THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The expansion of England?

Link:
Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:
Journal of Art Historiography

OPEN ACCESS

The expansion of England? Rethinking Scotland's place in the architectural history of the wider British world

G. A. Bremner

The principal title of this essay may be taken as a conceit. But it highlights a basic misconstruction that has plagued the political understanding of the British Isles for centuries. It comes from J. R. Seeley's popular account of the British Empire published in the early 1880s, entitled precisely that, *The Expansion of England*.[1] Although Seeley refers to 'England' throughout the book, it is clear he is describing what had become by 1707 the nation state of Britain, or more precisely Great Britain (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland after 1801). This constant if not stubborn reference to England by Seeley would seem all the more peculiar given that the critical moments of success for the empire in his account are seen to begin with the eighteenth century. Why he refers to England alone is not clear. It might be that he viewed 'the empire' as originally, and thus ultimately, an English invention; or simply that the idea of 'England' (and its compound referents) was taken for granted as signifying Britain in the minds of his contemporaries.[2] Consequently, to the modern reader, there remains a fundamental confusion at the heart of the book's narrative when, in a single sentence, Seeley can talk of England and then 'Greater Britain' without qualification, as if his readers were naturally capable of making this conceptual leap.

Seeley was of course not the only one to conflate England with the idea of Britain, or to lump the Scots and the Welsh, let alone the Irish, in with the idea of Englishness.[3] After all, one of the proudest and most famous Scots of all, David Livingstone, was prone to

[1] J. R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England*, London: Macmillan & Co., 1883.

[2] For the synecdochic relationship between 'England' and 'Britain' in this sense, see Peter Mandler, *History and National Life*, London: Profile Books, 2002, 21-22. In describing the Victorians, Owen Chadwick also observed how 'they confidently used the word English to describe the Scots the Welsh and Irish', but no explanation is given for this. Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church: Part I*, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1966, 1. Roger Louis reminds us that Seeley in fact disliked the term 'British Empire' as being somehow too imprecise and amorphous, preferring instead the term 'Greater Britain' as conveying more effectively the idea that Britain's colonies of white settlement were an extension overseas of English culture, values, and ideals. W. R. Louis, 'Introduction', in R. W. Winks ed., *Oxford History of the British Empire: Historiography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 8. For Seeley's views on this, see Seeley, *The Expansion of England*, 37-76.

[3] Most telling is the Scotsman David Hume's six volume series nominally entitled *The History of England* (1754-61), which is really a narrative about the modern constitutional history of the British Isles. Perhaps the most famous instance is T. B. Macaulay's *The History of England from the Accession of James II* (1848), which, again, like Hume, is particularly striking given Macaulay's immediate heritage. Others include E. A. Freeman's 'George Washington, the Expander of England' in E. A. Freeman, *Greater Greece and Greater Britain, and George Washington ...*, *Two Lectures*, London: Macmillan & Co., 1886.

calling himself an Englishman when it suited.[4] Indeed, as the title of Seeley's book suggests, it was not so long ago that the term 'England' was effectively a synecdoche for Britain in much historical writing, and, for those who travel abroad regularly, 'the English' is a phrase one commonly hears with reference to people from the British Isles, whether they be Scottish, Welsh, or in fact English.[5] I am none of these, I should confess—although I have comparatively ancient Scottish ancestry. As an Australian living in Edinburgh, when abroad I am often described as being 'from England', and sometimes even presented as 'English'! Despite all the efforts of 'New British' and 'four nations' history in recent decades, much confusion still prevails.

There is a serious historiographic point to this, which I wish to explore here. It refers to the idea of British imperialism, and, more specifically, revolves around the question of what it actually means to speak of a 'British' empire. Consequently, and by extension, it concerns what it means to use a term such as 'British architecture'. I have written elsewhere on what I think such a term ought to encompass, grounding my observations in J. G. A. Pocock's conclusions regarding the idea of British history.[6] But I want to unpack this some more by suggesting that such an idea, while remaining coherent, would benefit from further disaggregation if we are to understand properly how the various nations, cultures, and ethnicities of 'Britain' made identifiable, and in some cases unique, contributions to the built environment throughout the wider British world. In this respect 'Britishness', as will be argued here, must be understood as neither an entirely disaggregated nor wholly coherent phenomenon, but more as a series of interrelationships.

I raise this matter because all too often I see reference made to 'British imperial' or 'British colonial' architecture without adequate qualification.[7] In common parlance such terms do of course have a certain efficacy, but they have also become shorthand for *any* kind of architecture—particularly state-sponsored architecture—that was produced under the auspices of British colonial expansion and rule. This has led over the years to such architecture being seen as representing an undifferentiated cultural and political homogenate (i.e. 'Britain', and more generally 'the West'), leaving it somewhat vulnerable to

---

[4] See David Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa …* , London: John Murray, 1857, 35. Other Scotsmen were not, however. The Third Marquess of Bute, for instance, disliked the term 'British' as he believed it obscured in the popular imagination the extent to which 'our forefathers' tried to make Scotland an English province in 1706. He would certainly never have called himself an Englishman. See D. O. Hunter Blair, *John Patrick, Third Marquess of Bute, K.T. (1847-1900)*, London: John Murray, 1921, 133-4.

[5] Indeed, when I began to write this piece, I was listening to the Portuguese news in the background, where I could hear a pundit describing the problems of the EU in the wake of the Greek financial crisis, noting how 'Inglaterra' (England) may vote 'no' in its EU referendum. There are words in Portuguese for Great Britain and the United Kingdom, 'Grã-Bretanha' and 'Reino Unido' respectively.

[6] See 'Rethinking British Architecture: Towards an Expanded Methodology', in G. A. Bremner, *Imperial Gothic: Religious Architecture and High Anglican Culture in the British Empire, c.1840-1870*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2013, 431-40.

[7] This applies mainly to the history of architecture with a capital 'A', and primarily that concerning the late modern period. By their very nature, vernacular architecture studies and archaeology are much better at foregrounding the social, cultural, and ethnic structuring of the built environment. This is particularly evident in work on the early modern period of empire. For a good example of this approach, see Louis P. Nelson, *Architecture and Empire in Jamaica*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016.

the critical operations of postcolonial theory, which seeks to deconstruct it on account of its apparent discursive consistency with respect to political, economic, and cultural subjugation.[8] Thus, from the perspective of postcolonial theory, colonial architecture has tended to be understood as the material counterpart to imperial discourse at large, irrespective of the increasing formal and material complexity of such architecture at a global scale, and across a near five-hundred year period.

