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Sir Walter Scott and Kenilworth Castle: Ruins Restored by Historical Imagination

Kenilworth: A Romance, by Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832), is historical fiction set at the time of Queen Elizabeth’s 1575 royal visit to Kenilworth Castle. Scott succeeded in creating a sense of the past by incorporating references to former occupants of the castle or by describing its physical features. This study examines how the castle contributed to the historical imagination by comparing Scott’s narrative to the textual and visual documents to which he would have had access and to the ruins Scott would have encountered at the time of his visit. Antiquarian documents were not the sole source for Scott’s building descriptions. In fact, the ruins prompted Scott to imagine the lives that went on when the castle was in its prime. The openings that are no longer operable enticed Scott to picture ways in which bygone people made use of them, the limited presence of architectural ornaments in the ruin engaged him to envision the building in full decoration, and the apparent absence of building components enticed him to fill in the gaps with the imagined glory of the sixteenth century.

RUMIKO HANNA
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska
This is a study of how the architectural ruins of Kenilworth Castle contributed to the historical imagination of Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832) and how he forged their literary restoration. The castle, located between Warwick and Coventry, was first constructed in the early twelfth century by Geoffrey de Clinton, the royal chamberlain to King Henry I (r. 1100-1135). Major additions were made by King Henry II (r. 1154-1189); King John (r. 1199-1216); John of Gaunt (1340-1399), son of King Edward III and Duke of Lancaster; and Robert Dudley (1532-1588), Earl of Leicester. The castle played a number of important roles throughout English history, before it was slighted in 1650 during the Civil Wars. The building lay in ruins in Scott’s time, and has been managed since 1984 by English Heritage. The fascination with ruins that began in the middle of the eighteenth century in England often has been connected to the romantic or picturesque movement, which has tended to exclude from discussion the physical environment. This study treats the physical properties of the ruins as important contributors in engaging the viewer’s imagination. Scott, the literary author, has been selected as an exemplary visitor to the site because of his acute sensitivity to the environment and keen ability to record his reactions. He is said to have asked searching questions and to have spent several hours in contemplation during his second visit to Kenilworth Castle in 1815 (Hewitt 1993b, 473). This study compares the three modes of the castle – as it was described in Scott’s historical novel Kenilworth: A Romance (1821); as Scott confronted it in real life; and as it was depicted in historical documents. Drawing from this nineteenth-century instance, the study aims to address the questions of whether to restore the castle and to what extent. These debates are still relevant to today’s historic preservation practice.

Sir Walter Scott and Kenilworth Castle: Ruins Restored by Historical Imagination

RUMIKO HANDA

Sir Walter Scott, a Scottish poet and novelist, was the most successful writer of his day, both in popularity and critical acclaim. Familiar from childhood with stories of the region, he published Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border, a collection of ballads, in 1802-1803. His original works were first in poetry, beginning with The Lay of the Last Minstrel (1805). Then, Scott moved on to the prose romance, inventing the literary genre known as the historical novel (Lukács 1983). Beginning with Waverley (1814), the prolific writer produced more than two dozen works, drawing mainly from Scottish history, with a few based on the history of England. He was riding the great wave of the nineteenth-century historical consciousness by demonstrating the understanding of one’s nation through its genealogy. The works by “the Author of Waverley,” as Scott called himself anonymously, were so popular that reprints and multiple editions, including translations, were published. All the novels ultimately were compiled into a forty-eight-volume magnum opus edition entitled Waverley Novels, newly edited by Scott, who by this time had identified himself as the author. These volumes were issued monthly from 1829 for five pence each, the price intended to encourage even wider circulation, and continued after Scott’s death until 1833. Scott’s popularity inspired other artistic interpretations of his novels in operas, plays, and paintings up to the 1890s.

Part of the Waverley Novels, Kenilworth: A Romance was published in 1821. It took Scott only four months to complete. The story revolves around three historical characters: Queen Elizabeth; Robert Dudley, Earl of
At length the princely Castle appeared, upon improving which, and the domains around, the Earl of Leicester had, it is said, expended sixty thousand pounds sterling, a sum equal to half a million of our present money (Scott 1821, v.2, 329-330; Scott 1831, v.23, 137).2

In the ensuing paragraph, he gives a general description of the castle compound in its sixteenth-century glory:

The outer wall of this splendid and gigantic structure enclosed seven acres, a part of which was occupied by extensive stables, and by a pleasure garden, with its trim arbours and parterres, and the rest formed the large base-court, or outer yard, of the noble Castle. The lordly structure itself, which rose near the centre of this spacious enclosure, was composed of a huge pile of magnificent castellated buildings apparently of different ages, surrounding an inner court, and bearing in the name attached to each portion of the magnificent mass, and in the armorial bearings which were there blazoned, the emblems of mighty chiefs who had long passed away, and whose history, could Ambition have lent ear to it, might have read a lesson to the haughty favourite who had now acquired and was augmenting the fair domain (Scott 1821, v.2, 330-332; Scott 1831, v.23, 137-138).

