In 1911, Sir Henry Pellatt commissioned the architect E.J. Lennox to build him a new house. 1 The result was the most extravagant home that Toronto would ever see (fig. 1). Most Torontonians would say that Casa Loma has a great deal to answer for. In a conservative, polite city that has always valued discreet understatement, Casa Loma is neither conservative, polite, discreet, nor understated. Locals tend to regard it as something of a joke, or simply as a huge fake. Moreover, Casa Loma has been all but ignored by scholars. 2 Even Marilyn Litvak's biography of Lennox never addresses the question of why Pellatt and Lennox decided to build a medieval castle in Toronto. 3 Roger Hall's review of Litvak's book in the Globe and Mail newspaper refers simply to "the whatever-it-is-eclecticism of Casa Loma." 4 The purpose of the present paper is neither to praise Casa Loma nor to bury it, but to give some substance to that "whatever-it-is" by setting it into an appropriate architectural and intellectual context.

The key lies in identifying Casa Loma's true architectural lineage. The notion that Casa Loma is a "fake" is rooted in a misunderstanding of that lineage; it assumes that Casa Loma is a fake medieval castle. A "fake," however, must be meant to fool someone, and Casa Loma could never have been intended to fool anyone. The architectural and imaginative home of Casa Loma lies not in the thirteenth, but in the eighteenth century; in the literary and architectural movement referred to in the title as the "Gothic Imagination." Casa Loma is not the illegitimate child of the medieval castle—it is the legitimate child of the Gothic Imagination.

The Gothic Imagination is primarily concerned with reinventing the middle ages; with finding features of medieval culture (however inaccurately perceived) that seem to hold up a mirror to certain eighteenth-century sensibilities. One of the first architectural expressions of that tradition is Vanbrugh Castle, which the architect built as his own home in 1717 (fig. 2). Vanbrugh Castle is qualitatively different from the posthumous Gothic of his near contemporaries, Wren and Hawksmoor. 5 Wren admired the structural skill evident in Gothic, while Hawksmoor had a deep respect for its importance in the history of architecture; but Vanbrugh is the first major architect to love the emotional power of Gothic. 6 It is important to remember that as well

---
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[1] In 1911, Sir Henry Pellatt commissioned the architect E.J. Lennox to build him a new house. The result was the most extravagant home that Toronto would ever see (fig. 1). Most Torontonians would say that Casa Loma has a great deal to answer for. In a conservative, polite city that has always valued discreet understatement, Casa Loma is neither conservative, polite, discreet, nor understated. Locals tend to regard it as something of a joke, or simply as a huge fake. Moreover, Casa Loma has been all but ignored by scholars. Even Marilyn Litvak's biography of Lennox never addresses the question of why Pellatt and Lennox decided to build a medieval castle in Toronto. Roger Hall's review of Litvak's book in the Globe and Mail newspaper refers simply to "the whatever-it-is-eclecticism of Casa Loma." The purpose of the present paper is neither to praise Casa Loma nor to bury it, but to give some substance to that "whatever-it-is" by setting it into an appropriate architectural and intellectual context.

The key lies in identifying Casa Loma's true architectural lineage. The notion that Casa Loma is a "fake" is rooted in a misunderstanding of that lineage; it assumes that Casa Loma is a fake medieval castle. A "fake," however, must be meant to fool someone, and Casa Loma could never have been intended to fool anyone. The architectural and imaginative home of Casa Loma lies not in the thirteenth, but in the eighteenth century; in the literary and architectural movement referred to in the title as the "Gothic Imagination." Casa Loma is not the illegitimate child of the medieval castle—it is the legitimate child of the Gothic Imagination.