While recognising the general if limited usefulness of these terms, it is my contention that we must seek, where appropriate, to delve beneath the surface in an effort to arrive at a more nuanced and differentiated understanding of what an adjective such as 'British' demands of us when considering colonial architecture and urbanism. It is one thing to expand our understanding of what British architecture might include, but another entirely just to designate everything produced at the hands of 'imperialists' as somehow uniform in its intentions vis-à-vis the 'official mind' of the British state, or, as essentially identical in terms of the compact it apparently fosters between power, knowledge, and space. These relationships do of course exist, and they differ according to the type of architecture being considered, whether it be small-scale domestic and craft-based, or with reference to larger buildings of state designed by architects. Although I am here referring mainly to larger-scale 'official' architectures, I do not discount domestic scale structures, as they are often caught between vernacular studies and architectural history per se. Notwithstanding these caveats, simply labelling such architecture 'British' or 'English' only reveals part of the picture, and to insist that we need go no further is scholarly laziness, in my view—a sheltering behind the mere expediency of such blanket descriptions. On this point it is worth observing, as Andrew Mackillop has, that Scots used empire to re-imagine and reconstruct new forms and variants of Scotland. Through this, empire became a means of reconstituting the 'nation'—one that was not necessarily or automatically British.[9]

We could begin dealing with this problem by dissecting and analysing colonial architecture from the perspective of its agency rather than focusing incessantly on its representational and discursive qualities. Meaning is important, but it is not the only game in town. One approach is to consider such architecture as the product of institutionally-driven agendas and networks, most of which operated independently, and some of which were conflicting, including those motivated by military, mercantile, administrative, educational, and/or religious concerns. In other words, such architecture was not only or even predominantly about 'the state', even though the various participants shared broadly common cultural values. This is to say that a great many actors operating in and across the wider British world were not necessarily concerned with extending or maintaining state agency, despite in effect being part of that state in terms of its territorial claims and

---

[8] For a good overview of postcolonial theory, its impact and problems, see David A. Washbrook, 'Orients and Occidents: Colonial Discourse Theory and the Historiography of the British Empire', in D. Winks, ed., *Oxford History of the British Empire: Historiography*, vol. 5, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 596-611. See also Vivek Chibber, *Postcolonial Theory and the Spector of Capital*, London: Verso, 2013.

[9] Andrew Mackillop, 'Locality, Nation, Empire', in J. M. MacKenzie and T.M. Devine, eds, *Scotland and the British Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, 75. Perhaps the most trenchant call for a 'four nations' approach to British imperial history can be found in John MacKenzie's essay 'Irish, Scottish, Welsh and English Worlds? A Four-Nation Approach to the History of the British Empire', *History Compass*, 6:5, 2008, 1244-63.

sovereignty. These actors could be English, Irish, Scottish or Welsh (or, indeed, from other colonial realms) but did not necessarily see themselves as embroiled in affairs of state, or, again, even consider themselves 'British'.[10] To be sure, there was never as much joined-up thinking within the British imperial enterprise as is sometimes claimed. It was often a case of catching up with events on the ground, hence Seeley's quip that Britain's empire was acquired at least partly 'in a fit of absence of mind'.[11]

The other way to consider colonial architecture is from the perspective of less tangible but no less significant factors such as sub-identity, tradition, and cultural sensibility. These factors undoubtedly have something to do with architectural meaning and representation, but when considered discretely, in relation to specific cultural and ethnic subsets, they have the capacity to dissipate and thus undermine any easy idea of Britishness or British identity. How might such factors therefore impinge upon architectural production in ways that necessarily complicate our understanding of British imperial and colonial architecture? What use, if any, is it for us to ask where a 'colonial architect' came from, what his background and professional experiences were prior to emigration, who was he working for and to what end, what was the source of funding, and how this affected his output in context? I am not referring here to biographical information in the generic sense, as that is the stuff of architectural history more generally, but rather the peculiarities, subtle or otherwise, that identify an architect and his buildings as specific, conditional, or even irregular.

In relation to colonial architecture this might refer to additional layers of distinction such as whether a building can be classified as more Scottish, Welsh, or Irish as opposed to generically 'English' or 'British', and what implications this entails. In being Scottish, Welsh, or Irish such buildings are also 'British', but this can be very different to suggesting that they are essentially English.[12] Indeed, the same idea applies to England itself, where vast regional variation is observable. For instance, much early colonial architecture in North America can be traced back quite specifically to individual regions in England, such as East Anglia or the West Country, owing to patterns of spatial arrangement and the employment of vernacular construction techniques.[13] Therefore, we may also query what it means to speak of 'English architecture' in such a context, as this too was far from uniform. These are of course difficult

---

[10] Ibid. The requirement to recognise such tensions in the dynamic between metropole and colony more generally has been highlighted by Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler. See Ann Laura Stoler and Frederick Cooper, 'Between Metropole and Colony', in F. Cooper and A. L. Stoler, eds, *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997, 1-56.

[11] Seeley, *Expansion of England*, 8.

[12] One thinks here, for instance, of Damie Stillman's book *English Neo-Classical Architecture* (1988), the title of which overlooks the significant Scottish contribution to this tradition. This was a point raised in a number of reviews of the book. For example, see David Cast in *The Art Bulletin*, 72:4, 1990, 664, and James D. Kornwolf in the *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 51:4, 1992, 438.

[13] For instance, see Cary Carson, 'English' in Dell Upton, ed., *America's Architectural Roots: Ethnic Groups That Built America*, New York: Preservation Press, 1986, 55-61; A. L. Cummings, *The Framed Houses of Massachusetts Bay, 1625-1725*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979. See also Carl R. Lounsbury, *Essays in Early American Architectural History: A View from the Chesapeake*, Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011; and Cary Carson and Carl R. Lounsbury, eds, *The Chesapeake House: Architectural Investigation by Colonial Williamsburg*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

questions to answer, and it is not my intention to do so here. Rather, I merely wish to raise the question with a view to challenging us to think more carefully about the origins and character of so-called British colonial architecture.

Through a discussion of several examples, I hope to demonstrate that there are reasonable grounds upon which to qualify 'Britishness' in the colonial world by foregrounding the introduction and persistence of regional variation, whether in terms of form, style, materials, construction technique, and/or traditions of professional practice. As the title of this article indicates, I shall be focussing on Scottish architectural traditions and personnel within a wider world of British architecture. It will be argued that this has consequences for how 'colonial architecture' is framed and presented vis-à-vis British global expansion. It is my belief that in identifying distinctions of this kind we place ourselves in a better position to complicate our basic understanding of colonial architecture, revealing it to be a highly textured rather than essentially a monochrome phenomenon, riddled with difference, multiplicity, and even inconsistency.[14]

Scotland and Scottishness: the historiographic problem

If we consider for a moment developments in British imperial studies more generally, then we see that great strides have been made over the past decade or so with respect to how Scotland and Scottishness have been recognised in making distinct contributions to the British imperial experience. Scotland's enthusiasm for the immense opportunities offered by empire via political union with England had always been known, especially concerning imperial trade and military service, but, until relatively recently, the particular and extraordinary extent of Scotland's involvement was somewhat obscure.[15] What is now certain is that the contribution of Scots to empire was far in excess of their population size proportionate to the United Kingdom as a whole. Whether as merchants, planters, soldiers, settlers, doctors, scientists, teachers, administrators, engineers, or even architects, they were to be found everywhere. They stacked the civil service of the East India Company (EIC), swelled the ranks of the army, and dominated the tobacco trade; they even became leading drug dealers, with Benjamin Disraeli immortalising James Matheson of Jardine, Matheson & Co. in his novel *Sybil* as 'one McDruggy, fresh from Canton, with a million of opium in each pocket'.[16] Indeed, according to one estimation, by the 1780s Scots constituted nearly fifty

---

[14] This is a point also made by Daniel Maudlin and Bernard Herman. See 'Introduction' to D. Maudlin and B. L. Herman, eds, *Building the British Atlantic World: Spaces, Places, and Material Culture, 1600-1850*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016, 8-9.

