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Recent scholarship has called attention to the common features shared by five French and British elite centres of leisure called ‘gloriette’ that were built or so-named in the late 13th and early 14th centuries. Because these centres of repose and entertainment were located in principal residences, and thus were not garden pavilions, it has been suggested that there was no relationship between the northern gloriettes and the garden pavilion of La Zisa in Palermo, Sicily, whose name also meant ‘the glorious’. This article draws on archival sources in order to enhance our understanding of the resemblances between the gloriette of Hesdin, in northern France, and the four gloriettes in England and Wales. Drawing on the significant features of these five northern gloriettes, it also takes another look at the details of La Zisa, suggesting that we should not be so quick to dismiss its possible influence on the northern gloriettes, most especially the two that were built by King Edward I and Count Robert II of Artois after they had passed through Palermo in 1270/72.

SINCE the 19th century, scholars of medieval art, architecture, literature, gardens and landscape design have been fascinated by the sumptuous gardens and mechanical wonders of the late medieval chateau and park at Hesdin. In 1951, the French art historian Marguerite Charageat transformed how we look at Hesdin by establishing that it was Count Robert II of Artois (1250–1302), rather than the late 14th-century dukes of Burgundy, who gave the chateau and park their definitive shape when he installed a number of fantastic garden pavilions, water features and mechanical devices in them. Those wonders, Charageat went on to argue, were reminiscent of gardens in the Islamic world; their specific sources of inspiration, she argued, were the gardens and pleasure pavilions of Palermo, Sicily, which had been built by Islamic architects and artisans for the Norman kings of Sicily in the 12th century. Count Robert II, Charageat pointed out, had visited Palermo in 1270, during his return trip from King Louis IX’s crusade in Tunis.¹ He was a guest, at the time, of his uncle, King Charles I, who would have been eager to visit, and to show off to his royal guests, the splendours of the pleasure palaces of Palermo, which had become his when he conquered the kingdom of Sicily and southern Italy in 1266.²

One central component of Charageat’s argument concerning the Sicilian impact on Hesdin was the idea that a certain ‘gloriette’ at Hesdin had been named after the garden pavilion outside of Palermo called ‘La Zisa’, which was completed by the Norman King William II soon after the death of his father, William I, in 1166.³ Drawing
on evidence that Hesdin had garden pavilions, Charageat assumed that the gloriette of Hesdin was a garden pavilion as well. Pointing out that both the name ‘La Zisa’ (which was derived from the Arabic ‘al-‘Azīz’) and the name ‘gloriette’ meant ‘the glorious’, Charageat drew further parallels between an Arabic inscription at La Zisa, which associated the pavilion with both the glory of the king and earthly paradise, and the presence of decorative elements at the gloriette of Hesdin — a tree with carved birds that sprayed water and a seated statue of a king — that seemed to do the same. Charageat argued as well that the mechanical entertainments of Hesdin, including a mechanised fountain in the gloriette, had been inspired by a hydraulic clock in the royal palace in Palermo, which had been installed by King Roger II of Sicily (1105–54) in 1142. According to Michele Amari, who drew together evidence from several Arabic sources, King Roger’s clock, which was created by a skilled Muslim artisan, had a mechanised figure of a woman who marked the hours by dropping metallic balls into a metal basin.

While no one has questioned Charageat’s important discovery that it was Count Robert II who gave Hesdin its definitive shape — endowing it with features that were so unusual and fantastic that Hesdin remained the most famous garden park of northern Europe until the end of the 15th century — the Islamic part of Charageat’s argument has met with considerable scepticism. As Anne Van Buren pointed out in the 1980s, the mechanical devices in the gloriette and park of Hesdin were built not by Islamic engineers but by a Frenchman, who drew on his knowledge of north-west European military technology. Moreover, it is now clear that several parallels that Charageat drew between Count Robert’s gloriette and the Norman gardens and pavilions of Palermo suffer from misinterpretations of the evidence from Hesdin. Thus, while Charageat assumed that, like La Zisa, the Hesdin gloriette was a free-standing pleasure pavilion located in the park, it turns out, as Van Buren suggested, that the gloriette of Hesdin was a well-appointed part of the main chateau. Moreover, while Charageat apparently assumed that Count Robert II had commissioned the tree with water-squirting birds in the gloriette, our earliest reference to that tree is an account from 1344 (forty-two years after Count Robert’s death) commissioning its creation. Finally, while King Roger II’s hydraulic clock constituted an important part of Charageat’s thesis, we have no definitive evidence that that clock was still in Palermo in 1270 when Count Robert II passed through there. In the absence of the clock, Count Robert may have seen the inscription in the royal palace in Palermo, indicating that the clock had been commissioned by King Roger II; but the inscription gave no clues concerning the mechanical figures on the clock.