The Gothic Imagination is primarily concerned with reinventing the middle ages; with finding features of medieval culture (however inaccurately perceived) that seem to hold up a mirror to certain eighteenth-century sensibilities. One of the first architectural expressions of that tradition is Vanbrugh Castle, which the architect built as his own home in 1717 (fig. 2). Vanbrugh Castle is qualitatively different from the posthumous Gothic of his near contemporaries, Wren and Hawksmoor. Wren admired the structural skill evident in Gothic, while Hawksmoor had a deep respect for its importance in the history of architecture; but Vanbrugh is the first major architect to love the emotional power of Gothic. It is important to remember that as well

---
as being an architect, Vanbrugh was an accomplished playwright, for while his Gothic is even less archaeologically accurate than Wren’s or Hawksmoor’s had been, it is certainly more theatrical.6 For Vanbrugh, Gothic was a psychological entity, as well as an architectural one. This idea is at the core of the imaginative reinvention of Gothic which occurred in the eighteenth century. What grew from the idea was a highly romantic, overtly theatrical, and archaeologically inaccurate style of Gothic, which would flower architecturally in the second half of the eighteenth century.

The first generation of Gothic Revival buildings would later be dismissed contemptuously as “sham” by subsequent generations of architects and critics who believed their own understanding of Gothic to be superior. Following the lead of A.W.N. Pugin and the critic John Ruskin, architects such as William Butterfield and George Gilbert Scott saw Gothic as the embodiment of their own notions of taste and morality.7 For them, Gothic was virtuous while all other styles were immoral, and they believed such notion to be rooted in historic truth. To us, their designs look unmistakably and quintessentially Victorian, rather than medieval (figs. 3 and 4). A later generation of architects and critics found Gothic to be a prefiguration not of the Heavenly Jerusalem, but of International Style Modernism—in spite of the fact that, as the late Lawrence Hoey once commented, unnecessary masonry in Gothic can be measured by the ton.8 Somewhat more recently, Gothic architecture has been interpreted as a petrified equivalent of a mystical abstraction.9 One result of that was to reduce a style of architecture that proliferated throughout
Western Europe for over three centuries to a single formula, based on a study of two buildings.

In all of those cases, skilled architects and conscientious, meticulous scholars have looked at the medieval past and seen their own preoccupations reflected back at them. In so doing, they recreated Gothic in their own image. That is precisely what occurred at the birth of the Gothic Imagination in the eighteenth century, but those preoccupations were somewhat different.

As is well known, the eighteenth-century interest in things medieval owes as much to medieval ruins as to intact medieval buildings. Of all the cultural products to grow out of such fascination, the most widely known is not the architecture but the literature. From the outset, one of the defining features of the Gothic Imagination was its equation of Gothic architecture with tales of melancholy, dread, and supernatural horror. It is that impulse that caused Horace Walpole to set the world's first Gothic novel, *The Castle of Otranto*, in a twelfth-century castle, and, later, inspired Bram Stoker to set key scenes of *Dracula* in the shadow of Whitby Abbey. But how did the Gothic of sites such as Finchale Priory (fig. 5) become the Gothic of horror literature? The answer lies in the powerful emotional impact of such ruins. Ruins are not just fragments of buildings. The decomposing architectural skeletons are the mortal remains of medieval civilization. They are a powerful affirmation of mortality, and of the ephemerality of even the greatest human achievements.

Those impressions alone can explain the affinity between Gothic architecture and Gothic literature. More broadly speaking, it is fair to say that, to eighteenth-century romantics, the characteristics of Gothic that had been condemned by previous generations began to look really attractive. Consider the following statement made by John Evelyn in the 1660s:

> Greek and Roman architecture answered all the perfections required in a faultless and accomplished building. The Goths demolished these, and introduced in their stead a certain fantastical and licentious manner of building: congestions of heavy, dark, monkish piles, without any just proportion, use or beauty."

Evelyn’s understanding of the medieval use of proportion is demonstrably incorrect, but that is not the point. The point is that, a century later, a generation looking to extend the emotional ceiling imposed by Evelyn’s values would have used the same words to describe Gothic, only they would have meant them as a compliment. Evelyn hated Gothic because it seemed irrational. The eighteenth-century reinventors of Gothic loved it for that same reason.