[15] For a recent comprehensive overview of this, see MacKenzie and Devine, *Scotland and the British Empire*, in particular Andrew Mackillop's chapter 'Locality, Nation, Empire' (54-83). See also T. M. Devine, *Scotland's Empire 1600-1815*, London: Penguin Books, 2003. So important is the study of this contribution considered to be that there is now a whole academic unit dedicated to it at the University of Edinburgh, known as the Scottish Centre for Diaspore Studies, founded in 2014.

[16] B. Disraeli, *Sybil, or The Two Nations*, London: Henry Colburn, 1845, 105-6. Scots' growing connection with the EIC post Union is particularly striking. See George McGilvary, *East India Patronage and the British State: The Scottish Elite and Politics in the Eighteenth Century*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2008. For Jardine's, see A. Le Pichon, *China Trade and Empire: Jardine, Matheson & Co. and the Origins of British Rule in Hong Kong 1827-1843*, London/Oxford: British Academy/Oxford University Press, 2006; and R. J. Grace, *Opium and Empire: The Lives and Careers of William Jardine and James*

percent of EIC Writers in the Bengal presidency.[17] More importantly, it has been suggested by some that the Scottish presence throughout the empire tempered British imperialism in certain ways, giving it (in places, and at times) a particular Scottish character.[18] Here colonial business and trade might be pointed to in particular, where an overrepresentation of Scots was evident. The reasons for this are varied, ranging from fewer opportunities in Scotland, to the relative inability of Scots to penetrate elite English business circles. This not only gave Scots reason to seek new prospects in the wider colonial world, but also the occasion to shape that world in their own image and interests. For instance, on this point Maria Misra has observed: 'it has been suggested that the Scots, with their own legal and banking arrangements, traditions of independent trade, and distinctive education system were particularly well placed to participate in growing trade with the East'. Citing Richard Gatty, she highlights the example of the nineteenth-century Scottish merchant James Morison, who 'chose Edinburgh University for his son on the advice of James Mill who believed that Cambridge "might spoil him for commerce".'[19]

Recognition of such distinctions within the historiography of British imperialism was born out of 'new British' and 'four nations' history dating back to the 1970s, including the project to understand the history of Britain and the wider British world through the experiences and contributions of its constituent ethnicities.[20] To be sure, this was not an attempt to disentangle and disintegrate that history along national and ethnic lines, but, on the contrary, to highlight the very complexity of that entanglement and to re-centre the history of Britain in recognition of its diversity. It was, in the words of Pocock, an effort to invent a previously 'unknown subject'—there had been no such thing as British history, only English; never, it was hoped, would 'England' stand in for 'Britain' again.[21]

This approach has been a major factor in British historiography ever since, transforming the way we think, write, and teach British history. As the noted historian of empire John Mackenzie has observed, the renewed understanding of Britishness resulting from this approach has encouraged us to view the empire as a series of distinct if

---

Matheson, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014. For Scots and the China trade in general, see Susan Leiper, *Precious Cargo: Scots and the China Trade*, Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland, 1997. For Scots' involvement in Asia more generally, see T. M. Devine and A. McCarthy, eds, *The Scottish Experience in Asia c.1700 to the Present: Settlers and Sojourners*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

[17] Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, p. 251.

[18] Martha McLaren, *British India & British Scotland, 1780-1830: Career Building, Empire Building, and a Scottish School of Thought on Indian Government*, Akron: The University of Akron Press, 2001. For instance, the Scottish background of Lachlan Macquarie, governor of New South Wales, was seen to influence his particular attitude towards convict emancipation. See H. Dillon and P. Butler, *Macquarie: From Colony to Country*, Sydney: Random House, 2010, 123. Scottish intellectual influence was also spread in particular through education. See C. Craig, 'Empire of Intellect', in MacKenzie and Devine, *Scotland and the British Empire*, 84-117.

[19] Maria Misra, *Business, Race, and Politics in British India, c.1850-1960*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, 30.

[20] E.g., see essays in R. G. Asch, ed., *Three Nations – A Common History? England, Scotland, Ireland and British History, c.1600-1920*, Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1993. See also Hugh Kearney, *The British Isles: A History of Four Nations*, 2nd. edn, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[21] For Pocock's seminal essay on this matter, see J. G. A. Pocock, 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 8:1, 1974, 3–21.

interspersed 'worlds' (Irish, Scottish, Welsh and English), as opposed to a single, conglomerated 'British world'.[22] But this need not imply a case of either/or. Rather, multiple identities were invoked and exploited, depending upon circumstance. One could be both Scottish *and* British (or, indeed, English if you were Livingstone); the one did not necessarily preclude the other.[23] Again, as Andrew Mackillop has shown, Scottish identity construction could be quite complex in given imperial contexts.[24] Nevertheless, such an approach now enables us to seek out and extract particular Scottish contributions to the character and operations of British imperialism.

British architectural history and Scotland: a divided tradition

To return to our original question: what about 'British architecture'? How have Scottish, let alone Irish or Welsh, traditions and contributions been represented in the various architectural narratives of these isles? Put simply, architecture in Scotland has held a lowly place in wider accounts of architecture in Britain, despite the interventions of leading Scottish architects on the English scene such as James Gibbs, Colen Campbell, and Robert Adam. Take, for instance, John Summerson's classic and as yet unsurpassed account of architecture in Britain. Despite whatever other merits the study may have, and there are many, its structure suggests quite a lot about how architecture outside England was viewed (or, indeed, valued) by metropolitan-based English *cognoscenti*. To the modern eye, there is a curious division of arrangement made in the text between the English and Scottish renaissances, even though the account is supposed to begin in 1530. The English Renaissance makes it into the main narrative, whereas (and rather embarrassingly) Scotland, along with America, is relegated to a twelve-page 'appendix' at the back of the book, entitled 'Architecture in Scotland 1530-1707'. Ireland received even less attention. This seems rather meagre for a book the main text of which is 332 pages long. Even after Union, where Scotland seems to become integral to the narrative, very little specific coverage is afforded.