Scott intended to include the castle’s genealogy, as the above passage makes explicit. He listed its “mighty chiefs”: Kenelph; Geoffrey de Clinton; Simon de Montfort; Roger Mortimer; John of Gaunt; and Robert Dudley, most of whom appeared in William Dugdale’s Antiquities of Warwickshire (1656), which Scott used for other specific information (“sixty thousand pounds sterling” and “seven acres”). Although not cited explicitly by Scott, Dugdale would have been familiar to a nineteenth-century antiquarian. Dugdale also

FICTIONAL NOMENCLATURE AND HISTORICAL GROUND PLANS

Scott intended to include the castle’s genealogy, as the above passage makes explicit. He listed its “mighty chiefs”: Kenelph; Geoffrey de Clinton; Simon de Montfort; Roger Mortimer; John of Gaunt; and Robert Dudley, most of whom appeared in William Dugdale’s Antiquities of Warwickshire (1656), which Scott used for other specific information (“sixty thousand pounds sterling” and “seven acres”). Although not cited explicitly by Scott, Dugdale would have been familiar to a nineteenth-century antiquarian. Dugdale also
supplied the oldest known ground plan of the castle (Dugdale 1656, 160) and three distant views engraved by Wenceslaus Hollar, based on sketches Dugdale made at the site in September 1649, in light of its imminent destruction.

The names of the castle buildings and the arrangements of the compound in Scott’s narrative are mostly faithful to Dugdale’s ground plan, which allowed him to cover the eras of Mortimer, Lancaster, and Leicester. The ground plan inserted in Scott’s magnum opus edition uses a numbering system identical to Dugdale’s, and Scott’s nomenclature is nearly identical.

Another possible source for the nomenclature and arrangements is The Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain by John Britton, which carried a ground plan of the castle (Britton 1814, v.4). Much more detailed than Dugdale’s, Britton’s plan, based on an extensive survey, depicted the castle in ruin (Fig. 1). While Britton’s publication was neither cited by Scott nor found among his extant library, a ground plan constructed from Britton’s was included in Kenilworth Illustrated (1821, between 54 and 55). Two facts are against Scott’s prior exposure to Britton’s work: Kenilworth Illustrated came out in the same year as Scott’s novel, and it was cited only in the

Fig. 1. John Britton, ground plan, Kenilworth Castle (Courtesy University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries).
magnum opus edition. Furthermore, some portions of Kenilworth Illustrated definitely were written after Scott’s novel: its “list of the plates” refers to “the Romance of ‘Kenilworth’” and “the Wizzard of the North” (1821, 2), and its “survey of Kenilworth Castle in 1821” calls one of the castle buildings by the name Scott gave it (“Mervyn’s Tower”) (1821, 58). However, because Scott was a subscriber, some of the plates could have been available to him prior to publication.

The ruins gave the author an opportunity to be creative. Scott found the name Saintlowe listed as an earlier occupant of the castle in George Gascoigne’s report of the 1575 royal entertainment; he gave it to the vertical portion southwest of the Great Hall within Lancaster’s building blocks (built by John of Gaunt in the 1370s), which historical documents had not assigned any specific name. He must have felt the name more appropriate than Clinton or Montfort, who were included in Scott’s list of “mighty chiefs” but would have been too early for Lancaster’s time. “Saintlowe’s Tower” appears in the narrative several times as a passage between the Great Hall and the earl’s private apartment (Chapters 35, 39, 41).