As an alternative to Charageat’s flawed argument for imported Sicilian inspiration, Van Buren argued that the wondrous mechanical devices of Hesdin were inspired not by Count Robert’s travels, but by his reading of French romance literature. Jeremy Ashbee, Matthew Reeve and Malcolm Thurlby have offered a similar argument for the inspiration, both at Artois and in Britain, of the name ‘gloriette’.

Despite the specific flaws in Charageat’s use of evidence, I wish to argue that the time has come to revisit her larger idea — that the spectacular architectural features and mechanical devices in the garden park of Hesdin, especially those of the gloriette, manifested a number of characteristics that came to north-west Europe from the Islamic cultures of the Mediterranean and that La Zisa of Palermo played an important role in the transmission of those characteristics to the gloriette at Hesdin. I will also suggest that La Zisa and other garden pavilions in Palermo may have had an important influence on the 13th- and early 14th-century British gloriettes that were
recently described and analysed by Ashbee, and that the evidence in that direction is strongest in the case of the gloriette at Leeds. My perspective on these issues is informed by new archival evidence for the gloriette at Hesdin and a re-examination of the ways in which northern European visitors would have seen and experienced La Zisa and the other Norman pavilions of Palermo.

As Ashbee pointed out, in addition to the gloriette of Hesdin, which was built between 1288 and 1302, four high-status residences of late 13th- and early 14th-century England and Wales included a room, or suite of rooms, called gloriette. More recently, Jean Mesqui pointed to two additional French gloriettes, at the chateau of Lillebonne and in the town of Arbois; however, since the earliest documentation for these additional French gloriettes dates from the late 14th century, I will not include them in this discussion.

To date, the earliest known evidence for a British gloriette occurs in a survey conducted in 1260 describing the dilapidated condition and contents of the castles of Sherborne and Corfe. That survey indicates that the castle of Corfe, which had been built by King John, had a room called gloriette. It was somewhere in the vicinity of the great hall, which was on the middle level of a three-storey tower at the north-east corner of the castle. The name gloriette came to be associated with the room near the great hall at some point during the reign of King John or Henry III; by the mid-14th century, the entire set of rooms in the middle level of the tower had come to be called ‘gloriette’. The next gloriette to appear in the written records was the one at Chepstow. Jeremy Ashbee, Rick Turner, Stephen Priestley, Nicola Coldstream and Bevis Sale have argued that this gloriette was probably located in the lower bailey, which was poised on a cliff’s edge over the river Wye. The gloriette at Chepstow first acquired that name in or before 1271, around the time that Roger Bigod, the fifth Earl of Norfolk, began to renovate the castle. At Leeds castle, which occupies two islands in the middle of a man-made lake, the name gloriette was associated, by the 14th century, with the entire edifice that was located on the northern, inner, island, for which the only access was via a drawbridge joining that island to the main castle on the southern island. Leeds became a royal castle in 1278, during the reign of King Edward I; Ashbee argues that the documentary evidence suggests that Edward I gave it much of its current form, and that the association of the name gloriette with the northern edifice dates from Edward’s reign. The fourth British gloriette, a part of Canterbury cathedral priory, was built between 1285 and 1290, but the name gloriette was not used there until 1338 or after.

As Ashbee emphasised, the four British gloriettes were chambers or suites in the main complex of these high-status residences. Archival evidence, to which Van Buren only alluded, indicates that the same was true for Hesdin: an account from 1379 mentioning ‘repairs done on the machines of entertainment of the chateau, both those of the galleries and those of the gloriette’, definitively establishes that the gloriette was in the main residence.