Notwithstanding the obvious date for the political Union between Scotland and England, which could not be ignored so easily, one might ask what the rationale was for

---

[22] MacKenzie, 'Irish, Scottish, Welsh and English'. See also David Armitage, 'Making the Empire British: Scotland in the Atlantic World 1542-1707', *Past and Present*, 155, 1997, 34-63; D. J. Hamilton, *Scotland, the Caribbean and the Atlantic World, 1750-1820*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005; and, more recently, the extraordinary exhibition catalogue *For Auld Lang Syne: Images of Scottish Australia from First Fleet to Federation*, Ballarat: Art Gallery of Ballarat, 2014. The same observation is made by Gary Magee and Andrew Thompson in their book *Empire and Globalisation: Networks of People, Goods and Capital in the British World, c.1850-1914*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, 85-6.

[23] This, of course, is the thesis behind Linda Colley's *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992. For an architectural angle on this, see also Daniel Maudlin, 'Politics and Place-Making on the Edge of Empire: Loyalists, Highlanders, and the Early Farmhouses of British Canada' in Maudlin and Herman, *Building the British Atlantic World*, 290-312.

[24] Andrew Mackillop, 'European, Britons, and Scots: Scottish Sojourning Networks and Identities in Asia, 1700-1815', in Angela McCarthy, ed., *A Global Clan: Scottish Migrant Networks and Identities since the Eighteenth Century*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2006, 19-47. See also, Tamson Pietsch, 'A British Sea: Making Sense of Global Space in the Late Nineteenth Century', *Journal of Global History*, 5:3, 2010, 423-46. The other essays in *A Global Clan* are also useful in this respect.

hiving-off Scottish architecture in this way. As neither the first nor subsequent editions of the book have either a preface or introduction, no detailed reason is given up front. When we finally reach the appendix in question, we are told that as early modern architecture in Scotland was 'quite different' to that of any 'school' in England, it needs to be treated entirely separately, as though it were Danish or Spanish. I am neither the first nor only person to query this anomaly[25], and it is quite telling that in his 1955 review of the first edition, G. H. Chettle described it without irony as a 'scholarly and unbiased history of English architecture'.[26] Clearly, whatever the reasons, and one suspects some degree of prejudice at work (unwitting or otherwise), the idea that architecture in Britain ought to be considered in any kind of integrated or 'trans-national' manner was anathema.

Some may think I am being overly critical here, and that Summerson's book is just a product of its time. I acknowledge this. However, I am not so sure that the assumptions (or prejudices) that lay behind it have diminished much over the years. Indeed, as passions seem to run high on such matters, it may well have entrenched itself, and will possibly widen still further given the current identity politics at play in Scotland. Again, I wish to emphasise that I have no axe to grind either way in this—I have nothing at stake as I am not an historian of Scottish or English architecture per se. I am entirely anti-parochial in that sense. I simply make an observation which, to my mind, is not only symptomatic of how architecture and its history in 'Britain' has been viewed and divided up over the years, but also how the history of architecture in Britain, in any holistic sense, is, as British history once was, an 'unknown subject'.[27]

Take, for instance, *The Buildings of England* series by Nikolaus Pevsner, who, like Summerson, was one of the modern discipline's founding fathers. It may be unfair to single this series out, as it is not strictly an academic enterprise, but it does raise questions about deep-rooted historiographic instincts and their perpetuity in the British historical imagination (or German, as the case may be). Given the project's original scope and ambition, one may be forgiven for asking why England? Why stop at the River Tweed or the Kershope Burn? Why not 'The Buildings of Britain' or 'Buildings of the British Isles'?[28] No

---

[25] See Elizabeth McKellar's comments in Elizabeth McKellar, 'Populism versus professionalism: John Summerson and the twentieth-century creation of the "Georgian"', in Barbara Arciszewska and Elizabeth McKellar, eds, *Articulating British Classicism: New Approaches to Eighteenth-Century Architecture*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004, 39, 47-8; Owen Hopkins's review of Simon Thurley's *The Building of England* in *The Burlington Magazine*, 156:1338, 2014, 544. Edward McParland in his bibliography of Irish architecture from 1988 observed of Summerson's book that it was 'insular' in comparison to Albert Richardson's *Monumental Classic Architecture in Great Britain and Ireland* (1914), whose 'integrated view of British and Irish architecture … is still exceptional'. See Edward McParland, 'A Bibliography of Irish Architectural History', *Irish Historical Studies*, 26:102, 1988, 161-3. I wish to thank Conor Lucey for pointing out this piece to me.

[26] G. H. Chettle, review of *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, *The Antiquaries Journal*, 35:3-4, 1955, 249.

[27] Writing in *Prospect* magazine (July 2015) on the subject of the Scottish National Party's record in government, John McDermott made the observation that the party's rhetorical strength can be explained in part by the 'imbalance between what Scotland knows about the rest of the UK and what the rest of the UK knows about Scotland'. It strikes me that a similar imbalance exists with respect to the study of architecture, leading to a general paucity of knowledge and understanding of the 'Celtic fringe' of architectural tradition in the British Isles.

[28] Susie Harries notes in her biography of Pevsner that in 1939 he had plans for a 'grand' topographic survey of Britain, which appears to have been a wide-ranging account of modern styles of

doubt there were good reasons for pursuing such a division, including those of precedent, practicality, and publishing, but it would be nonsense—as Pevsner would have known—to suggest that simply because Scotland and England were once independent kingdoms, and that a 'border' between the two still exists, that one ought to treat their architectures entirely separately.[29] The history of medieval architecture, to take but one period, does not allow such a strict or simplistic partition, whether Norman or Gothic. The Normans commanded an empire in parts of Northern Europe and the Mediterranean whose architecture was distinctive and recognisable wherever they planted it, from Antioch to Ireland; while medieval masons took Gothic architecture, in particular its 'English' variant, to all corners of the British Isles. Nor can we forget the influence that particular religious orders played in the spread and development of Gothic forms, such as the Cistercians.[30]

Although it was not Pevsner's intention to create artificial boundaries where none existed—he was, after all, author of a book that attempted to present 'European architecture' in an international and cross-cultural context.[31] The point is that such divisions ultimately worked to legitimate and normalise such boundaries, whether consciously or not. Indeed, as the noted Yale historian George Kubler observed over half a century ago, in drawing maps of artistic influence in the world one discovers quite quickly that spheres of influence and exchange rarely, if ever, coincide with political boundaries.[32] This is an important point to bear in mind when contemplating what might constitute an architectural history of the British Isles. In this regard, the 'Atlantic archipelago', as Pocock is wont to described it, was in many respects an extension of influences emanating from the European continent, particularly prior to the late modern period, but once these forms and ideas had landed it would be misrepresentative simply to carve them up according to the interests and prejudices of twentieth-century cultural and political identity.

