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British Solutions to Irish Problems: Representations of Ireland in the British Architectural Press, 1837–1853

RICHARD J. BUTLER

This article investigates perceptions and representations of Ireland in the British architectural press over a fifteen-year period that includes the Great Famine of 1846–51. I examine four national publications: the Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal (1837–68), the Art-Union (1839–1912), the Ecclesiologist (1841–68), and most importantly the Builder (1843–1966). These periodicals are particularly useful sources for investigating Victorian architecture, urban planning, sanitation, engineering, industry, and the development of science. As noted by Michael Brooks, the Builder played an important role in shaping the nascent architectural profession and was received by architects with “unexpected warmth.”¹ Similarly Rosemary VanArsdel has highlighted what she has termed the “eclecticism” of the Builder, which appealed to a “wider readership among the non-specialist public,” including “reformers and decision-makers.”² The Builder’s broad readership and its detailed weekly dispatches make it a particularly useful source when considering British policy towards Ireland. The other three publications also had substantial readerships that overlapped with one another, as is indicated by their cross-referencing of editorial themes and news stories. Practising architects and engineers most likely regularly browsed three, if not four, of the titles. Even the Ecclesiologist often went well beyond critiquing new ecclesiastical architecture and eventually reached an international British colonial audience. In political inclination, they all shared a pro-union, pragmatic, conservative stance and devoted minimal space to Irish nationalist political agitation or the day-to-day tussle of Westminster politics.³ They left many of the more unpalatable stereotypes of the Irish to their more well-known contemporary publications, particularly Punch. In the time period under study, Ireland appears in architectural press in some 461 articles, which I recently catalogued as
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part of a larger study of the culture of architectural production in pre-
famine Ireland (figure 1).

Michael De Nie recently argued that “British newspapers lost interest in Ireland after 1849.” He suggests that by this time the popular press had largely given up on any further schemes for Ireland’s regeneration and eventual Anglicization until it was forced to reconsider Ireland’s future during the Fenian crisis of the late 1860s. However, when studying representations of Ireland in the architectural press, as shown in figure 1, it becomes clear that there was significant British engagement with Ireland from 1837 to 1853. In the early 1850s, there was not so much a diminution of interest as a sustained and intensive examination of Irish issues. In particular, coverage of the industrial exhibitions staged in Cork (1851) and Dublin (1853) reflect a continued and indeed renewed interest in Irish issues and a faith in the idea of further Anglicization of Ireland. British perceptions and depictions of Ireland in the nineteenth-century press have a historiography of their own; the crude depictions of Irishmen, especially in late Victorian periodicals, have been analysed in terms of race, values, and class. My purpose here is to contribute new material to this discussion by focusing specifically on the architectural press. While it is generally agreed that the famine years marked a sudden shift in perceptions of Ireland—with Edward Lengel recently asserting that this was when the “British public soured on Ireland,” it is a mistake to jump straight from the famine to the 1860s without considering, for example, the role played by
the *Builder* and other architectural periodicals in covering Irish issues and industrial exhibitions. Throughout the late 1840s and early 1850s, Belfast and other urban centres were increasingly differentiated from a backward and antiquated rural Ireland.

First we must look at the pre-famine period. That Ireland in the early nineteenth century was a uniquely poor, unindustrialised, and troubled country (in European terms) was a cliché even in its own time. William Thackeray commented that travellers went to England “for the wonders of its wealth—Ireland for the wonders of its poverty.” A lack of investment from both domestic and foreign capitalists precipitated a larger and more extensive role for the government than would have been countenanced in mainland Britain. At the same time, the press defined industrialized Belfast and northeast Ulster as exceptions to the rule. An August 1845 article in the *Builder* (lifted from the *Northern Whig*) boasted that because 400 houses had been built so far that year in Belfast, “there is not in the town a machine-maker, iron-founder, boiler-maker, stone-cutter, stonemason, bricklayer, brick-maker, or carpenter, unemployed who is willing or able to work.” The purpose of including this short but positive article linking construction and employment in Belfast was clearly to further an argument regularly employed by the architectural press in this period: that architectural activity could bypass political or sectarian divisions and act as a channel for Ireland’s regeneration and continued Anglicization.