For the other vertical portion within Lancaster’s building blocks, to the northwest of the Great Hall, Scott created the name “Mervyn’s Tower” (Chapter 26). Historical documents had assigned it a rather generic name, Strong Tower. While Saintlowe refers to an actual clan, Arthur ap Mervyn is a fictional figure. Scott might have adopted the Welsh name Mervyn because it is a derivative of Merlin, the ancient wizard who appeared in Gascoigne’s document. For this figure, Scott created a story that foreshadows Amy’s destiny. Upon arriving at the castle, Amy is led to this tower, where she takes refuge in “a small [octangular] chamber” (“Mervyn’s Bower”) on an upper floor (“third storey,” Chapter 27). The room, “which, in the great demand for lodgings, had been on the present occasion fitted up for the reception of guests,” is “generally said to have been used as a place of confinement for some unhappy person who had been there murdered. Tradition called this prisoner Mervyn, and transferred his name to the tower.” Scott’s Amy awaits Leicester here, as if she were jailed. Eventually her presence in this room causes Leicester to accuse her of infidelity: He had allotted the room to Edmund Tressilian, yet another Scott creation, to whom Amy had once been betrothed by her father.

BUILDING DESCRIPTION TAKEN FROM THE RUINS

Mervyn’s Tower and Bower, important because their story foreshadows the protagonist’s fate, were described in detail in Chapter 26, stimulating the reader’s pictorial imagination:

... the floor of each story was arched, the walls of tremendous thickness, while the space of the chamber did not exceed fifteen feet square [in diameter]. The window, however, was pleasant, though narrow, and commanded a delightful view of what was called the Pleasance ... (Scott 1821, v.3, 13-14; Scott 1831, v.23, 151-152).

Descriptions abound throughout the text, including how the “great arched passage, which, running betwixt the range of kitchen offices and the hall, led to the bottom of the little winding-stair that gave access to the chambers of Mervyn’s Tower” (Chapter 29). While Mervyn and his story were fictional, the physical features are for the most part a result of Scott’s observation at the site, when antiquarian documents did not provide enough detail.

The current state of the Strong Tower is, of course, different from the way Scott saw it almost one hundred years ago. Vegetation and crumbling stones have been cleared, and wooden steps have been constructed in the block’s northern end for contemporary visitors’ convenience in contrast to the earthen mound that worked as a ramp, shown in late nineteenth-century photographs (Fig. 2); however, the basic makeup is the same. The tower has four levels, if we count a narrow strip of exposed floor that runs on the west side of the top level. Each of the remaining three levels is vaulted in stone (Fig. 3) and has thick walls, as Scott described them. The lowest level is now thought to have serviced the kitches
as cellars and the like, while Scott described it as “occupied by some of the household officers of Leicester, owing to its convenient vicinity to the places where their duty lay” (Chapter 26). At the northwest and southwest corners of this block are two small vertical protrusions. The former contains, on the second and third levels, a small polygonal space with a narrow window (Fig. 4), which would have oriented toward Henry V’s Pleasance at some distance; it is now extinct. Immediately south of the

![Fig. 2. James Valentine, “Mervyn’s Tower” (Reproduced by permission of English Heritage).](image)

![Fig. 3. “Mervyn’s Tower” (Photographs by author, unless otherwise noted).](image)

![Fig. 4. View from a polygonal room, “Mervyn’s Tower”](image)

![Fig. 5. Great Arched Passage leading to the Great Hall](image)
Strong Tower, a large arched opening exists in the ruin, facing east (Fig. 5). The opening occupies the northernmost intercolumniation of the upper floor of the Great Hall block. Samuel and Nathaniel Beck’s engraving of the ruined castle, dated 1729 (Fig. 6), shows a ramp connecting this opening to the courtyard. Although the ramp no longer existed in the nineteenth century, Scott imagined it from the arched opening and described a “great arched passage.” Scott’s “little winding stair,” although hard to find, runs from the second to the fourth level, occupying the small southwest protrusion and a narrow strip of the southern portion of the Strong Tower block (Fig. 7). It connects to the Great Hall through an opening in the northernmost wall of the Great Hall block (Fig. 8), although this passage is currently blocked with an iron fence.

“CASTELLATED ARCHITECTURE” IN HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

Scott makes explicit in his narrative his intention to take advantage of architectural style and ornaments in order to invoke the color of the past:
They entered the inner court of the Castle by the great gateway, which extended betwixt the principal Keep, or Donjon, called Caesar’s Tower, and a stately building which passed by the name of King Henry’s Lodging, and were thus placed in the centre of the noble pile, which presented on its different fronts magnificent specimens of every species of castellated architecture, from the Conquest to the reign of Elizabeth, with the appropriate style and ornaments of each (Scott 1821, v.3, 13; Scott 1831, v.23, 151).