---

architecture across Britain for the *Architectural Review*. Owing to the outbreak of war, however, it never came to fruition. See Susie Harries, *Nikolaus Pevsner: The Life*, London: Pimlico, 2011, 241, 381.

[29] For aspects of the history surrounding the commissioning of the series, see Bridget Cheery, *The Buildings of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales: A Short History and Bibliography*, Henley on Thames: Penguin Collector's Society, 1998. Interestingly, the division along national lines was not inevitable. For instance, in the early 1950s there was an attempt to create a series of guide books covering the whole of the UK. Known as the 'About Britain' guides, they were produced as part of the Festival of Britain, and published by Collins. I wish to thank Simon Bradley for bringing these to my attention.

[30] On this point Peter Draper notes that, in terms of stylistic influence, the northern region of England was taken as extending into the lowlands of Scotland. See Peter Draper, *The Formation of English Gothic: Architecture and Identity*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006, 108. See also C. Platt, *The Architecture of Medieval Britain: A Social History*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990, 51-4.

[31] Nikolaus Pevsner, *An Outline of European Architecture*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1943. Ian Jack, writing in *The Guardian* (19 November 2016, p. 39), observed how Pevsner at first was not particularly interested in extending the series into Scotland, believing that there was not much of note there.

[32] For instance, see Kubler in *Santos: An Exhibition of the Religious Folk Art of New Mexico, with an Essay by George Kubler*, Fort Worth: Amon Carter Museum of Western Art, 1964. See also, George Kubler, 'Two Modes of Franciscan Architecture: New Mexico and California' in T. F. Reece, ed., *Studies in Ancient American and European Art: The Collected Essays of George Kubler*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985, 34-8.

To be sure, there are differences in architectural tradition between Scotland and England, which need to be acknowledged, but these are no more or less extreme than those between the building stocks of Kent, Cornwall, East Anglia, or Cumberland; or, for that matter, the gradations in form and building practice that are observable across the length and breadth of Scotland itself. After all, this is only to be expected.[33] As T. B. Macaulay once observed, and to put it another way, by the seventeenth century lowland Scots 'spoke a tongue which did not differ from the purest English more than the dialects of Somersetshire and Lancashire differed from each other'.[34] After about the mid-eighteenth century, separate and distinct accounts of architecture in Scotland and England (Wales and Ireland could be included also) makes little sense, if they ever did, particularly given the free and ready movement of personnel and expertise across the British Isles coming into the industrial age[35]—in effect, and to continue the metaphor, they spoke the same architectural language, with what might be described as regional accents. But, again, one of the unintended consequences, perhaps, of this division is that it has left near unbridgeable historiographic chasms across the British architectural landscape. Thus, to return to Pevsner, we now have in addition to the *Buildings of England* a separate *Buildings of Scotland*, *Buildings of Wales*, and *Buildings of Ireland* series.[36] To this day, architectural histories in Britain are all but split between the ancient kingdoms of the British Isles. We find numerous studies of architecture in each place, but little attempt (or even desire, it seems) to forge an integrated historiography drawing out influence and continuity, as well as accounting for variation and difference. Divisions have tended to be reinforced.

It need not be this way, however. As Giles Worsley pointed out in his *Classical Architecture in Britain* (1995), the relationship between English and Scottish architecture in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries should be seen as one of synergy, growing interdependence, and shared strengths, not one of cultural competition. He also makes the worthwhile point that without the likes of Campbell, Gibbs, Adam, and Robert Mylne, let alone the Scottish decent of James Stuart and William Chambers, English architecture would have been quite different, as would Scottish architecture from 1660 without the influence of English Palladianism.[37] If an updated account of architecture in Britain were to be attempted today, no such strict division between 'England and its provinces' could be entertained.

---

[33] For example, see Arciszewska and McKeller, *Articulating British Classicism*.

[34] Macaulay, *The History of England*, 55.

[35] For instance, in an interesting recent addition to British architectural history Edward Gillin makes play of the fact that in the process that led to the design and erection of the new Houses of Parliament a number of eminent Scottish scientists and engineers – who were seen to be at the forefront of scientific advancement during the period – were involved in working out the mechanical systems for the building. Their 'Scottishness' was recognised and viewed with suspicion by English 'scientists' and MPs, who perceived their ideas a radical and potentially politically destabilising. See Edward Gillin, *The Victorian Palace of Science: Scientific Knowledge and the Building of the Houses of Parliament*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[36] This also perhaps highlights a tendency towards what might be considered the over emphasis on national distinction in architecture. For instance, see Miles Glendinning, Ranald MacInnes and Aonghus MacKechnie, *A History of Scottish Architecture: From the Renaissance to the Present Day*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.

[37] Giles Worsley, *Classical Architecture in Britain: The Heroic Age*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995, 153.

While accounting for variation, continuity would have to be the overriding motif. The result may well be variegated and uneven for certain periods, but a coherent story could and should be told. Again, this is not to diminish regional difference, but instead to make the most out of common ground. Although some gains have been made in recent times in this regard, whether we will ever be able to arrive at such a history remains to be seen.[38]

The expansion of Scotland: Scottish architecture and architects abroad

By extrapolation, the same logic applies to British architecture abroad. In this case, however, the historiographic problem is inverted. Like two sides of the same coin, what had started off as contrived disjunction in the one has become casual homogenisation in the other. British colonial architecture may have been part of a state-orchestrated political and economic enterprise, but this should not preclude recognition of cultural variety and difference. In some cases this difference is quite pronounced, and inexplicable without recourse to knowledge of specific building cultures and traditions in particular locations of the British Isles. I have already mentioned how early colonial architecture in British North America can be identified with certain regional building practices in England. Particular Scottish trends can be identified as well. There are many instances to which one could point, such as Scots plantation architecture in Ulster, the Scottish presence in Montreal, the extension of the Scots Baronial tradition abroad, or the contributions of numerous individual émigré architects.[39] One might also mention distinguished Scottish contributions to the modern discipline of architectural history, such as those by James Fergusson (1808-86), who was not only a leading historian of architecture in the mid to late nineteenth century, but in many respects the father of architectural history as we know it in Britain today.[40] I shall only discuss a few examples here for the purposes of illustration.

Leaving aside Scotland's participation in the plantation of Ulster, the architectural continuities of which are plain to see[41], Scottish involvement in the British colonial project

---

[38] For more recent studies that have both acknowledged and attempted to bridge these gaps, see Christopher Christie, *The British Country House in the Eighteenth Century*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000; Arciszewska and McKeller, *Articulating British Classicism*; Daniel Maudlin, *The Highland House Transformed: Architecture and Identity on the Edge of Britain, 1700-1850*, Dundee: Dundee University Press, 2009.

[39] E.g. see special edition 'Scottish Architects Abroad' of the journal of the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland, *Architectural Heritage II* (1991). For the particular connection between Scottish architects and Montreal, see H. E. B. Kinnear, 'Building a Scottish Canada?: Five Architects in Montreal, 1883-1914', PhD Dissertation (University of Edinburgh, 2006).