That is the background to the Gothic Imagination. Horace Walpole provides its most complete early manifestation, both in architecture and literature, in his novel, *The Castle of Otranto*, and his house, Strawberry Hill (figs. 6–8). The literature of that early phase of the Gothic revival is crucial, but it is not entirely
“literature” in the way that architectural historians typically understand the term. Michael McCarthy has stated, “Professional pattern-books, books of architectural criticism and studies in antiquarianism form the literary background to the revival of the gothic style in architecture in the middle decades of the eighteenth century.” McCarthy is right to emphasize the importance of the literature – there may be no style of architecture for which it is more important to read the text in order to understand the buildings. In the case of the Gothic Revival, however, the ‘text’ is not merely a collection of pattern-books and critical and antiquarian studies – it is also a group of lurid, melodramatic novels and short stories.

The first such novel is Walpole’s Castle of Otranto, published in 1764. Set in the middle ages, it is the story of a usurped Prince whose ghost haunts, and ultimately destroys, the descendants of his usurpers. The story begins at a wedding celebration, which is rudely interrupted when the ghost dismembers the groom on the second page. The novel ends with the wrongs of the passed redressed, but with most of the main characters either dead or clinically depressed:

[...]. Theodore’s grief was too fresh to admit the thought of another love; and it wasn’t till after frequent discourses with Isabella, of his dear Matilda, that he was persuaded he could know no happiness but in the society of one with whom he could forever indulge the melancholy that had taken possession of his soul.

That novel sets the tone for subsequent Gothic literature. Members of the genre share several characteristics. First, as any reader reaching page two of The Castle of Otranto could attest, there is a great love of melodrama. The genre also has a love of exotic content and setting; especially, not surprisingly, an intense infatuation with the Middle Ages. Underlying the Gothic novel is a pervading sense of fear, or dread, even horror; a sense that the powers of darkness are lurking just below the surface, and could erupt at any moment. As well as horror, there is a sense of playfulness; albeit of a rather serious, spine-chilling kind.

At times, early Gothic literature even took on the form of the architectural ruins that inspired it. Anna Laetitia Aikin’s Sir Bertrand: a Fragment (1773) is an incomplete piece of a story, as if the narrative had failed to survive the vicissitudes of the Reformation and Civil War. The playfulness easily segues into satire, as in Jane Austen’s Northanger Abbey (1818), or Bret Harte’s Sedilia Sedilia (1865), where a young aristocrat visits his betrothed in her ancestral home at sunset:

“My Selina!”
“Edgardel You here?”
“Yes, dearest.”

“And—you—you—have—seen nothing?” said the lady in an agitated and nervous manner, turning her face aside to conceal her emotion.

“Nothing—that is, nothing of any account,” said Edgardo. “I passed the ghost of your aunt in the park, noticed the spectre of your uncle in the ruined keep, and observed the familiar features of the spirit of your great grandfather at his post. But nothing beyond these trifles, Selina.”

Such playful sensibility pervades both Horace Walpole’s novel and his house. The love of melodrama, the taste for medievalism; the enthusiasm for medieval forms as exciting, exotic toys, all these are expressed at Strawberry Hill in wood, plaster, and papier-mâché. The enduring impression is less of horror than of fantasy. Gothic, both visually and verbally, has become a landscape through which the imagination can roam unfettered by rules and conventional expectations.
For those who read between the lines, it is clear that the connection between Walpole's novel and his house is more concrete than simply a shared sensibility. In one passage that has become a cliché of the horror genre, a figure depicted in an ancestral portrait comes to life and "descends on the floor with a grave and melancholy air." The spectre then leads Prince Manfred through a room called the "Gallery," and disappears through a locked door into what is referred to as a "chamber on the right." The "Gallery" seems to be based on the gallery at Strawberry Hill (fig. 7), which was under construction as Otranto was being published. Walpole, in his 1784 description of his house and its contents, admits that a portrait hanging in the Gallery of Henry Carey Lord Falkland had inspired him to write the scene. Moreover, when one walks through the Gallery, there is a doorway that leads to a "chamber on the right," which Walpole called the Tribune (fig. 8). This puts Walpole's introduction to the first edition of The Castle of Otranto into a mischievous light. In that introduction, Walpole, who had not yet publicly admitted that he was the author, wrote: "The scene is undoubtedly laid in some real castle," and refers to several passages in the book, which "are strong presumptions that the author had some certain building in his eye." The author did have some certain building in his eye—his own house. In the preface to his description of Strawberry Hill, Walpole appeals for good humour from readers who might be disposed to condemn the fantastic fabric, and hopes they will think the house "a very proper habitation of, as it was the scene that inspired, the author of The Castle of Otranto.