Describing further “castellated architecture,” Scott attached one of the typical features of such construction, “battlements,” to the Gallery Tower in Chapter 26 and to Leicester’s Apartments in Chapter 39. By the time of Scott’s visit, such features had eroded. In Buck’s engraving, Leicester’s Apartments and all other buildings except Leicester’s Gatehouse are missing their tops. Scott may have applied his general knowledge about medieval castle construction, as he explained battlements as “usual in Gothic castles.” He may also have seen the battlements intact in his mind’s eye, by applying the features of Leicester’s Gatehouse to all other buildings. Although Leicester’s Gatehouse is the newest construction, the unique reddish stone (Kenilworth Sandstone) used for the entire castle compound likely enticed Scott to imaginatively apply the same feature to older buildings, overcoming the differences that would have cropped up over four hundred years of construction.

Additionally, Scott could have been aided by historical documents that depicted the castle’s pre-Civil-Wars appearance. The only such illustration available before Scott’s writing, besides the three distant views by Dugdale mentioned above, would have been an image engraved in two different sizes and published in 1817 (Fig. 9).7 Showing the compound from an eastern vantage point, the engraving is a second-generation derivative, after a drawing of 1716 by Henry Beighton, of the original fresco at Newnham Padox House.8 Did Scott see the 1817 engraving? There is circumstantial evidence to support this; the publisher also published Kenilworth Illustrated,9 and since Scott was one of the book’s subscribers, he could have been shown the print by the publisher.10

Fig. 9. Merridew and Radcliffe, eastern view (Reprinted by permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library).
Scott described another defensive feature, “palisades,” for the walls of the “tilt yard,” or the bridge over the lake between the Gallery and Mortimer’s Towers:

They now crossed the entrance tower, which obtained the name of the Gallery-tower, from the following circumstance: – The whole bridge, extending from the entrance to another tower on the opposite side of the lake, called Mortimer’s Tower, was so disposed as to make a spacious tilt-yard, about one hundred and thirty yards in length, and ten in breadth, strewed with the finest sand, and defended on either side by strong and high palisades (Scott, 1821, v.3, 9; Scott 1831, v.23, 148).

Built of slender tree trunks aligned vertically, palisades reflect construction methods much earlier than Elizabethan times. They likely would have been replaced with masonry by 1575 and for certain before the Civil Wars. Both the 1656 Dugdale and 1817 Merridew/Radcliffe illustrations depicted battlemented stone walls on both sides of the tilt yard. Where did Scott get the idea for palisades? Dugdale’s illustration, showing the western side of the bridge, should be noted. The battlemented masonry wall is shaded with vertical hatching (Fig. 10), which appears similar to the way vertically aligned logs might have looked. Scott could have understood it as rendering palisades, or more likely, he could have interpreted the illustration liberally, with full awareness of what it really depicted.

ARMORIAL BEARINGS

Scott engaged his imagination in creating fictional architectural features. Comparing what he saw to his narrative will reveal how the ruins stirred his imagination. Scott expanded the range of heraldic symbols on buildings to as far back as the twelfth century, while only those from Robert Dudley’s time remained at the site.

Fig. 10. William Dugdale, prospect of Kenilworth Castle (detail) (Reprinted by permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library).
In a passage from Chapter 25, quoted above, Scott made clear his intention to describe the history of the castle by using armorial bearings carved in the buildings. In Chapter 32, Scott’s knights pay respect to these ancestral emblems during the royal procession. Although the Clintons and the Montforts appeared on his list of “mighty chiefs,” they did not make it into the building’s nomenclature. Scott takes care of them by conjuring up their armorial bearings: “On the exterior walls [of the Keep] frowned the scutcheon of the Clintons, by whom they were founded in the reign of Henry I, and of the yet more redoubted Simon de Montfort, by whom, during the Barons’ wars, Kenilworth was long held out against Henry III” (Chapter 25). In Chapter 26, Scott referred to the “scutcheon” of the Earl of March (Roger Mortimer):

Mortimer’s Tower bore on its front the scutcheon of the Earl of March, whose daring ambition overthrew the throne of Edward II.[...] and aspired to share his power with the “She-wolf of France,” to whom the unhappy monarch was wedded. The gate, which opened under this ominous memorial, was guarded by many warders in rich liveries...

(Scott 1821, v.3, 9-10; Scott 1831, v.23, 148-149).