[40] Fergusson is most noted for his multi-volume and multi-edition (reprinted several times) *A History of the Modern Styles of Architecture* (1863). He had earlier published a similar study under the title of *The Illustrated Handbook of Architecture* (1855). Fergusson, having spent many years in India as an indigo merchant, also published *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture* (1876).

[41] E.g. E. M. Jope, 'Scottish Influences in the North of Ireland: Castles with Scottish Features, 1580-1640', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 3rd series, 14, 1951, 31-47; H. G. Leask, 'Early Seventeenth-century Houses in Ireland', in E. M. Jope, ed., *Studies in Building History: Essays in Recognition of the Work of B. H. St. J. O'Neil* (London, 1961), pp. 243-50; D. M. Waterman, 'Some Irish Seventeenth-century Houses and Their Architectural Ancestry' in Jope, *Studies in Building History*, pp. 251-74; R. Loeber, 'The Early Seventeenth-Century Ulster and Midland Plantations, Part II: the New Architecture', in Olivia

dates back to earliest times, not least the Act of Union of 1707. If we take the island colony of Jamaica, for instance, then we see that a sizable Scottish planter community had established itself on the island by the middle of the eighteenth century, keen to exploit the potential for huge profits on offer through sugar production and processing.[42] As the entire Caribbean was a volatile and politically unstable region, with the constant threat of military invasion and piracy, let alone slave revolt and the challenging climate, early plantation architecture was distinctly defensive in character. Louis Nelson has recently shown how a number of the plantation houses on the island, including Stewart Castle (name says it all) in Trelawney (begun *c.*1750s), were laid out along the lines of sixteenth-century Scottish 'Z-plan' castles and built in stone, reflecting the peculiar martial building traditions of the increasing number of sojourner Scots present on the island.[43]

Recognising this has historiographic implications. A series of buildings that once carried the generic label 'British colonial', can now be understood as not merely originating from the British Isles but from a particular region within those isles, distinguishing them as British, certainly, but more specifically Scottish. Therefore, as a species of material culture, this architecture may be said to manifest a form associated with a distinct ethnic sub-set within the wider British polity. This matters because it characterises the architecture in a certain way, enabling us to appreciate better the complexities surrounding the motivations, ambitions, and limitations of this group within the wider imperial enterprise, and especially with respect to plantation culture in the British West Indies. We have to remember that many of the Scots who ended up in Jamaica were refugees from the failed, all-Scottish Darien scheme (1698-1700)—they never intended to be part of (let alone promote) an English empire. As Nicholas Canny has observed, much the same can be said for Scots planters in Ulster in the seventeenth century, where familial connection, religious denomination, and patronage were all important in creating a new 'Scottish microcosm' against English political dominance.[44]

Similar trends can be identified wherever Scots were to be found in the empire. Australasia, for instance, was a place where many Scots not only took active career service but also settled in large numbers. Indeed, one of the earliest governors of the colony of New South Wales was Major-General Lachlan Macquarie (1762-1824), a Scottish regimental soldier from Ulva off the Isle of Mull. He was intent on 'improving' colonial society, making it his priority to bolster the permanent built infrastructure of the colony, including roads and other civic amenities. He is noted, among other things, for having recognised the talent of the convict architect Francis Greenway, engaging his services in the realisation of his architectural ambition. One building the commissioning of which Macquarie was involved was the Female Orphan School in Parramatta, then outside Sydney. Erected between 1813 and 1818, it was modelled on Airds House in Argyllshire, the Scottish ancestral home of Macquarie's wife, Elizabeth (*née* Campbell). Designed in a plain but distinct Palladian idiom,

---

Horsfall Turner, ed., *'The Mirror of Great Britain': National Identity in Seventeenth-Century British Architecture*, Reading: Spire Books, 2012, 101-38.

[42] Hamilton, *Scotland, the Caribbean and the Atlantic World*, esp. 55-62.

[43] Nelson, *Architecture and Empire in Jamaica*, 36-64. See also Sophie Drinkall, 'The Jamaican Plantation House: Scottish Influence', *Architectural Heritage II*, 1991, 56-68.

[44] Nicholas Canny, 'The Origins of Empire: An Introduction' in N. Canny, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Origins of Empire*, 5 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, I, 13-14. See also Mackillop, 'European, Britons, and Scots'.

it raises questions about the 'Englishness' or 'Britishness', or otherwise, of this particular style, especially once it had gained currency across Britain and the wider British world. Although the Palladian style as such cannot be identified as Scottish, in the eyes of the Macquaries at least, Airds was understood as representing a 'Scottish gentleman's house'.[45]

This specific if unassuming qualification is important, for according to the Macquaries' experience, Airds was an especially Scottish rendition of Palladianism, characterised by its sober classical grandeur articulated through austere, four-square ashlar monumentality.[46] In other words, the Macquaries' new school was to be in the image of the house of a 'lesser' Scottish laird, the type of family to which Elizabeth belonged. If one compares the school as built with Airds, the similarity is striking. It is all but a copy. At the very least this qualification, and all the connotations and caveats it invokes, must complicate the way we read and interpret Macquarie's orphan school as an example of British colonial architecture—British, yes, but in particular a vignette of Scottishness, rendering the building with subtler layers of historical significance given Scotland's much older and more egalitarian (compared to England) state education system. Does this school therefore not have something to do with the 'democratic intellect' tradition of Scotland?

Coming down into the nineteenth century we have the advent of the Western District homestead in the south-east of Australia, in the colony of Victoria, to which émigré Scottish architects made a significant contribution. The 'homestead' was essentially a minor Australian version of the landed estate house in Britain—a type of hipped-roof bungalow (one or two storeys) with wide eaves and verandah. Indeed, as pastoralists, the owners of these houses and their accompanying tracts (or 'runs') of land were parodied as the 'squattocracy', having prospered significantly off grazing sheep for the production of wool, accruing elite social and political status in the process. A great many of these pastoralists were Scottish immigrants who arrived either of their own initiative or via companies established for the purpose.[47] This is important because recent research by Harriet Edquist has demonstrated that, given the cultural and ethnic background of these squatters, combined with the professional input of their kinsmen, including architects such as Alexander Hamilton, Alexander Davidson, and George Henderson, this architectural typology, especially as it manifested itself in the Western Districts of Victoria, was by and large a Scottish invention.[48] Moreover, some houses were based directly on the experience of their owner's previous lives in Scotland. We therefore have here an example of a kind of Scottish migrant architecture the significance of which lies less in its aesthetic continuity with Scottish models—although there are some that maintain this connection, such as

[45] B. H. Fletcher, 'Religion and Education in the Age of Macquarie' in J. Broadbent and J. Hughes, eds, *The Age of Macquarie*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1992, 83.