Because they did not constitute freestanding garden pavilions, Ashbee concluded (as Van Buren had in her study of Hesdin) that there was no apparent connection between the name gloriette, as it was used in 13th-century England, Wales and Artois, and the name of the garden pavilion of La Zisa in Palermo. Rather, Ashbee suggested, the name for these high-status spaces was inspired by the late 12th-century vernacular epic, the Prise d’Orange, which described a beautiful urban palace called ‘la gloriette’. This literary palace belonging to a fictional Muslim ruler had marble columns, ‘windows sculpted of silver’ (‘fenestres entaillies d’argent’), pine and carob
trees, walls decorated with multicoloured marble, gold pommels, depictions of lions and birds, and a tower. According to the anonymous author of the epic, the interior decor of this gloriette was so stunning that upon first viewing its interior the Christian hero, William of Orange, declared it to be a ‘paradise’. It is certainly possible that the imagined Islamic palace of the Prise d’Orange played a role in inspiring King John (or Henry III), Roger Bigod, King Edward I, Count Robert II, and the prior of Canterbury cathedral to name a chamber or apartment ‘gloriette’. Like the literary gloriette, the actual gloriette at Hesdin had well-appointed interiors, and it seems likely that the British gloriettes were elaborately decorated as well. Several of the French and British gloriettes, moreover, included private space, and at least one of them incorporated space for entertainment. Like the gloriette of the Prise d’Orange, moreover, three of the northern gloriettes included, or were in close proximity to, a tower. Finally, in a manner that was somewhat evocative of the two trees mentioned in the Prise d’Orange, at least three of the gloriettes were associated with a garden or green space.

While it is important to recognise the similarities between the literary gloriette of the Prise d’Orange and the five architectural gloriettes of England, Wales, and France that came to be so-named by the early 14th century, it is also important to recognise that La Zisa of Palermo shared all these characteristics as well. Like the gloriette of the Prise d’Orange, La Zisa had fantastic marble and gold decor, mosaics depicting peacocks and hunters (if not a lion), private apartments, space for entertainment, a tower (or two), and it was associated with paradise. Moreover, in a manner that far exceeded the two trees mentioned in the Prise d’Orange, La Zisa was located in a luxuriant garden park. Given the similarities between La Zisa of Palermo and the gloriette of the Prise d’Orange, one might be tempted to argue that one of the two influenced the other, but they were too close in their dates of creation for scholars to establish a connection between the two.

In addition to sharing a number of characteristics with the gloriette of the Prise d’Orange and those of 13th- and early 14th-century Britain and France, La Zisa had several characteristics never mentioned in the Prise d’Orange that recurred in the northern gloriettes. Like all of the northern gloriettes, La Zisa had elevated chambers, and, like four of the northern gloriettes, it had windows commanding spectacular views that were prized for their aesthetic, rather than their strategic, use. Like Hesdin and Leeds, moreover — both built after their owners had visited Palermo in 1270 and 1272 — La Zisa was not only located in a walled park, but it also included dramatic water features that enhanced the aesthetic experience of the architectural space. Finally, like the gloriette of Hesdin, La Zisa conveyed a message associating the glory of the ruling resident with the paradisiacal quality of the ‘glorious’ architectural monument — Charageat erred in her use of some of the evidence on this point, but her instincts were correct about the overall message of the two architectural spaces. While there is no evidence that there were mechanical devices at La Zisa, and no way to affirm whether or not Count Robert ever saw King Roger II’s hydraulic clock in Palermo, I will argue, nevertheless, that the principal inspiration for Count Robert’s mechanical entertainments probably did come from the Islamic world — if not through his own direct experience in Sicily or southern Italy, then through literary representations of Islamic uses of mechanical ‘wonders’.

We begin, then, with the characteristics that were shared by the gloriette of the Prise d’Orange, at least some of the northern gloriettes, and La Zisa. The first of those characteristics was unusually elaborate decor. Of the five northern gloriettes, Hesdin
stands out in this regard. Surviving financial records indicate that the gloriette there had painted walls and decorated glass, gilded pommels, birds and tabernacles (or niches), busts of kings, a fountain with some kind of mechanical device and several other mechanical entertainments. Historians agree that the mechanical devices at Hesdin were the first of their kind in northern Europe, and that they anticipated a fashion for mechanical entertainments in the renaissance period. Similarly, according to Christian de Mérindol, the decorative programme in the count’s chamber at Hesdin, with its series of royal busts, put it on a par with the decorative programme in King Henry III’s painted chamber at Westminster, which also associated its chief occupant with the glories of past kings. Hesdin’s chamber with royal busts, as I argue below, was apparently in the gloriette.