In general, in the years before the famine, Ireland occupied a peripheral position in the British architectural press, with many articles pleading ignorance of all Irish matters. Reviewing a new pamphlet on Irish architecture in 1838, a contributor to the *Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal* began by stating, “So very rarely does anything concerning architecture, even though limited to mere intelligence, come from the sister island, that even this pamphlet, small as it is, claims more notice than it might otherwise obtain from us.” When Ireland was mentioned, the commentary was usually antiquarian in focus. As the *Ecclesiologist* noted in an 1846 review of George Petrie’s new history of Irish medieval architecture, “We had no notion in fact, till we had looked through this volume, of the antiquarian treasures which Ireland possesses.” However, some articles in the pre-famine era do treat Ireland at greater length. A more extensive review in the *Builder* was accompanied by five woodcuts taken from Petrie’s book showing Cormac’s Chapel, Cashel, and the round tower on Devenish Island, County Fermanagh. The depiction of ruined medieval architecture, neglected and half-covered in ivy, signified Ireland’s former status and achievements, which were also noted by the British architect George Wilkinson, who was then working on building Ireland’s workhouses. He comments, “We cannot but look upon [these ruins] as noble memorials of a vigorous and powerful race: these and other extensive remains, ecclesi-
astical and monastic, excite feelings of surprise and just admiration, which are rarely elicited by the structures of more modern date.”

They also implicitly hinted at subsequent decay and decline, which was highlighted by the melancholy images of neglected graveyards and solitary men standing among ruins. Contributions to the *Art-Union* in 1839–40 suggested that the ignorance of all things Irish had come from Ireland’s own self-imposed isolation and in recent years from its political agitation for repeal of the union. The main victim, they argued, was the “state of the Fine Arts,” which they variously described as “lamentable,” “depressed,” or having been “completely outstripped” by Scotland, “a far poorer country [. . .] in the race towards improvement.”

An 1844 article in the *Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal* had a more optimistic tone:

It at all times affords us much pleasure to notice the works that are in progress in Ireland. [. . .] We hear of continual comparisons between England and Ireland, in which the relative prosperity and poverty, civilization and crime, learning and ignorance of these two countries, are descanted upon with no small share of skill. [. . .] Better times are upon us now, and church building, within these last twenty-five years, durably marks the vast spread of civilization, learning and religion, which have come, as it were, in a well regulated abundance upon the people.

The link between architectural activity and renewed Anglicization is complicated by the fact that the churches described in the article are not associated with the Church of Ireland (the established church) but with Roman Catholicism. These churches were funded by an increasingly wealthy and influential Catholic merchant class which adopted the latest and most luxurious British architectural styles.

Concern for Ireland’s development and large civil engineering projects was often juxtaposed with more romantic discussion of Ireland’s primitive or quasi-Oriental origins, echoing much travel writing of the period. Within the space of six months, the *Builder* carried two articles on Ireland, the first by W. F. Fairholt on “The Architectural Peculiarities of Galway, in Ireland,” in which he writes lovingly of the “slender, tall, and graceful forms, long black hair and keen eyes” of the Irish peasant girls, which “brought forcibly” to his memory the “paintings of Murillo.” His piece was illustrated by scenes from Galway he thought particularly Spanish in influence: the medieval Lynch’s Castle, with its curious and unusual Gothic features, and the archway of a door under which two ladies went about their work (figure 2). The second article, “Fall of a House at Limerick,” was much more contemporary and striking in its gruesome details, chronicling a fatal accident at a house in Limerick during a wake: “The floor gave way [. . .] with a tremendous crash and wild shriek. [. . .] Eleven persons
were killed and from sixteen to twenty grievously maimed—some with legs and arms broken, skulls fractured, and one man had his back broken.”

While the exotic beauty of an Irish peasant girl was to be much admired, the distinctly non-Anglican custom of holding large public wakes was one aspect of Irish culture which must have struck readers of the time as utterly incomprehensible—a facet of Irish life which would have to be reformed if the country were to escape its acute malaise.

At the same time, we find enthusiastic coverage of civil engineering work, such as early plans for Irish railways and the construction of large bridges. The scale of these projects offered hope and direction for large-scale regeneration and modernization. For example, in 1838, the Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal provided an illustration of the striking and novel suspension bridge at Kenmare in south-western Ireland (figure 3). This bridge was built by the British government in an attempt to open up (and pacify) the “backward” parts of counties Cork and Kerry. The scale
of building and the use of new materials such as iron made this bridge a vivid example of architecture that symbolized Ireland’s regeneration and Anglicization.