The Castle of Otranto requires considerable suspension of disbelief. It must be read innocently, with a child-like sense of wonder. Its premises, irrational as they may be, must be accepted unconditionally; it only works if the reader agrees to play along. The same is true of Strawberry Hill. A detached, intellectual approach to it will miss the point entirely. If the bubble of illusion bursts, then there is little choice but to agree with Kenneth Clark: "Bad art flourishes in every epoch, but art may be healthily or unhealthily bad, and Strawberry was bad in a peculiarly ominous way." But the appeal of Strawberry Hill will never be found in conventional taste. Strawberry Hill is a place where the imagination is invited to come out and play.

The same must have been true of William Beckford's home, Fonthill Abbey, built by James Wyatt between 1796 and 1812 (figs. 9-12). Unfortunately, sloppy construction methods, exacerbated by Beckford's impatience to see the job done, brought about Fonthill's collapse in 1825. Fortunately, numerous descriptions survive, along with illustrations published in 1823, to convey a vivid sense of the Abbey at its brief but sensational zenith.

If the element of sublime horror was a little understated at Strawberry Hill, the same cannot be said of Fonthill Abbey. Beckford knew of Walpole, and of Strawberry Hill, and despised them both: "The place was a miserable child's box—a species of Gothic mousetrap—a reflection of Walpole's littleness." That being said, it must be admitted that some aspects of Fonthill, such as St. Michael's Gallery (fig. 10), show an obvious debt to Strawberry Hill. However, as Beckford's comments on Strawberry Hill imply, he had in mind something much more grand. Once again, the literary context is crucial. Beckford was also a Gothic novelist. His contribution to the genre was Vathek (1786), the story of a Caliph with a bad attitude. Vathek's main character flaws were an insatiable lust for physical pleasures and a pathological thirst for forbidden knowledge. In order to penetrate the secrets of Heaven, Vathek built an enormous tower atop his palace. A few years later, Beckford built Fonthill Abbey.

If certain medievalizing details of Fonthill can be traced to Strawberry Hill, there can be no comparison at all of the spatial effects. Beckford's Great Western Hall and his octagon, or saloon (figs. 11-12), reveal a Vathek-like compulsion to "out-Goth" not only Walpole, but the middle ages themselves. Fonthill was less...
Fig. 13. J.M.W. Turner, Southwest View of Gothic Abbey (morning), now building at Fonthill. The Seat of W. Beckford. 1799.
(Art Gallery of Ontario)

by Sir Henry in Casa Loma, like ancestral portraits. The paintings, however, depict the ancestors of Casa Loma, not of Sir Henry Pellatt. One was a J.M.W. Turner watercolour of Fonthill Abbey, commissioned by Beckford in 1799 (fig. 13). The other was a Reynolds oil portrait, painted in 1756, of Horace Walpole (fig. 14). The latter provides a rather satisfying concrete link between The Castle of Otranto and the Castle of Toronto. Both paintings were sold at auction on June 26, 1924, when financial collapse forced Pellatt to liquidate most of his assets.28 The Reynolds was bought by J.P. Bickell for $2700, while the Turner fetched an auction-high $5100 from a certain G. Edwards of Ottawa.29 Architecturally speaking, Casa Loma became an orphan when the two paintings were removed from its walls, causing an identity crisis from which its public image has never recovered.