The written records for the British gloriettes are not as extensive as those for Hesdin; and, while parts of the three castles with gloriettes are still standing, much of the interior decoration has disappeared. It is difficult, moreover, to match the written references to the gloriettes with the surviving physical structures or ruins. Nevertheless, architectural historians who have written about the three 13th-century British gloriettes have suggested that they probably included elaborate decor.

The written records for Chepstow indicate that the gloriette there had at least two chambers, one of which belonged to the earl, that there was a stone tabula (a decorative band of stonework) running along the roofline, and that the gloriette either included, or was in close proximity to, a set of stairs, a kitchen and a lead-covered roof. Drawing on this fragmentary written evidence, Ashbee, Turner, Priestley, Coldstream and Sale have suggested that the Chepstow gloriette must have been located in the lower bailey, which is still standing, and that the earl’s chamber constituting part of the gloriette was the upper room just adjacent to the hall in the lower bailey; that chamber includes a fireplace, a tracered window overlooking the Wye gorge and a closet with a latrine. The interior decoration of this chamber has been stripped, but Turner, Priestley, Coldstream and Sale have argued that the name gloriette suggests that the decor must have been elaborate. Certainly, the extensive decorations of the adjacent hall point in that direction. The hall has stone window seats dating from the 13th century, as well as window arches with delicately carved depictions of four-leaved ornaments. Turner, Priestley, Coldstream and Sale have underscored the unusually fine quality of those ornaments:

Whilst many great 13th-century buildings have foliate decoration on vaults and window dressings, none matches the four-leaved versions at Chepstow. Here the comparisons are in metalwork or in such buildings as the Sainte-Chapelle, Paris, heavily influenced by or intended to evoke work in precious materials.

At Corfe castle, which was largely destroyed in the 17th century, the ruins of a suite of buildings in the north-east corner, at the highest elevation within the site, have long been associated with the name gloriette. In 1260, however, the name was employed to describe not a suite of rooms but a single room, which apparently does not survive. Ashbee has speculated that this room may have run along the south end of the great hall, which faces east. The ruins of the great hall show signs of masonry and moldings of exceptional quality, as well as carved stone window seats. The name gloriette suggests that it, too, may have had fine interior decor, but there is no way to be certain that that was actually the case.

The gloriette at Leeds, which was spectacularly located on a separate island in an artificial lake, has undergone numerous renovations since the late 13th century, so it
is impossible to determine the quality of the interior décor. Nevertheless, two fine Y-traceried window frames dating from the 13th century, which may have opened onto the chapel of the gloriette, offer hints that the Leeds gloriette may have included excellently crafted decorative features.39

At La Zisa, the internal decor, much like that of the gloriette of the Prise d’Orange, differed in materials and overall feel from that of Hesdin — the one northern gloriette for which we have some solid evidence concerning decor — but it, too, was of extremely fine quality. The main vestibule on the ground floor (the first of three levels) had a large archway framed by a marble frieze with an Arabic inscription. A 16th-century description suggests that the vestibule also had gilded mosaics. The vestibule opened onto the ‘room of the fountain’, which had fine marble columns topped with capitals decorated with birds and leaves. The wall behind the fountain had a banded mosaic of gold and coloured glass depicting date palms, peacocks and hunters. Parallel horizontal wall bands of multicoloured marble encircled the room with repetitious geometric patterns. Moreover, three of the walls — including the one behind the fountain — had niches that were surmounted by elaborately carved, stalagmite-textured Islamic muqarnas. The most important decorative feature, however, was the fountain. Water entered the room through a spout at the back of a three-walled niche located on the western side of the room, which was opposite the principal entrance to the room. From the spout, the water flowed down a chevron-covered diagonal surface (known as a šādirwān in Arabic), emptying into a channel system that bifurcated the room (Fig. 1). A first channel led from the šādirwān to a rectangular basin, which opened onto a second channel and basin, from which another channel led to a conduit under the floor of the vestibule, which led the water to a rectangular pool facing the front entryway of the building.40

Like the ground floor, the top floor of La Zisa had two central rooms, an atrium, which was located directly over the room of the fountain, and a room now called the ‘belvedere’ which was located over the vestibule. Although much of the interior decor has disappeared from these two rooms, it is clear that they too were once meticulously ornamented. The remains of the atrium include three blind walls with decorative niches framed by slender marble columns topped with carved stone capitals. The arched opening between the atrium and the belvedere is framed by four more marble columns, and we know from a 16th-century description that the central window of the belvedere included a slender marble column, which divided the lower part of the window into two vertical openings (Fig. 2).41