[46] See Glendinning, MacInnes, and MacKechnie, *A History of Scottish Architecture: From the Renaissance to the Present Day*, 90-130.

[47] M. L. Kiddle, *Men of Yesterday: A Social History of the Western District of Victoria, 1834-90*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1961. See also D. S. Macmillan, *Scotland and Australia 1788-1850: Emigration, Commerce and Investment*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967, 298-300; M. D. Prentis, *The Scots in Australia: A Study of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, 1788-1900*, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1983, 93-100.

[48] Harriet Edquist, 'The Architectural Legacy of the Scots in the Western District of Victoria, Australia', *Architectural Heritage*, 24, 2013, 67-85. See also P. Tryon Macdonald, '"A Scotch Settlement": Scots and the Pastoral Industry', in *For Auld Lang Syne*, 148-57.

Ercildoun (Gaelic *Arciol Dun*), near Buninyong (1840-58)—than in the forms of agency and networking that brought it into existence.[49]

The leading role played by Scots architects in forging a distinct architectural vocabulary can be found across the length and breadth of Australasia. In the colony of Queensland, for instance, the career of F. D. G. Stanley stands out. Scottish born and trained, Stanly spent the formative years of his professional life working in the Edinburgh-based practice of Brown & Wardrop, before emigrating to Brisbane in 1862. This experience meant that he soon acquired the office of Clark of Works in the Queensland Colonial Architect's department, rising to the post of chief architect in 1872. As a newly-formed colony, Queensland (est. 1859) was in need of qualified architects to create the civic infrastructure necessary for the proper and effective functioning of its colonial government. Thus, Stanley was the right man in the right place at the right time, producing as a consequence the largest volume of public buildings by a single Colonial Architect in Queensland history. But as Stuart King has argued, little attention has been paid to Stanley's training and career background in Edinburgh, and the implications this has for interpreting not only his individual contribution but also the nature of Queensland colonial architecture in general.[50] It was in Edinburgh that Stanley absorbed his most refined architectural impressions, taking these to Australia where they emerged in an altered but identifiable form, in particular the grand but austere classical tradition of that city, evident, for example, in his many courthouse buildings, as well as the Queensland National Bank in Brisbane (1881-5). In understanding the colonial architecture of Queensland, it is important to recognise and account for this context, as it once again characterizes the buildings in a particular way, linking them with a specific locality and tradition in the British Isles.

There are a number of parallels here with the architectural scene in New Zealand. Like the Australian colonies, New Zealand attracted a substantial number of Scottish immigrants. Indeed, there were entire 'colonies' of Scotsmen established there, as in the case of Otago in the 1840s, which was primarily a Free Church of Scotland settlement. Its capital was Dunedin, from the Gaelic for Edinburgh, *Dùn Èideann*, complete with Edinburgh street names. Here, for obvious reasons, Scotch influence was strong, especially with the presence of the Presbyterian Church. Buildings by Scottish-born and trained architects such as R. A. Lawson and T. B. Cameron gave many of the city's buildings an appreciably Scottish feel. Even English-born architects, such as Maxwell Bury, found this identity irresistible, referencing, for instance, the University of Glasgow in his design for the University of Otago (1878-83).[51] This was all British colonial architecture, but British colonial architecture of a very different and peculiar sort.

Even the very materiality of British architecture at this time owed much to Scottish ingenuity and enterprise. I am thinking here of cast and wrought iron architectural

---

[49] This house was self-built by its owner, Thomas Learmonth (1783-1869), from Edinburgh. It is reputed to have a stone from the thirteenth-century tower house of 'Thomas the Rhymer', from whom the Learmonths believed themselves to be descended. See Kiddle, *Men of Yesterday*, 308-10.

[50] Stuart King, 'Eclecticism in the Work of Queensland Colonial Architect F. D. G. Stanley, 1871-1881', *Fabrications*, 21:2, 2012, 37-60.

[51] For Scottish influence in New Zealand architecture, see Ian Lochhead and Paul Walker, 'New Zealand and the Pacific' in G. A. Bremner, ed., *Architecture and Urbanism in the British Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, 356-92.

ornament, which became a defining feature of Victorian architecture and urban landscapes.[52] The manufacture of iron was of course a nationwide affair, but a number of foundries in Scotland, such as Sun, Lion, and Saracen, led the way.[53] The Saracen Foundry in particular, owned by Glasgow-based firm W. MacFarlane & Co., achieved global pre-eminence through its penetration of American and colonial markets, employing over 1500 men by 1875. To this day one can still find original MacFarlane products across Latin America, India, and Australasia, demonstrating the reach and influence of Scottish manufactures within the greater sphere of British foreign and imperial trade.[54] Other Scottish foundries, such as Robertson & Lister, established markets for manufacturing and shipping entire, prefabricated iron buildings to the colonies, such as the two Presbyterian churches they sent to Australia in the 1860s.[55]

By the time we reach the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, we find Scottish architects leading the charge right across the British world with respect to avant-garde design. This was the age of the Grand Manner, or so-called Edwardian Baroque, style—an 'imperial style' if there ever was one. Although based on 'English Renaissance' sources, in particular Wren, Vanbrugh, and Hawksmoor, it is worth remembering that two of this movement's foremost theorists and practitioners were Scotsmen, John Brydon and William Young. Who can forget Brydon's 1889 appeal to the time of Wren as a great age of empire, where

> it was no longer a question of England and Scotland, but of Great Britain … . The East India Company had been incorporated, and made great progress in the formation of what ultimately became our Empire in the East. England's Colonial Empire had been founded by the settlements in the Carolinas and the New England States,—the beginning of that Greater Britain which has come to be such a factor in the civilisation of the world.[56]

The implication here is that not only was the age of Wren perceived as being comparable to Brydon's own, but that it somehow represented the growing tide and strength of Unionism. That two ambitious Scots pushed this agenda should perhaps not be surprising, but it does once again highlight the Scottish factor. This style did of course emerge in the context of debates around tighter financial and political union between Britain and its colonial empire,

---

[52] For a good recent study on this, see Paul Dobraszczyk, *Iron, Ornament and Architecture in Victorian Britain: Myth and Modernity, Excess and Enchantment*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2014.

[53] David Mitchell, 'The Development of the Architectural Iron Founding Industry in Scotland', PhD Dissertation (University of Edinburgh, 2012).

[54] Lucia Juarez, 'Scottish Cast Iron in Argentina: its Role in the British Informal Imperial System', in Paul Dobraszczyk and Peter Sealy, eds, *Function and Fantasy: Iron Architecture in the Long Nineteenth Century*, London: Routledge, 2016, 141-62; Pedro Guedes, 'El Mercado Central de Santiago: Antes de su Embarque a Chile / Santiago Market: Before it Sailed to Chile', *ARQ Chile*, 64, 2006, 10-16; Gavin Stamp's introduction to J. Gay, *Cast Iron: Architecture and Ornament, Function and Fantasy*, London: John Murray, 1985, 11.