Henry Pellatt's castle-building aspirations rested on a foundation of spectacular financial success. Born in Kingston, he made a small fortune in his father's brokerage firm, then a large one through hydroelectric development in Niagara Falls, Ontario. Friends and business acquaintances seemed to regard him as warm, generous, self-effacing, egomaniacal, ruthless, lawless, or some combination thereof.30 Undoubtedly, in business he was visionary, hugely ambitious, and willing to do anything necessary to succeed. In E.J. Lennox, he found an architect whose imaginative vision matched his commercial one. By the same token, Lennox, an architect whose imagination sometimes dramatically outstripped his patrons' budgets,31 must have regarded Pellatt as the perfect patron. It is not surprising that the two became fast friends.32

The 98-room behemoth which Pellatt and Lennox concocted became the building that Torontonians love to hate.33 It is not hard to see why. Towering above Toronto's conservative skyline, Pellatt and Lennox erected an architectural leviathan to rival Dracula's castle. At the time of the castle's completion, most of Toronto unfolded from the bottom of Casa Loma's spectacular hillside site southward toward Lake Ontario—nestled, as it were, at the castle's feet. This strong visual impression of almost feudal domination persists today, in spite of the city's subsequent northward expansion and growth of its downtown core.

From whatever direction it is approached, Casa Loma's asymmetry is striking. According to Michael McCarthy, the most revolutionary feature of Strawberry Hill was not its medievalism, which was a growing fashion of the mid-eighteenth century, but its conscious asymmetry, which integrated theories of the picturesque with medievalist taste.34 With an extra century and a half of picturesque design to draw from for inspiration (as well as other major nineteenth-century intermediaries, such as

Fig. 14. Joshua Reynolds. Portrait of Horace Walpole, 1756.
(Art Gallery of Ontario)

an actual building than a theatrical depiction of one. It was the stage
upon which Beckford could enact what he considered to be his proper role in the world—as quasi-feudal
Lord of a great estate, patron of the arts, and grand socialite. It must
have been a bitter irony to Beckford that, owing to his social ostracism,
the stage was filled with players only once, when he entertained his old
friend Sir William
Hamilton, Hamilton's
wife Lady Emma, her lover Horatio Nelson, and a (mostly paid)
supporting cast of hundreds. With this love triangle at centre
stage, the evening of dazzling entertainments against the larger-
than-life backdrop of Fonthill Abbey unfolded like a Gothic Peter
Greenaway film.35

This was the monumental stage built by the pioneers of the
Gothic Imagination—a stage that is still occupied by Strawberry
Hill. Exit Walpole, with his death in 1797. Exit Fonthill Abbey,
which collapsed in 1825, and Beckford, who died in 1844. In 1911,
enter Casa Loma.

The patron, Sir Henry Pellatt (1859-1939), never wrote a
gothic novel. Pellatt was a hugely successful businessman who
filled his spare moments with athletic and military pursuits; it
could not be stated with any confidence that he ever even read a
Gothic novel.36 Whether his friend and architect, E.J. Lennox
(1854-1933), ever did so is not recorded. However, that Casa
Loma is firmly and consciously located within the architectural
and literary tradition of Walpole and Beckford is clearly demonstr-
ated by two paintings, now in the collection of the Art Gallery
of Ontario. These two paintings had been purchased (presum-
ably in England, although the details are not recorded) and hung
Neuschwanstein), it is not surprising that Casa Loma's asymmetry is far bolder than that of Strawberry Hill. The view of the castle, which Torontonians drive by on Austen Terrace, consists of a spectacularly uneven massing of rooflines, turrets, gables, and chimneys, flanked by an immense round tower to the east and a somewhat smaller one to the west (fig. 15). The castle's main entrance is nestled among a highly picturesque grouping of rectilinear and curvilinear forms.