The outbreak of famine in late 1845 fundamentally changed the coverage of Ireland in the architectural press. While in ordinary times architectural periodicals were not inclined to fall into the usual British pattern of depicting Irish matters with political animosity and religious sectarianism, during the famine, they tended to adopt the biased stance of their more mainstream colleagues. By November 1846, the Builder commented on the staggering “273,023 persons” who were being employed in public relief works in Ireland: “Able-bodied men—the individual representatives of at least a million of people—all dependant on the Government, not only for present but for future support.” Such large-scale state involvement ran contrary to many English capitalists’ conception of laissez-faire values. By the following summer, the tone had significantly soured: “The destitute Irish,” said the Builder, “are continuing to shew their gratitude for all these Saxon mercies in their own peculiar way. [...] At Glenfin, in County Derry, an agent of the Board of Works, and agriculturist of an estate, who had made arrangements for expending about 400l. or 500l. on the property in works, for behoof of the destitute, was attacked a few days since by upwards of a hundred armed men, headed by a man in woman’s clothes, and forced to put out his tongue, while they coolly cut away an inch of it!” This accusation of barbarity was echoed a few months later in the

Figure 3. “Iron Suspension Bridge across Kenmare Sound, Ireland,” Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal 1 (September 1838): 315.
Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal, which suggested that a new kind of fast light railway system could be used as a “means whereby Ireland may easily be intersected and civilised, and the reproach taken away from us, that a wild people, knowing no law but the ‘wild justice of revenge,’ still dwells within the borders of our island domain.” In this and much other coverage of the Great Famine, it was clear that “donor fatigue,” in the words of W. J. Lowe, had set in.

Yet not all coverage during the famine years was unsympathetic. In the Art-Union Journal, Anna Maria Fielding, writing as Mrs. S. C. Hall, took up Ireland’s famine suffering in three articles entitled “The Cry from Ireland.” “Within a distance of eighteen hours from the English metropolis,” she writes, “thousands of creatures, the echoes of whose wit have resounded round our hearths, and whose simple and earnest pathos is a truth in history—to think that they are dying of hunger, enduring the most awful of all deaths.” Calling for charitable donations to be sent to the journal for distribution in Ireland, Fielding used gendered language to compare the union of Britain and Ireland to a marriage (echoing very much her own Anglo-Irish union): “I believe England will be repaid a thousand-fold for its labour of love in lessening this calamity in Ireland. It will draw the bond of union between the two countries closely together; set the brand of shame on the forehead of the agitator who would seek to separate them; proving beyond the possibility of doubt, and by proofs that can never be hereafter touched by controversy, that IRELAND’S EXTREMITY HAS BEEN ENGLAND’S OPPORTUNITY!”

Fielding’s articles were not illustrated, but her 1850 book on Killarney included ten woodcuts highlighting the desirable wildness and untouched simplicity of the landscape: images of lakes, forests, and exaggerated mountain skylines or travellers on a tranquil country road. Such representations were of course highly sentimentalized, suggesting an idealized rural past. Other woodcuts showed quintessentially rural females—the vendor of goat’s milk, shown in deep shadows, as if to indicate her submissiveness and non-threatening demeanour, and the “keener” employed at wakes to cry, tell stories, and lament the deceased person (figure 4). These images of Ireland’s landscape presented the country in a distinctly Anglicised manner, stressing the familiarity of its landscape and its shared history with Britain while suppressing the violence and starvation of the famine years. Similarly, those images showing working women emphasized their passivity or presented them as captivating, if superstitious, performers. The threatening woman—brutalized, starved, crazed, or criminal—is, of course, left out.