The most visible examples of heraldry as architectural decoration at the present site are those on Leicester’s Gatehouse. On the south façade is a shield of “a fess between six cross-crosslets” (horizontal band between six crosses with each arm crossed) (Fig. 11), and on the west are cinquefoils, ragged staffs, and the initials RL (Robert, Earl of Leicester) (Fig. 12). Inside the building, a fireplace also bears those initials and symbols together with his motto, “Droit et Loyal,” the year “1571,” and shields encircled by the Order of St. Michael, Dudley’s military title, and the coronet. The building was constructed by Robert Dudley during 1571-1575 for the Queen’s visits, and these symbols all point to Dudley. However, Dudley himself adopted them from his ancestors and predecessors, e.g., Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick and Dudley’s ancestor through his paternal grandmother, and Simon de Montfort, old Earl of Leicester. It is therefore not difficult for Scott to imagine earlier heraldry from Dudley’s emblems. Additional ornamental carvings referring to Dudley have survived on the portions of the buildings...
constructed in his time. On the wall above the entry opening immediately west of the Keep (Fig. 13) also are the remains of ornamental carvings, including, “70,” referring to the construction of 1570, and a small pediment. Above these are cinquefoils and the letter “R,” with its vertical element made of a ragged staff. On the south-facing exterior wall of the State Apartment block is an abutment with dentils and other ornamental carvings (Fig. 14).

**DOOR HINGE AND SALLYPORT (POSTERN)**

Scott imagined doors for a number of key locations, while at the site only traces of opening mechanisms were discernible. In Chapter 25, he created a heavy door at Mortimer’s Tower to reflect Amy’s tenuous position:

> …though unquestioned Mistress of that proud Castle, whose lightest word ought to have had force sufficient to make its gates leap from their massive hinges to receive her, yet she could not conceal from herself the difficulty and peril which she must experience in gaining admission into her own halls (Scott 1821, v.2, 333; Scott 1831, v.23, 139).

In the ruin, on both sides of the passage, large chunks of stones protrude from the walls and suggest hinges that supported wooden doors.

There are additional architectural details of opening mechanisms. King Henry’s Lodging had long disappeared, and so had the “great gateway” (Chapter 26) between this building and the Keep. Scott would have imagined the opening from the groove in the south-facing wall of the Keep near its east end. This groove extends almost to the full two-story height, suggesting that it was a portcullis (Morris 2006, 9). Merridew/Radcliffe (1817) is the only pictorial source for King Henry’s Lodging block, depicting its eastern elevation with the arched opening on the northernmost span and the steps leading to it from the base court. Scott did not see this opening in Dugdale’s views, because this particular part is obscured by a shadow or a tree.

In Scott’s text, “sallyport or secret postern” was mentioned several times as located in the outer wall near “Mervyn’s Tower”. In Chapter 29, Scott’s narrative follows minor characters to the western side of the castle compound:

> Lambourne, with hasty steps, led the way to that same sallyport, or secret postern, by which Tressilian had returned to the Castle, and which opened in the western wall, at no great distance from Mervyn’s Tower (Scott 1821, v.3, 54; Scott 1831, v.23, 180).
In the final, forty-first chapter, Amy is moved from the castle through the same sallyport (“the Countess was transported from ‘Saintlowe’s Tower’ to the postern gate, where Tider waited with the litter and horses”). The opening still exists in the outer wall of the western side. Corresponding to this sallyport is an opening in the western wall of the Great Hall block. Here, the remains of a portcullis can be observed, with grooves for the door that was suspended and operated by a pulley from above, and which Scott may have taken as an inspiration (Fig. 15).

IMAGINED ARCHITECTURAL STRUCTURES

Scott also imagined the “highly-carved oaken roof” of the Great Hall, along with a splendid interior space, magnificently decorated for the festivities:

… the Queen … at length found her way to the Great Hall of the Castle, gorgeously hung for her reception with the richest silken tapestry blazing with torches [no “blazing with torches”], misty with perfumes, and sounding to strains of soft and delicious music. [From the highly carved oaken roof hung a superb chandelier of gilt bronze, formed like a spread eagle, whose outstretched wings supported three male and three female figures, grasping a pair of branches in each hand. The hall was thus illuminated by twenty-four torches of wax.] At the upper end of the splendid apartment, [no “,”] was a state canopy, overshadowing a royal throne, and beside it was a door, which opened to a long suite of apartments, decorated with the utmost magnificence for the Queen and her ladies, whenever [it] should be her pleasure to be private (Scott 1821, v.3, 87-88; Scott 1831, v.23, 204-205).
The roof had vanished completely by the time of Beck’s engraving. What remain are some fragments of ornate perpendicular-style pointed arches, fireplaces, and window-side benches. In addition, discernible only to observant eyes, are notches in the uppermost position of stone walls, regularly placed above the solid portions of the walls between the arched openings. These notches would have held the hammer beams (Fig. 16). The viewer might fill in the apparent “voids,” either the grooves or the notches, with an imaginary positive.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The question of whether to restore a mutilated building and to what extent (Brand 1994, 90) exists today just as it did in the writings of two mid-nineteenth-century contemporaries, the English art critic John Ruskin and the French architect and theoretician Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc. The former was a strong proponent of conservation, stating in The Seven Lamps of Architecture (1849) that restoration means “the most total destruction which a building can suffer” (Ruskin 1881, 184), and “the greatest glory of a building is in its Age” (Ruskin, 176-177). In contrast, the latter advocated restoration both in theory, in Dictionnaire raisonné, vol. 8 (1866), and practice, at Notre Dame de Paris (1845-1864), among others. For Viollet-le-Duc, restoration could never bring a building back to its original state; its purpose was “to reinstate it in a condition of completeness that could never have existed at any given time” (Viollet-le-Duc 1990, 269). Noting “the best means of preserving a building is to find a use for it,” he was not averse even to introducing modern technology (Viollet-le-Duc, 276).

In our contemporary setting, historical accuracy weighs more heavily in appreciation of buildings than in Scott’s time. However, it is undeniable that we often encounter difficulties in achieving completely accurate reconstruction: historical documentation may not be sufficient, materials may no longer be available, or construction methods may have been lost. There also is a question of to which time period we restore a building. Kenilworth Castle was constructed over four centuries, and it did not look to Elizabeth as it had appeared to Simon de Montfort. Scott had a “confused” love of Gothic architecture (Ruskin1907, 290), but in both literary and architectural production he was “not a restorer of Gothic ruins,” and his is “an audacious recreation rather than a laborious reconstruction” (Bann 1984, 101).

The ways in which the ruins’ physical properties engaged Scott’s imagination are relevant to today’s preservation practice at historic sites. Historical novels may serve the same purpose as historic preservation advocacy when they arouse the reader’s interest. An example close to Scott’s time would be Victor Hugo’s Notre Dame de Paris (1831), which is set in the fifteenth century and centered on its namesake cathedral. An additional literary way to provoke reader’s historic imagination is, for example, Benjamin Disraeli’s Sybil, or the Two Nations (1845), set during the author’s time, using a ruined monastery modeled after Fountains Abbey. Among numerous such examples, Scott’s novel is a special case because the
author restored the ruined building to its past glory with his imagination. In comparison, no alteration was necessary to Hugo or Disraeli: Notre Dame had stood as a working cathedral,¹¹ and Fountains Abbey appears as a ruin in the literary work. Scott brought a nineteenth-century ruin back to its sixteenth-century state by referring to antiquarian documents (“historical”) but also by using his imagination, grounded in the observation of the ruins. Because he employed both historical knowledge, fiction, and imagination, Scott seems to have involved the whole of his being in relating to the past. Moreover, the past restored thus was not a dry, remote period but a past that allowed him to contemplate his own existence, including the transient nature of that existence in time’s continuum:

We cannot but add, that of this lordly palace, where princes feasted and heroes fought, now in the bloody earnest of storm and siege, and now in the games of chivalry, where beauty dealt the prize which valour won, all is now desolate. The bed of the lake is but a rushy swamp; and the massive ruins of the Castle only serve to shew [show] what their splendour once was, and to impress on the musing visitor the transitory value of human possessions, and the happiness of those who enjoy a humble lot in virtuous contentment (Scott 1821, v.2, 332; Scott 1831 v.23, 139).

The intellectual and emotional connection Scott made through historical imagination was successful in enticing his readers. Scott’s fictional nomenclature stuck to the actual building after Kenilworth’s publication, as in A Concise History and Description of Kenilworth Castle’s 1825 and later editions. English Heritage still uses “Saintlowe Tower.” The novel popularized the actual site, boosting tourism at Kenilworth Castle; famous visitors included Charles Dickens (1838), Queen Victoria (1858), and Henry James (1870s) (Morris 2006, 51). Scott’s imagination is influential even today, as English Heritage is reported to have consulted his narrative in recreating the Elizabethan garden at the castle. We need to acknowledge the importance of viewer involvement in maintaining historical structures as a living heritage, and Scott’s case is an important demonstration of how architectural ruins engage the viewer.

