to keep this peculiarity in view, because each tide of conquest deposited its own kind of castles, marking its epoch, just as different diluvial deposits may mark the stages in the rising or the receding of a flood. The spread of the Normans over Europe was that great inundation which first covered her with castles, and hence it is that their progress over England is marked by one baronial type, and their expansion over Scotland, two centuries later, is marked by another and totally different type, indicative distinctly of changes created in the development of baronial architecture by the lapse of time.

The most natural primitive shape of a built fortress is a square block. We find it in the Roman Wall in Northumberland, in the Wall of China, in Arabia, and among the earliest forms used in mediæval Europe. The Normans were by no means bigoted to this form; in their eager scramble for places of strength, they occupied the ponderous tombs left by the Romans, and they would have occupied the Egyptian Pyramids and the Eastern mosques for the same purpose, had these fallen in their way. The French antiquaries seem to think that many of the castles of their own country were begun by the Romans, and that the square Norman tower was hence the legitimate descendant of the Roman *arx* or citadel. Their evidence that some of these were built in the Roman cities at a moment of extreme emergency for defence against the invasions of the barbarians—evidence resting on their use of statuary, tombs, and whatever stones were available, to strengthen the walls,—is exceedingly curious and interesting. It is enough here, however, to know that Rome

stamped her architecture on the details, if not on the structural character, of the earliest feudal castles, in those characteristics which are called Norman or Romanesque work.

Such were the earliest castles of England. But the fact already alluded to in the learned paper by Mr. Robertson is, I think, extremely striking and suggestive—the fact, namely, that there is not one known specimen of the kind of work called Norman or Romanesque—I mean early round arched work—in any baronial remain in Scotland.[2] We have, throughout the part of Scotland southward of the Grampians, very abundant remains of ecclesiastical buildings erected in the style immediately preceding the pointed Gothic. That a form of Christian architecture should have left vestiges in affluence, while none appear to be left in the corresponding type of baronial architecture, may suggest to some inquirer the examination of an instance where the influence of the Church preceded that of feudality, and may afford an interesting illustration of the difference between the conquests of the Cross and those of the sword. But for my present purpose the existence of these numerous ecclesiastical vestiges, only makes the absence of the Norman baronial features the more remarkable. That there is no existing vestige of a Norman castle in Scotland it would of course be hardy to assert; I can only say that I have searched for one in vain, and that none of the several friends acquainted with architecture, to whom I have mentioned the matter, have been able to point to a single instance. That because no vestige of the style can be found just now, there never were in Scotland any Norman castles, it would be preposterous to maintain. But it is surely fair to infer that buildings of that class must have been rare, and on the whole the tendency of the negative evidence is to show that, as the earliest castles of England were planted there by the Normans, so the earliest feudal castles in Scotland were likewise those that were planted there by the Normans in a later age, and consequently a later style. It is remarkable, indeed, that when one castle—the Goblin Hall of Haddingtonshire—was built, just a little before the event which it is convenient for me to call the Scoto-Norman

[2] See the "Sketch of the History of Architecture in Scotland," communicated at the Meeting of the Institute in Edinburgh, by Mr. Joseph Robertson, and printed in the Archaeological Journal, vol. xiii. p. 228.

conquest, the building of such an edifice was deemed an incident important enough to be commemorated in history. On the other hand, I am not prepared to say that there was not one castle in England before the Conquest—that Coningsburgh, and one or two others, have no claim whatever to Saxon origin. But I believe that, generally speaking, the residence of the Saxon gentleman, as that of the Scottish landowner of a much later period, was the fossed and palisadoed arena, with its numerous wooden buildings, so well described by Scott, in Rotherwold the abode of Cedric the Saxon.