During the famine years, the role of the state and the prevalence of architectural monopolies in Ireland were the subject of sustained criticism. Journalists criticized the Irish workhouses built following passage of the Irish Poor Law Act in 1838. In September 1847, Irish architect Sir
Richard Morrison, on behalf of the Royal Irish Institute of Architects, sent an address to the new lord lieutenant, the Earl of Clarendon, “deploring the present condition of architecture in Ireland.” The British government granted large commissions to select British architects, as had been done in the implementation of the Poor Law, where the work for more than 100 Irish workhouses had been entrusted solely to the hands of George Wilkinson. Morrison criticized this distinctly non-British way of granting large commissions without competition. Clarendon’s response, printed in the *Builder*, offered little more than vague promises and generalisations, and there the matter rested until February 1850, when an impassioned article on the recent collapse of auxiliary workhouse buildings at Limerick and Killarney reignited the controversy. While members of the Irish architectural profession felt they had lost out to Wilkinson’s monopoly in the first round of workhouse building, during the famine years the need to urgently erect additional workhouse accommodation meant that often no architect was appointed to supervise construction. Contracts were instead offered to ill-trained local builders, which often resulted in sub-par construction. Criticism of this policy was carried out in six letters to the editor during the spring and summer of that year. Lord Dufferin, speaking at the Belfast School of Design, launched a broad attack on Irish architecture, saying there was hardly a country where it had been more “neglected, or rather abused.” “Disfiguring the country,” he noted, “there are innumerable structures, churches, castles, mansions, public buildings, all vying with each other in deformity.” Once again linking architecture with national regeneration, he asks, “What nobler, what more lasting possessions has a nation than its architectural structures?” The fault, a letter-writer responded, lay with the professional institute, which had done little to prevent large government monopolies: “The stranger sees nought in our towns and cities but abortions of churches, court-houses, banks, club-houses, &c., evidencing an absence of all taste and propriety, and a positive retrograde movement; instead of the noble progress that marks the profession where it is not tied down and trammelled, bound hand and foot, [. . .] stamped with the impress of illiberality, sameness, and mere utilitarianism. [. . .] The last years of famine and general depression have almost ruined the industrious classes, and drained the country of its capital.” Another correspondent to the *Builder* was quick to defend the institute and to suggest a few recent buildings which he thought had some merit. He agreed, though, that blame rested with the “system of monopolizing public business by a limited number of (too often tasteless) individuals.” Then came a vicious attack on Wilkinson and his Irish workhouses: “What would the profession in England say were Government to place the designing of every church in the hands of one architect; of every workhouse in those of another; and of every normal school and educational establishment in
those of a third? Why, such a storm of indignation would burst from one end of your land to the other as would scare any Government from the commission of so unjust an act.” It is clear that if architecture were to be linked with national regeneration and Anglicization, the way in which it was controlled and commissioned would have to be more in line with British laissez-faire values. The debate ended with a piece praising some recent buildings which were seen as exceptions to the general trend of monopoly and repetition, including the new Queen’s College in Cork by Sir Thomas Deane, an institution set up by the British government in its latest attempt to use state-provided education to reform and reshape Ireland. An illustration of the structure—a fashionably modern Gothic building set in an open and airy site—was featured in the Builder in 1848.

During the course of this debate, the Builder changed the way in which it reported Irish news. Until August 1850, notices on Irish topics were generally carried in the “Notes in the Provinces” section, but from this time forward, they were almost always the subject of separate articles, with titles such as “Architecture and Building in Ireland.” It is possible that the Builder’s editor George Godwin made this decision after the angry debates of 1847–50, but we will never know for sure why this shift occurred. The decimated state of Ireland at the end of the famine meant that at no time was the Builder’s ethos—that architecture and engineering could be used to improve and advance civilisations—more in need, and at no time was Irish news more deserving of editorial attention. The result was that Irish matters were separated from English (or Welsh or Scottish) provincial news and that Ireland moved from being a sidelight to a major topic of discussion. The growth of reporting on Ireland during this period arises almost entirely from the Builder’s decision to divorce Irish from provincial news coverage.

The immediate post-famine years provided an opportunity for urban centres, especially Belfast, to set themselves apart from the perceived failures of the rural hinterlands. In May 1851 the Builder published “A Growing Town: Prosperity in Ireland,” writing, “While in several of the large towns in Ireland, scarcely a mason, bricklayer, or carpenter is at work at this season, we, in Belfast, are in a position to give employment to a large number.” In the Art-Journal, a contributor suggested that “were a few of the populous towns of Ireland to follow the example set them by the inhabitants of Belfast, we should cherish an ardent belief that a new era—one of bright expectation—was about to dawn upon a land where discord and commotion have too long predominated.” This call—to follow Belfast’s path towards Victorian modernity—was taken up in Cork with the hosting of an industrial exhibition in the summer of 1852. A gushing review in the Art-Journal stated,
It was, in simple truth, A GREAT SUCCESS: commenced in Cork upon small means, by comparatively humble men, and with very limited hopes, it rapidly assumed a gigantic form: contributions in money and “in kind” poured in from all quarters. [It] is unfortunately and unwisely, the custom to consider Ireland as exclusively a country for growing grain and fattening animals, and that, consequently, manufactures are to be for ever exotics there. Yet who that travels in Ireland can have driven beside the borders of any one of its broad lakes or brawling rivers without mourning over a waste of water-power sufficient to turn all the spindles of all the towns of Lancaster and York!