Ashbee, Reeve and Thurlby have argued that the northern gloriettes resembled each other not only in their probable inclusion of exceptionally fine decorative features, but also in their association with private space or leisure.42 According to Ashbee, all four of the British gloriettes included, or were limited to, private chambers, and indeed, three of those four chambers belonged to the most elevated resident of the castle — the king at Leeds, the earl at Chepstow, the prior at Canterbury.43 Archival records from the reign of Count Robert II’s daughter, Mahaut, indicate that Hesdin also had an apartment in the gloriette that was reserved for the ruling resident; there is no reason to believe that that room had not been there when Count Robert was alive as well.44 The gloriette at Hesdin also had special rooms for entertaining guests; and at Corfe the name gloriette eventually came to encompass not only a single private chamber but also a suite of rooms that included the great hall where guests would have been entertained.45 At Hesdin, the room, or set of rooms, for entertaining guests
Fig. 1. La Zisa of Palermo: interior view of the ‘Room of the Fountain’. Near the top of the photo is the apex of a carved triangular shaped Islamic *muqarna*, which extends halfway down the wall to a banded horizontal mosaic, which depicts peacocks, date palms and archers. Below the banded mosaic is a small niche pierced by the opening through which the fountain’s water entered the room (there was probably a spout attached). Below the niche, a diagonal *sadirwān* guided the water to the floor, where a channel led to a rectangular basin.

*Photo credit: Bernhard J. Scheuvens*
Fig. 2. Rocco Lentini, Creative reconstitution of La Zisa of Palermo, its pool, and garden setting (oil on canvas, 1935). Lentini’s depiction of the window frames comes closer to accurately reproducing the original window openings than do the frames that are on the structure today. Lentini’s reconstruction of the smaller pavilion facing La Zisa is derived from the footprint of that structure, which is still visible.

*Photo credit: Rocco Lentini, ed. F. Lentini Speciale and U. Mirabelli (Palermo 2001), 126. © Città di Palermo*

included a fountain with a mechanical device and galleries with additional mechanical devices.46

The gloriette of the Prise d’Orange also included private space and centres for entertainment, which is not surprising, since it was a royal residence. Similarly, the garden pavilion of La Zisa had both centres for entertainment and private apartments. Two private apartments on the top floor were probably intended for the king and queen. The atrium and belvedere on that same floor provided a space where both the royal party and their guests could be entertained, with the view from the belvedere as the main source of entertainment. The most spectacular centre for entertainment, however, was the room of the fountain on the ground floor. There, in the presence of the gently gurgling water, and with women of the court gazing down through interior windows on the floor above, Islamic musicians probably entertained guests of the Norman kings; that is the impression to be gained, at least, from a 12th-century painting in the royal palace in Palermo, which depicts two musicians in Islamic dress flanking a fountain much like that of La Zisa, with two women gazing down from
upper-storey interior windows. There were similar interior windows looking down from the women’s quarters at La Zisa itself.47

In addition to private space and centres for entertainment, three of the 13th-century northern gloriettes (Chepstow, Leeds and Hesdin) resembled the gloriette of the Prise d’Orange because they were associated with, or in close proximity to, towers. We can add La Zisa (and the two late 14th-century French gloriettes)48 to the list of glorious spaces with towers as well. At Chepstow, a small tower was located just off the main hall of the lower bailey, near the high table.49 At Leeds, there are references to a turret next to the gloriette, called ‘larder’.50 At Hesdin, a lead-roofed tower was located ‘next to the gloriette’.51 At La Zisa, there were (and are) two towers: one each adjoining the north and south faces of the building (Fig. 3).52

With its reference to pine and carob trees, the Prise d’Orange suggested that the Muslim castle called gloriette was associated with green space. Along similar lines, La Zisa was surrounded by a lush walled garden park called Genoard, which was a name derived from the Arabic for ‘earthly paradise’.53 Much like La Zisa, the gloriettes at Leeds and Hesdin were located in chateaux that were surrounded by parks (Fig. 4).54 Indeed, it seems possible that four of the northern gloriettes of the 13th and early 14th

Fig. 3. La Zisa of Palermo: east facade. The tower abutting the south façade is visible at the left end of the pavilion. On the east façade, the two levels of windows above the ground floor demonstrate that the structure has three levels. The window openings, which are modern, differ from the originals.