The castles which started up all over England immediately after the Conquest, were, generally speaking, the simple square tower, without any flanking-work. In some instances—such as Newcastle, Rochester, and Bamburgh—there were angular projections, more like buttresses than flanking-towers, since they were not deep enough to be pierced with side-windows or loop-holes for the purpose of lateral defence. In the next stage we find ancillary towers, sometimes square, but generally round, erected at the corners. This is the commencement of the flanking system—the most important step in modern fortification. Vauban owned that the towers at the angles of the early castles were the rudiments of his system. The first object of an attacking enemy is to get at the face of the fortress that he may demolish it. The object of the besieged is to keep him away from that critical point, or to attack him when he is there. Thus, both before and since the invention of gunpowder, the immediate aim in adjusting the details of a fortification, has been to create sufficient flanking-works, and the corner-towers of the Normans did it as effectually against the battering-ram and the mangonel as bastions and ravelins accomplish it towards artillery. In what is sometimes called the Edwardian period of castellated architecture, we have the flanking arrangement brought to what I think must be considered perfection, for fortresses not attacked by artillery. The general outline of the castle has now come to be a screen with round towers at intervals—say, for the sake of simplicity, a square work with a round tower at each angle. There was usually a gate with a round tower on either side, but there is no occasion for going into the variations of a feature far too strongly marked to admit of any misunderstanding about it.

So far as any existing remains show, it was when castellated architecture reached this phase that it entered Scotland. Among the castles of the Edwardian type are Dirleton, Bothwell, Caerlavrock in Galloway, Kildrummy in Aberdeenshire, and Lochindorb. Perhaps there may be some others, but these are at once noticeable because they were very important fortresses in the War of Independence. Until I shall hear of evidence to the contrary, I shall believe that these fortresses were built by the English, or I should rather say the Normans, when the Edwards for a time had Scotland in subjection. Dirleton Castle, perhaps the finest specimen, was, as we know, long defended by the coadjutors of Wallace against Edward I. and his Archimedes, the warlike Bishop Beck ; but I cannot help believing that the older part of Dirleton, as it at present exists, was built by the English after the capture of the castle, such as it had been. The same type of castle is to be seen all along the margin of the Edwardian conquests in Wales and Ireland. As the simple square tower with round arches is the deposit of the Norman conquests of the XIth century, so the screen with round towers at intervals, and pointed arches, is the deposit of the Norman conquests of the XIIIth century. Thus, our oldest castles in Scotland are undoubtedly of the later style of Norman-English.

The prostration of Scotland after the War of Independence, is a matter pretty well known in history. There was no rearing of costly edifices, whether ecclesiastical or baronial, until long after that struggle was over. When lairds or chiefs in Scotland were again rich enough to build, they had to fall back upon the primitive square tower ; hence it is that, as I have already said, there are many of them throughout Scotland which have a general external resemblance to the Norman keep, but are entirely distinct from it both in historical connection and architectural detail. In such fine instances as Borthwick, Clackmanan, Edzell, Doune, and a few others, the English traveller can only be convinced by an examination of the architectural details, that he does not see before him a Norman keep. Generally, however, the Scottish tower is much smaller and ruder than the Norman ; and it is, of course, destitute of those peculiar features which form the connecting link between Gothic and Roman architecture. It was still of consequence to the Scottish laird to have flanking

defences to his keep. He could not afford the princely round towers of the Edwardian baronial period, but he found an economical substitute creditable to his ingenuity. The projecting parapet was, of course, an available means of attack from above. At the angle, it was enlarged into a sort of machicolation or bastion. This is a common feature in many kinds of defensive architecture, but nowhere is it so confirmed and systematic as in the Scottish square towers of the XVth and XVIth centuries.

To see how Scottish architecture again emerged from this humble condition, it is necessary briefly to describe historical conditions which would be familiar to every one if our history, instead of being a mere parochial register, were written in the catholic spirit of denoting Scotland's condition among the European States. After the War of Independence —which it is more just to consider the struggle of the Saxons in Scotland against Norman aggression, than a national contest—Scotland arose, a separate nation, hating England. That metropolitan influence, which it would naturally have received from the centre of British advancement in London, was drawn from Paris. The Civil Law and French feudality were introduced. The Church, the Parliament, and the Courts of justice were French. The Universities were French to the nicest peculiarity, and in the remote colleges of Aberdeen, the fresh students were called *béjeants*, just as they were in the University of Paris. Everything in Scotland might be said to have become French, except the language and the national character, and at last the countries were deemed so closely united, that it was discussed in Paris, as a matter of business, whether Scotland should be attached to the Crown of France, or become an appanage for a cadet of the House of Valois. It is now necessary to cast a glance at the progress of baronial building in France. The style which in this country is generally called Edwardian—consisting of screens and round towers —was there very prevalent. But a feature was superadded to it, not known in England, by the mounting of cones or obtuse spires, sometimes on the round towers, sometimes on the central building. There are instances of large separate round towers, on which such cones were subsequently mounted, as, for instance, the donjons of Guise and Semur. Sometimes the cone springs flush from the wall—sometimes