Cork would soon industrialise, it was hoped. Ireland’s regeneration would have to start in her cities and would afterwards spread to backward rural areas. The author urged English people to visit Ireland and to judge for themselves, emphasizing that “one country cannot flourish unaided by the other—that their interests are, in short, MUTUAL AND INSEPARABLE.”

Cork’s achievement was quickly overshadowed by enthusiasm for the much larger industrial exhibition in Dublin the following year, which featured an enormous main hall decorated with hanging flags in the manner of an English cathedral and filled with genteel, well-dressed people. In its May 21, 1853 issue, the Builder featured the hall in an illustration (figure 5). Large exhibitions emulating the Great Exhibition of 1851 were ideal staging posts for distancing Ireland from the horrors of the famine and presenting a new image of Irish urban life. An editorial in the Builder reported that the “fine streets of Dublin [. . .] crowded with visitors, must have astonished those who know Ireland only in connection with famine, misery, outrage, and murder.” From the opening day in May 1853, the chairman of the exhibition’s executive committee noted that “annalists may date a period when industry and public order, with their inseparable companions, happiness and wealth, shed their abundant blessings over this portion of her Majesty’s dominions.” Other commentators agreed that the exhibition was an important part in the process of post-famine regeneration. The Art-Journal called it a “great civiliser” that “was intended to improve the people, to enlarge their understandings, to disabuse their minds of long-cherished prejudices, and to promote in them habits of industry and prudence.” In the run-up to the Dublin Exhibition, the Builder for the first time in its publishing history carried a series of four front-page editorials on Ireland. One offered an introduction to the country for prospective English tourists: “You may breakfast in London and be in Dublin at half-past ten the same night.” Ancient and medieval ruins, such as those at Newgrange, with its exotic Celtic spirals and mysterious portal, were discussed alongside new railway viaducts and station
Figure 5. "The Dublin Industrial Exhibition," *Builder* 11 (May 21, 1853): 329.
buildings. However, there was seldom any positive commentary on smaller provincial towns. An illustration of the town of Drogheda featuring the medieval St. Lawrence’s Gate was marred by a sad scene in the foreground of a solitary man and a disused cart, “show[ing] much destitution” (figure 6).52 The third editorial opened with a stark comparison: “If the extraordinary ruins and ancient monuments to which we have already referred speak eloquently of the Ireland of the past—dead Ireland, so to speak,—BELFAST, in the north, illustrates no less forcibly and flatteringly, the Ireland of to-day,—living Ireland.”53 The same issue featured an illustration of the new Presbyterian College in Belfast, an ostentatious Italianate pile designed by the city’s most famous architect, Charles Lanyon (figure 7).54 “Dead Ireland” was not simply the ancient ruins of Celtic civilisation but also an entire way of life in rural Ireland, which seemed to harbour vastly different values than those expressed in the British architectural press and in the British government’s policy towards Ireland. According to Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Hall, “dead Ireland” was most epitomized by the rural village of Connaught, which they describe in the Art-Journal in 1853. They depict idealised scenes of rural life, emphasizing that peasant “habits and customs are comparatively as unchanged by time as their mountains, lakes, and old ocean.”55 By presenting rural Ireland as seemingly unchanged, the Halls brush over the calamitous loss of human life and rural culture produced by the famine. If Ireland’s urban centres increasingly represented “living” Ireland, then the rural hinterland, unreformed and non-Anglicized, was the “dead” Ireland that could only be reshaped by extensive changes in land ownership under the Encumbered Estates Act.