RUMIKO HANDA

University of Nebraska-Lincoln
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ENDNOTES

1. The recent authoritative edition from the University of Edinburgh Press has removed these additions, because many present-day readers view them as an interruption (Hewitt 1993a, xi).

2. The first edition of Kenilworth: A Romance consisted of three volumes, the first of which covered the first twelve chapters, the second the subsequent thirteen chapters, and the third the remaining sixteen chapters. The novel occupies volumes 22 and 23 of the magnum opus edition, the first of which covers seventeen chapters. There are some textual differences, and this paper denotes the magnum opus edition by [...].

3. Another possible source is A Concise History and Description of Kenilworth Castle, the castle’s first and quite popular guidebook, whose first edition was published in 1777 by the printer S. Thornton of Kenilworth. Many subsequent editions were printed with corrections and additions made each time,
including the second (1781) by Thomas Luckman (d. 1784) of Coventry, the third (1790) by Thomas Pearson (fl. 1761-91) of Birmingham, and others (1798, etc.) by Henry Sharpe (d. 1831) and his son Henry J. Sharpe (d. 1876) of Warwick. It grew to its thirteenth edition in 1821, and to the twenty-sixth edition in 1842. Scott would no doubt have seen a copy, although he did not cite it as a source. The book must have used Dugdale as the source for its ground plan, included in the second and subsequent editions, which was only slightly different from Dugdale’s in construction.

4. The last ground plan to consider as a possible source is prompted by Scott’s note: “I am indebted for a curious ground-plan of the Castle of Kenilworth, as it existed in Queen Elizabeth’s time, to the voluntary kindness of Richard Badnall Esq. of Olivebank, near Liverpool. From his obliging communication, I learn that the original sketch was found among the manuscripts of the celebrated J. J. Rousseau, when he left England. These were entrusted by the philosopher to the care of his friend Mr. Davenport, and passed from his legatee into the possession of Mr. Badnall.” Despite the explicit reference, this is a least likely source for the following reasons: first, the above note originally appeared posthumously “in an 1837 edition by Fisher, Son, and Co. It subsequently appears in Robert Cadell’s 1842 and 1844 editions of Kenilworth”; second, the aforementioned plan “was sent to Scott by Richard Badnall on 26 May 1830...” and “Scott returned the plan with a letter of 4 June” of the same year (Correspondence from Dr. Paul Barnaby, project officer, Walter Scott Digital Archive, Edinburgh University Library, July 14, 2009). On the one hand, Badnall’s plan may have been the source for the ground plan included in the reproduction of Kenilworth, which he would have been working on at the time. On the other hand, Scott did not cite the source, nor did he include the above note in the reproduction. Additionally, as mentioned above, the reproduction is not Dugdale’s plan, whether it is based on Badnall’s plan or not, closely resembles Dugdale’s.

5. Scott described “Mervyn’s Tower” as “a small but strong tower, occupying the north-east angle of the building adjacent to the great hall, and filling up a space betwixt the immense range of kitchens and the end of the great hall itself.” Here “north-east” is Scott’s inadvertent mistake for “north-west,” a simple and likely error of reading the ground plan that unconventionally oriented the north to the right instead of to the top. In fact, this error supports the speculation that Scott used Dugdale as the source for its ground plan, included in the second and subsequent editions, which was only slightly different from Dugdale’s in construction.

6. Scott finds an opportunity in Chapter 29 to elaborate on Arthur ap Mervyn in a story told by Lawrence Staples, another fictional figure and “the upper-warder, or, in common phrase, the first jailer, of Kenilworth Castle.”

7. Various versions of this construction were produced after the publication of Scott’s Kenilworth, in much more simplified and crude forms and carrying the nomenclature of Scott’s creation, an indication of the novel’s popularity. One such reproduction is in the Walter Scott Archive at the University of Edinburgh, having been extracted from an anonymous work, Account of Kenilworth Castle: With A Key to the Novel of Kenilworth (Warwick: H. Sharpe, [1827?]) and with the altered title, “Kenilworth Castle as it stood in the reign of Queen Elizabeth to illustrate the romance of Kenilworth, 1575” (Correspondence from Dr. Paul Barnaby, project officer, Walter Scott Digital Archive, Edinburgh University Library, July 14, 2009). The Concise History and Description mentioned above also carried a reproduction from its fourteenth edition (1822) onward. The author examined various editions of Concise History and Description: 1777 (1st); 1790 (3rd); 1798 (4th); 1809 (7th); 1819 (12th); 1822 (14th); 1825 (16th); 1831 (19th); 1834 (21st); 1837 (23rd); 1840 (25th); and 1842 (26th). She did not examine the 1821 (13th) edition, which is not in the British Library collection.