it was raised behind the rampart. A good example of the latter may be found in Holyrood—our latest adaptation from the French. In its completion by Sir William Bruce, it was almost a direct copy from Chantilly, the abode of the Condés. In Paris, there were two fortresses of awful notoriety—the Temple, built by Hubert, the treasurer of the Order, who died in 1222, and the more recent Bastille. The latter—an excellent specimen of the Edwardian form as it continued for a long period in France—retained its original simplicity and gloom; but the Temple was decorated with a central spire, and a cone on each of its four flanking round towers. The conical form thus became an inveterate feature in the baronial architecture of France. When flanking works of a smaller and less costly character than towers were thrown out from the corners of buildings, they naturally assumed the conical shape, which had become an architectural peculiarity in France and the countries in which her national habits held sway. Hence the French château of the XVIth century was encrusted with quantities of the rocket-shaped turrets already referred to. The architecture of our ancient allies when it reached this form was accurately copied in Scotland, and it is impossible for buildings to be more like each other than the French château of the middle of the XVIth century, and the Scottish mansion of about eighty years later. There are, of course, some differences. Many of the French buildings were larger and more costly than the Scottish. The French had some peculiarities of a rather earlier age, in a mixture of their own rich Gothic with the decorations. In Scotland there are but few and faint touches of Gothic in the conical architecture. It seems to have prevailed to any considerable extent only in the beautiful castle of Inverary, which has unfortunately disappeared. In many instances additions were made in the French conical style to the original square tower, and thus an edifice presenting in its lower storeys the rudest simplicity, would expand into a picturesque coronet of many-figured turrets and grotesque chimneys. The use of the small bastion, to which I have already referred, was in itself an incidental step towards the adaptation of the style. The stone work of the turret was indeed just an enlargement of the bastion, often occupying the same position as a flanker. In one instance—that of Castle Huntly—the old bastions

have recently had turret tops placed on them, as if to complete their original design, but the result is by no means happy, since they are thus evidently unfitted to serve as bastions, while they are not large enough to contain turret chambers.

I shall conclude with a remark, applicable to one adaptation of this style which has attracted much attention—Heriot's Hospital. The block plan has evidently been adapted from the palace of Aschaffenburg on the Main, built in the year 1611.[1] But in the decorations, and especially the turrets, the architect appears to have been ambitious of reducing the elements of the Scottish conical architecture into something like order and symmetry. A rich confusion generally reigns in the turretted mansions, as if they had grown in luxurious wildness, without any controlling design, but Heriot's Hospital is all symmetry. The turrets are light and small—too small for turrets, and liable to the objection of being palpably useless; their proportions are nicely adjusted, and their tops, instead of the hard conic outline, have the ogee curve. The rough crow-step—a common and peculiar feature in Scottish baronial architecture,—is converted into richly-decorated scroll-work, and the gaunt storm windows of our old houses resolve themselves into small decorated tympanums. It was a bold and ingenious attempt to bring the scattered elements of our Scottish architecture into order and system; and I am inclined to believe that the architect who made the attempt was William Aytoun, an ancestor of my distinguished friend the author of "Bothwell" and the "Lays of the Cavaliers," who inherits his name.

The French origin of our street architecture is very obvious. The older parts of our towns are full of the tall irregular moulded gables, truncated turrets, and abutments of all kinds, which give so much picturesqueness to the towns of the north of France. In Aberdeen there are several edifices with their turrets abutting on the streets, more like the country châteaux than the city hotels of the French. There is there a large building, generally called the Bishop's Palace, with the conical-topped round towers and intervening screens,

[1] See the representation and account of this remarkable building in the "Architectura Curisa Nova," of the celebrated hydraulic engineer Boecklern, translated by the still more celebrated John Christopher Sturm.

an imitation of a French castle of that earlier period when the conical tops were first mounted on the flanking round towers. There are many such instances in Scotland, both in town and country, but the common stair—the house above house—at once attests the severance from England and the connection with France. The modern street house, I believe to be the invention of that sagacious people the Dutch, but the English were not far behind them, if we may judge from the houses of the XVIIth century near St. James's park—all regularly and symmetrically planned, with the dining-room flat below and the drawing-room flat above. These were inhabited by the English gentry, while those of Edinburgh and Paris were perched several floors above the street.