[55] Miles Lewis, 'The Ecclesiology of Expediency in Colonial Australia', in G. A. Bremner, ed., *Ecclesiology Abroad: The British Empire and Beyond*, special issue of *Studies in Victorian Architecture and Design*, 4, 2012, 43-4.

[56] *The Builder* (2 March 1889), 169.

taking the form of Imperial Federation and the idea of a 'Greater Britain', which itself suggests a certain anxiety over imperial decline. Again, Scottish architects were key in transporting this style throughout the empire, including David Ewart in Canada and John Campbell in New Zealand. As Peter Richardson has shown, few such buildings expressed the bonds of empire more clearly than Campbell's chief post office buildings in Auckland and Wellington (both 1908-12). The model for these was Sir Henry Tanner's General Post Office headquarters building in London (1907-11). Indeed, the New Zealand Prime Minister at the time, William Massey, suggested that Aucklanders had reason 'to be proud of their new Post Office' for this very reason.[57] Scottish born and trained Ewart, on the other hand, not only designed in the Edwardian Baroque style, but also in an adapted version of the Scots Baronial, evidenced in such buildings as the Victoria Memorial Building (1905-12) and the Royal Canadian Mint (1901-8), both in Ottawa.

     Ewart's eclecticism was appropriate to the context. But, in Canada, this went further. Here Scots influence had been strong through successive generations of immigration and political preferment, resulting in the rise of a characteristic version of the Grand Manner style, which made direct reference to that Dominion's mixed cultural heritage, especially Scottish and French.[58] This type of architecture has since been described as the 'Château Style', and was deployed mainly on large public and service-type structures, including hotels, banks and government buildings. Noted examples include the Château Rideau Hotel, Kingston, Ontario (c.1898), the Château Laurier Hotel, Ottawa (1908), and the Confederation Building, also in Ottawa (1928-31). It was a style that underscored not only the strength of the Scottish connection in Canadian culture, but also the French, which was itself a significant factor in Scottish Renaissance and Scots Baronial styles of architecture to begin with. Given the predominance of these ethnicities in the Canadian context, it has been suggested by Harold Kalman that this type of architecture had become by the 1920s, and independently of metropolitan imperial sources, the government's choice for expressing Canadian national identity.[59]

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

[57] Peter Richardson, 'Building the Dominion: Government Architecture in New Zealand, 1840-1922', PhD Dissertation (University of Canterbury, 1997), 296-316; Ian Lochhead, 'The Politics of Empire and the Architecture of Identity: Public Architecture in New Zealand 1900-1918', in C. McCarthy, ed., *'. . . we have no style . . .': New Zealand Architecture 1900-1918*, Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington, 2004, 42-48.

[58] Although Scottish influence is both detectable and strong in certain contexts in Canada, it needs observing that recognition of this influence depends equally upon what type and class of Scotsman one chooses to speak of; or indeed what type of architecture one is analysing. As Daniel Maudlin has shown, as poorer crofters from the Scottish Highlands immigrated to Nova Scotia in considerable numbers during the early nineteenth century, they did not wish to replicate vernacular 'black house' traditions from their homeland. Rather, they were content to adopt more modern methods of planning, living, and house construction, thus virtually obliterating Scottish vernacular techniques from their architectural identity. See Daniel Maudlin, 'Architecture and Identity on the Edge of Empire: The Early Domestic Architecture of Scottish Settlers in Nova Scotia, Canada, 1800-1850', *Architectural History*, 50, 2007, 95-123.

[59] Harold D. Kalman, 'The Railway Hotels and the Development of the Château Style in Canada', *Studies in Architectural History*, Victoria: University of Victoria Maltwood Museum, 1968; See also R. Windsor Liscombe, 'Nationalism or Cultural Imperialism?: The Château Style in Canada', *Architectural History*, 36, 1993, 127-144.

In many respects this article is a rehearsal of the arguments that have already been made in mainstream British studies over the past few decades, but which have yet to infiltrate the notoriously insular realm of architectural history. As an architectural historian myself, I acknowledge that the subject has its own traditions and techniques of analysis which are largely exclusive and therefore valuable (a form of 'special knowledge', if you will), but this does not excuse it from failing to engage with historiographic advancements in other cognate disciplines. In my view, it would be folly for architectural historians to pretend that they are somehow immune to such exchange, and thus entitled to splendid isolation.

We have seen here how the history and traditions of Scottish architecture have either been hived off or concealed for the sake of historiographic convenience in wider accounts of 'British' architecture. This is because recognition of Scottish building practices were seen as problematic to the construction of neat and coherent architectural narratives, whether they be insular, regional, or global. But the differences and continuities need to be acknowledged, with an embracing of all the complications this necessarily brings. One way of solving these disjunctions and elisions in the histories of Scottish, English, and 'British' architecture would be to bring these traditionally separate spheres of scholarship and understanding into genuine dialogue, instead of having them face off against or be subsumed by one another in perpetuity. This is one of the key lessons that architectural history can take from New British and Four Nations historiography.

If there has been a call in recent years for historians to make better use of the built environment as historic evidence, reaching out to what architectural historians have traditionally done best, then it cannot be a one-way street. I believe that architectural historians can and ought to learn much more from how historians conceive and frame historical problems, particularly when it comes to understanding architecture as a species of material culture. To be sure, architectural historians have become much better at couching their objects of study in a wider socio-political context, but more could be done. Finally, as Edward Said once put it in another context: it would not only be irresponsible for us to transcend or deem irrelevant the connections and caveats highlighted here, but also that we now know too much to do so in good faith.[60] If, in one sense, Seeley was correct to observe that imperial expansion was indeed the 'great fact' of modern British history,[61] we must not rest contented in continuing to push beyond his notion of 'England' as the primary locus through which to frame and present that history.[62]

G. A. Bremner is Senior Lecturer in Architectural History at the University of Edinburgh. His research interests centre on the history and theory of Victorian architecture, especially in its relation to the wider British world. His publications include *Imperial Gothic: Religious Architecture and High Anglican Culture in the British Empire, c1840-1870* (Yale UP, 2013) and *Architecture and Urbanism in the British Empire* (Oxford UP, 2016), an edited volume for the Oxford History of the British Empire companion series.

[60] Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, London: Vintage, 1993, 114.

[61] Seeley, *The Expansion of England*, 12.

[62] The recent symposium 'Building the Scottish Diaspora: Scots and the Colonial Built Environment c.1700-1920', held at the University of Edinburgh on 17 November 2017, has continued this project in earnest. See symposium website for details: https://buildingscottishdiaspora.wordpress.com/. Accessed 24 November 2017.

G. A. Bremner   The expansion of England? Rethinking Scotland's place
                        in the architectural history of the wider British world

alex.bremner@ed.ac.uk