Photo credit: Scala/Art Resource/New York
FIG. 4. Map of the town, chateau and park of Hesdin, with darkened band showing the presumed woodland area inside the walls of the park. The area between the chateau and the woodland, which sloped upward from the castle, was presumably meadow

Adapted from A. Hagopian van Buren by R. Bloom
centuries had vistas that opened onto adjacent, or nearly adjacent, gardens or green spaces. At Hesdin, Countess Mahaut placed a flowery mead below the *gloriette* in 1306. At Leeds, the *gloriette* looked out over a piece of turf on the central part of the island, which was planted with grass, and at Canterbury the *gloriette* was close to the prior’s garden. Concerning the site at Chepstow, Turner, Priestley, Coldstream and Sale have suggested that a small enclosed space on the edge of the cliff may have been intended as a private garden or viewing space for the earl. Visible from the earl’s private upper chamber in the *gloriette*, and accessible via a well-crafted door below, that garden — if it existed — would have provided a dramatic visual foreground for those gazing out from the earl’s chamber onto the deep river gorge; those standing in the garden itself would have had breathtaking views from the very edge of the cliff. It is also possible, however, that the enclosed space on the cliff’s edge functioned primarily as a service platform for receiving supplies that were hoisted up from the river.

The text of the *Prise d'Orange* makes no explicit reference to an upper chamber commanding a special view. By contrast, at least four of the northern *gloriettes*, as well as *La Zisa*, seem to have included chambers with special vistas. Ashbee’s analysis of the written and physical evidence for Corfe and Canterbury indicates that the *gloriettes* at both of those residences were upper-storey chambers. Ashbee has proposed that the *gloriette* at Corfe may have been an elevated room that ran across the southern edge of the great hall in a suite of buildings that were located at the highest elevation within the castle site. At Chepstow, the earl’s upper chamber in the lower bailey was, according to Ashbee, Turner, Priestley, Coldstream and Sale, most certainly one of the rooms of the *gloriette*. At Leeds, the *gloriette* was probably on the ground floor, but that ground floor was elevated over 2 m above the surface of the surrounding artificial lake, which was visible from windows in the *gloriette* (Fig. 5). There are no physical remains for the *gloriette* of Hesdin, but written accounts indicate that there was a door or gate under the *gloriette*, so it, too, was in an elevated position. *La Zisa* also had elevated spaces — both a middle and an upper floor. As far as we can tell, the elevated chambers of at least four of the northern *gloriettes* had windows with spectacular views; the same was true at *La Zisa*. At Corfe and Chepstow, the residences themselves occupied elevated positions, so the windows in the *gloriettes*, which occupied even more elevated positions, looked down on dramatic panoramic views. At Corfe, which was located on a hill that still dominates the surrounding countryside, the great hall had windows facing east that would have commanded spectacular views of Poole harbour, which is about four miles away; if, as Ashbee has suggested, the *gloriette* ran along the southern edge of the hall, it would have commanded views of the south coast, which is also some four miles distant. At Chepstow, the great hall in the lower bailey included one large window looking out over the courtyard and another that was dramatically placed over the cliff that dropped down to the Wye. A small tower adjacent to the great hall, and accessible from the high table there, also had windows overlooking the gorge, as did the earl’s private upper chamber, which was apparently part of the *gloriette*.

In contrast to Chepstow and Corfe, the residences of Leeds and Hesdin occupied relatively low-lying positions — in part because the patrons wanted to take advantage
of water features. Nevertheless, we know that the gloriette at Leeds commanded spectacular views, and we can surmise that the same was true at Hesdin. At Leeds, we know from written evidence that the gloriette overlooked, on one side, a turf covered court; on the other side, the surviving structure still looks out over the spectacular artificial lake (Fig. 5).

At Hesdin, as Clovis Normand’s 19th-century sketch of the ruins suggests (but with some exaggeration), the chateau was located near the low point of a gently rising terrain: the surrounding landscape rose from an elevation of 29 m at the Canche river (which ran through the town of Hesdin) to an elevation of 50 m at the chateau to a crest line with an elevation of 115 m running along ‘Li Vert Chemin’ around the area where it intersected ‘Li chemin de fontaine aus dames’. That intersection, now in the village of Le Parcq, is around 1400 m from the ruins of the chateau; thus, the grade of the terrain as it rises from the chateau to the crest line is approximately 4.6 per cent (Figs 4, 6).