In “Famine, Irish Identity, and the British Press,” Michael De Nie argues that the “British people, quite weary of Irish news by 1849 and convinced that they had done everything that should be done, were content to leave the Irish to their fate.”56 My analysis of four architectural periodicals suggests that it is now time to reconsider this interpretation. The famine does occupy much space in architectural periodicals and is used as justification for the “regeneration” and continued Anglicization of Irish people, who were previously seen as peripheral or unimportant. However, architectural periodicals were even more concerned with issues of patronage, enterprise, and capital. They were specifically interested in investigating what they considered to be the non-British structure and operation of the Irish architectural world. Architecture was viewed as the vehicle by which Irish regeneration might take place, as is evident in coverage and illustrations of large engineering projects. Studying the architectural press thus presents a counter-narrative to dominant themes in the mainstream press, as explored by de Nie, Lengel, and other scholars. After 1849, architectural periodicals demonstrate sustained interest in large Irish industrial exhibitions as
Figure 6. “St. Lawrence’s Gate, Drogheda,” *Builder* 10 (July 31, 1852): 481.

Figure 7. “Presbyterian College, Belfast.—Mr. C. Lanyon, Architect,” *Builder* 10 (August 7, 1852): 503.
a means of correcting false impressions that Ireland was a land decimated by famine and asserting Ireland’s interest in renewed Anglicization. This proposition was tenable, they argued, if Belfast, Cork, Dublin, and other urban centres were defined as distinct and separate from rural Ireland. In the process, much of rural Ireland and its unique challenges came to be identified as the antithesis of Victorian modernity.
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1. Brooks, “‘The Builder’ in the 1840s,” 90.
2. VanArsdel, review, 352.
3. See, for example, “Art in Ireland and the Provinces,” 353.
4. De Nie, Eternal Paddy, 140.
6. Lengel, Irish through British Eyes, 163–64. See also Williams, review, 148; Leighton, review, 423–24; Leerssen, Remembrance and Imagination, 105; and Curtis, Apes and Angels, 29. King suggests that the moment of transition may be closer to 1825 (“Ethnicity, Prejudice, and Justice,” 394).
9. This has prompted historians to view Ireland as a kind of laboratory for testing the reach of central government. See Burn, “Free Trade in Land,” 61–74; MacDonagh, Ireland, chapter 2; Akenson, Irish Education Experiment, 1–16, 376–91.
10. See, for example, Beckett and Glasscock, Belfast; Cullen, Economic History of Ireland, 100–145.
12. This is a point highlighted by De Nie with reference to the Illustrated London News (“The Famine, Irish Identity, and the British Press,” 28). Ireland certainly occupied a peripheral position, though arguably less so than twenty years previously. Caesar Otway prefaced his 1827 book Sketches in Ireland with the remark, “Ireland is such an unfashionable country” (i). When he revised it for a second edition in 1839, he offered a qualification: “This, however true twelve years ago, is certainly not so now—for at present multitudes of tourists pass along” (v–vi).
21. “Fall of a House at Limerick,” 71. This can be seen as following on from an earlier editorial devoted to exposing the condition of tenement housing in the United Kingdom, most likely written by the editor, George Godwin. See editorial, 1.
25. “Notes in the Provinces,” 270. Comments of a very similar tone are found in the review of *The Life of James Gandon*, 48.
27. Lowe, review, 516. See also Lengel, *Irish through British Eyes*, 97–121.
29. Ibid. See also Hall, “The Cry from Ireland,” 180, 221. Lengel calls attention to the metaphors of marriage used to describe the union of Britain and Ireland. See Lengel, *Irish through British Eyes*, 19–49. For further commentary on Fielding, see Curtis, *Anglo-Saxons and Celts*, 55.
31. This was also the case in the railway commissioners report debate, 1838–39. See preface, “Irish Railways,” “Irish Railway Commissioners Report,” “Irish Railways—Ballinasloe meeting,” “Irish Railway Commission,” and “Irish Railway Debate.”
34. Corcagiensis, “How They Build Workhouses in Ireland,” 89.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
41. See also Akenson, Irish Education Experiment; J. J. L., “Position of Architects in Ireland,” 436; and “Queen’s College Cork,” 630–31.
42. See, for example, “Notes in the Provinces,” 270; “Architectural and Artistic Doings in Ireland,” 375–76; and “Architecture and Building in Ireland,” 416.
46. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
54. “Presbyterian College,” 503.
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