That asymmetry is not only in keeping with the well-established taste for the picturesque. It is also fundamental to Lennox's personality as a designer, or at least as one persistent aspect of it. At Casa Loma, as at Toronto's "Old" City Hall (1887-99) or the Massey Mausoleum (1892), also designed by Lennox, the architectural exterior is treated as a massive, sculptural surface to be chiselled and penetrated in a formidable variety of ingenious ways. Nowhere is Lennox's virtuosity with mass and surface more evident than at Casa Loma.

After such an imposing display of feudal grandeur on the exterior, it comes as something of a surprise that many of the interior spaces are in fact classically detailed.

The so-called "round room" is decorated with classical mouldings and egg-and-dart (fig. 16). The same is true of Lady Pellatt's suite of rooms, which is also a wonderfully lyrical exploration of picturesque spatial groupings—showing that what Lennox achieved with mass on the exterior, he achieved with space in the interior (fig. 17). These and other examples notwithstanding, however, the medievalist illusion still dominates. On the ground floor is the enormous, two-storey Great Hall, complete with a hammerbeam roof (fig. 18). It is separated from a long, groin-vaulted corridor ("Peacock Alley") by two levels of arcing decorated with grotesque corbels (fig. 19). Mid-way up the east wall of the great hall is a shallow balcony that opens up directly into Pellatt's bedroom suite. From this elevated vantage point, Sir Henry could survey the immense grandeur of his world, like a
latter-day Charlemagne gazing down from the throne of his Palace Chapel.37

Like Strawberry Hill and Fonthill Abbey, Casa Lorna requires complete suspension of disbelief. It must be regarded not as a fake, but as a work of fiction, to which words like “fake” and “real” do not apply. The reality behind Casa Lorna is not generally understood by Torontonians, but it is well understood by the motion picture industry, which not only recognizes the Castle’s true calling, but regularly allows it to do its proper job, which is to act as stage scenery for dramatic productions (in fig. 20, the castle is used as the setting for an episode of the children’s television show Goosebumps, entitled “A Night in Terror Tower”).

For Lennox, the combination of architectural literacy and imaginative extravagance seen at Casa Lorna would not have been a stretch at all. Many of his more ambitious works—such as the double-cube “Pantheonesque” bank at 205 Yonge or the Massey’s Romanesque two-celled ‘chapel’ in Mount Pleasant Cemetery—demonstrate not only a considerable fluency with architectural languages from the past, but an ability to make new and unique statements in those languages.

The dénouement is (almost) tragic enough for a Gothic novel. After living for ten years in the not quite completed castle, Pellatt fell victim to a combination of hydro nationalization and a revised tax assessment on his home. He died, virtually penniless, in Mimico in 1939.38

In the movie Dead Poets’ Society, there is a scene where Robin Williams’ students, their imaginations emancipated by poetry and inspiring teaching, run through the school grounds by moonlight—surrounded, not coincidentally, by Gothic architecture. From Walpole’s time to our own, Gothic has seemed the ideal architectural analogue to the wildest flights of the imagination. It has become the architectural language of the irrational; the naturalized setting of those who dream big and plunge into the unknown. Between Walpole and Pellatt, another generation briefly but spectacularly appropriated Gothic, imposed the light of reason upon it, and proclaimed it, in Ruskin’s words, “the only rational architecture” (his italics).39 Thus was Mr. Hyde transformed into Doctor Jekyll. Gothic, however, never lost its associations with emotional melodrama. John Evelyn’s “certain
fantastical and licentious manner" was ideally suited to Pellatt's aspirations and Lennox's imagination. Classical restraint would have been unthinkable. Gothic suited Pellatt and Lennox because it reached for the stars, revelled in drama, and, like them, acknowledged no rules.
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5. The most visible example of a Gothic Wren design is the Tom Tower, Oxford, in which Gothic was adopted to harmonize with the existing gate. Similarly, Hawksmoor's towers at Westminster Abbey blend with the medieval work, although at All Souls College, Oxford, he designed an entirely new building in Gothic.
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