Since the only physical remains of the chateau at Hesdin are two crumbled wall or tower fragments, and since the site has never been excavated, we have no firm idea concerning where in that residence the gloriette was located and no firm evidence concerning the views from its windows. Nevertheless, works accounts for the chateau offer a few clues: we know, for instance, that Count Robert II purchased over 700 panes of clear glass for the gloriette, and that a few years after his death his daughter put in a meadow ‘below the gloriette’, surrounding it with violets, strawberry plants and raspberry bushes. The fact that the gloriette also included an aviary suggests that it had soaring ceilings, and that some of the clear glass served the purpose of providing the captive songbirds with the illusion of open sky, so that they would feel relatively free flying about the top levels of the aviary. The elevated position of the gloriette within the chateau, the meadow below it, and windows that rose up toward a soaring ceiling would have created the ideal conditions for viewing the
gently rising landscape, the woodland that ran along its crestline, and the skyline above.

Like the elevated spaces of the northern gloriettes, the top-level suite of La Zisa, of which the floor was about 14 m above ground level, commanded spectacular views (Fig. 3).⁶⁹ Looking out from the central east-facing window of the belvedere, or from similar windows in the two private apartments that flanked the belvedere, the royal party and its guests would have surveyed a reflecting pool below, the surrounding walled garden-park, and, across a plain that gently descended to the sea coast,⁷⁰ Palermo, which was located to the south-east about half a mile away; the Gulf of Palermo, somewhat over a mile to the east; and Monte Pellegrino, nearly three miles to the north-east (Fig. 7). The Arabic inscription in the atrium of the ground floor of the building made reference to the mountain and ocean views: ‘Whenever you wish you can gaze on the most beautiful part of the most splendid kingdom of the world — on the sea and on the mountain whose peaks are clothed with the narcissus flower’.⁷¹

At La Zisa, as was often the case with sumptuous Islamic architecture, the aesthetic experiences of both standing inside the building and gazing upon it from the outside were enhanced by the presence of two different bodies of water. For those who stood inside the room of the fountain, or who looked down on that room from interior windows on the floor above, the water flowing through the fountain and the channels that it fed provided the principal sensual experience of those interior spaces. For those who approached the building from the east or who stood gazing out from the eastern windows, the rectangular reflecting pool that stood adjacent to the building served to enhance two different vistas: the view, from outside, of the eastern façade of the building, and the view, from inside the building, of the land and seascape to the east (Figs 2, 7). A small pavilion in the centre of the reflecting pool — possibly a miniature version of La Zisa itself — served to enhance the vistas (Fig. 2).⁷² This was a miniature version of the ‘pavilion on pool’ type, which was common in Islamic garden architecture.⁷³
The gloriettes at Hesdin and Leeds picked up on these architectural uses of water, but in two different ways. At Hesdin, the fountain inside the gloriette and its mechanical devices must have inspired both delight and wonder, since permanent decorative indoor fountains, while relatively common in Islamic architecture, were rare in northern Europe. To be sure, a number of northern European monastic complexes included fountain houses with indoor fountains, and many such houses were quite beautiful. Nevertheless, monastic indoor fountains were intended for practical functions; the fountain in Count Robert’s gloriette, by contrast, was meant to entertain. Elsewhere at Hesdin, Count Robert seems to have produced his own ‘pavilion on pool’, placing it in dialogue with a larger, grounded pavilion, just as was the case at La Zisa: his principal pavilion in the marsh section of the park, which was accessible via a bridge, was next to a pond, and faced by a ‘lodge’ which was described, on various occasions, as ‘the lodge over the water’ ‘the lodge in front of the pavilion’ and ‘the high lodge’.