8. The building of Newnham Paddox House no longer exists, and the copy of 1716 by Henry Beighton was said to be in the Aylesford Collection, Birmingham Reference Library Archive, but the author was not able to locate it at Birmingham Library. The text below the engraving reads: “To John Newdigate Ludford, Esquire LLD of Ansley Hall in the County of Warwick, this view of Kenilworth Castle as it appeared in 1620, engraved after a drawing in his possession made by Henry Beighton, in 1716, from the original painting in fresco at Newnham Paddock, is respectfully inscribed by his obliged & obedient servants Merridew & Son, Coventry, published by Merridew & Son, Dec. 1st, 1817.”

9. The publisher of the engraving is “Merridew and Son,” that is, Nathaniel Merridew (1794-1823 trade) of Coventry and his son John (1813-1852 tr.) of Coventry but also Warwick and Lenington (See British Book Trade Index, http://www.bbti.bham.ac.uk/Details.htm?TraderID=46906). Its engraver (“Sc.”) is “W. Radcliffe,” that is, William Radcliffe (1796 -1855) of Birmingham, who sometimes spelled his name Radclyffe and traded as W & T Radcliffe with William Radcliffe (1817-29) (See British Book Trade Index, http://www.bbti.bham.ac.uk/Detailswithsource.htm?TraderID=56535). The publisher of Kenilworth Illustrated is Merridew and Son, Coventry; John Merridew, Warwick; and W. and T. Radclyffe, Birmingham.

10. The individual who compiled materials for Kenilworth Illustrated could also have informed Scott of the engraving. Although the book does not identify this compiler, the author concludes that it is Thomas Sharp (1770-1841) of Coventry. At Folger Shakespeare Library of Washington, DC, is a box of unbound folios identified as “Kenilworth illustrated, or, The history of the castle, priory and church of Kenilworth: with a description of their present state” (ART Vol. b22). Its first half contains the uncut pages of Kenilworth Illustrated, and the second half various images of Kenilworth Castle. Between pages 80 and 81 of Kenilworth Illustrated, where in the regular volume Gascoigne’s “Princely Pleasures” would have ended and “Masques: Performed before Queen Elizabeth” would have begun, two folios were inserted, carrying a portrait on the left page and text on the right. This text is a dedication to Sharp, indicating that he contributed antiquarian knowledge for the publication of Kenilworth Illustrated, and the set is one of only two produced by Merridew and Radcliffe. Folger Shakespeare Library does not have further information on
the provenance; however, it may have been part of the sale of Sharp’s library on July 23, 1858, by Sotherby and Wilkinson. Most of Sharp’s materials that became a part of Birmingham Free Reference Library collection were destroyed in an 1879 fire. The author has not located the second set. William George Fretton identified Sharp and his friend William Hamper (1776-1831) of Birmingham, as the joint compilers of Kenilworth Illustrated. See William George Fretton, "Memoir of Thomas Sharp," Illustrated Papers on the History and Antiquities of the City of Coventry (Birmingham: Hall and English, 1871), xii. Both Hamper and Sharp corresponded with Walter Scott; however, the earliest letter with clear identification included in Millgate Union Catalog is after Scott’s Kenilworth publication (from Sharp to Scott dated November 24, 1825). See National Library of Scotland, Millgate Union Catalogue of Walter Scott Correspondence, http://www.nls.uk/catalogues/resources/scott/full.cfm?id=11910 (accessed January 25, 2012). One earlier letter, dated May 4, 1821, from an unidentified correspondent of Coventry to Scott, opens with “The Edition of Kenilworth Illustrated having received through” and has “To the Author of Kenilworth a Romance” at bottom of f.119. Not signed, but apparently by the author of Kenilworth Illustrated. See National Library of Scotland, Millgate Union Catalogue of Walter Scott Correspondence, http://www.nls.uk/catalogues/resources/scott/full.cfm?id=11022 (accessed January 25, 2012). Both antiquaries are close friends and collaborators of John Britton.

11. Some of Notre Dame’s structures were destroyed during the French Revolution. Viollet-le-Duc’s restoration, controversial because it is suspected to have incorporated the architect’s original forms, began in 1845, by which time Hugo’s work had been published.
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