At Leeds, the gloriette itself seems to have conformed to the ‘pavilion on pool’ type. We can still experience the way in which the artificial lake wraps itself around the gloriette, providing dramatic vistas for those who view the gloriette from across or above the lake, as well as for those who survey the landscape from inside the gloriette (Figs 5, 8). According to Oliver Creighton, this relationship between an elite residence and a body of water was unique to Britain at the time. Certainly, there were other British castles, such as Kenilworth and Caerphilly, which were spectacularly surrounded by water. Like Leeds, those earlier English and Welsh castles were located on small islands. However, within their island locations, the castles of Kenilworth and Caerphilly were surrounded by a rim of turf and by outer walls; the gloriette at Leeds,
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by contrast, rose directly out of the water. The inspiration for this direct juxtaposition of architectural space and water may have come from the smaller pavilion that sat in the middle of the reflecting pool at La Zisa, but it is also possible that it came from another garden pavilion outside of Palermo — La Cuba, which was built by King William II. As was the case with the gloriette at Leeds, the walls of the main pavilion-palace at La Cuba rose directly out of a body of water, which completely surrounded the edifice (Fig. 9). In its relationship to a body of water that totally surrounded it, La Cuba provides a striking parallel to the relationship between the gloriette of Leeds and the surrounding lake. However, while La Cuba’s body of water formed a rectangular pool, the lake at Leeds was amorphous. The inspiration for this more natural-looking shape may have come from the lakes at Kenilworth and Caerphilly, but it is possible as well that it came from another artificial lake surrounding yet another Norman pavilion in Palermo: the lake of Maredolce, which nearly surrounded the castle-pavilion of Maredolce/La Favara (Fig. 10).

One can easily imagine that, after returning home from Sicily, King Edward I would have had a composite impression of all of the fantastic garden pavilions that he had seen in Palermo, and thus that his gloriette at Leeds could have incorporated elements from several of them. It is also possible, however, that the ‘pavilion on pool’ prototype for the Leeds gloriette came from Iberia: Leeds was primarily the castle of Queen Eleanor of Castile, who may have borne her own memories of Islamic gardens in Iberia, and whose employees included two Iberian gardeners at Langley and a worker at Leeds named ‘Ferrando of Spain’.

At La Zisa, as I have already suggested, an Arabic inscription called attention to the association between the paradisiacal qualities of the pavilion and its garden and the ruler (King William II) who had completed the construction of the space. Thus, the inscription in the vestibule describing the views of the mountain and the sea went

Fig. 8. Aerial view of Leeds castle, Kent. The gloriette is the structure furthest to the left, rising straight out of the water
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on to declare: ‘Here is the terrestrial paradise [. . .] here is the ruler who inspires glory [Musta’izz]; here is the palace called the glorious [al-‘Azīz].’

At the gloriette at Hesdin there were no inscriptions. Nevertheless, the interior decor attempted to recreate the paradisiacal qualities of a garden while recalling, as well, the close relationship between the count who built the gloriette and the Capetian kings of France (Count Robert was the grandson of King Louis VIII and the nephew of King Louis IX). In addition to the indoor fountain, the gloriette at Hesdin had an aviary (the ‘gaiole’), decorated with gilded birds and pommels, in which the count apparently kept small captive songbirds. Our earliest references to the small birds date from 1304, but a works account (which recorded expenses for construction projects and repairs, rather than daily maintenance expenses) indicates that the gaiole was already there in 1301. We learn from the same account of 1301 that Count Robert’s chamber contained busts of ‘heads of the kings’. Later accounts suggest that this chamber must have been in the gloriette. By bringing the natural world into its space, and by associating that space with the count’s royal lineage, the gloriette of Hesdin thus succeeded in associating Count Robert II with both royal glory and earthly paradise — much as the inscription at La Zisa associated the glory of King William II with the earthly paradise that the pavilion and its garden made manifest.
As was the case at Hesdin, three of the British gloriettes included private spaces that were reserved for the highest-ranking occupant of the residence: in these cases as well, then, the name gloriette may have been intended as a reference to the glory of the principal occupant of the space.

As I have already indicated, there is no way to be sure that the mechanical devices that Count Robert installed at Hesdin were inspired by his experiences in Palermo. A second possibility would be that during his sojourn in the kingdom of southern Italy, which lasted from 1282–91, Robert either saw or heard about two mechanised entertainments that had belonged to the region’s former ruler, the emperor Frederick II (1194–1250): an astrological clock given to Frederick by the sultan of Damascus, and a metallic tree with mechanised singing birds given to Frederick by al-Kamil, the sultan of Egypt. There was a great deal of continuity, in terms of administrative
personnel, between the era of Frederick II’s rule in southern Italy and that of Count Robert’s uncle, King Charles I, who took over the kingdom in 1266. For instance, Giozzolino della Marra of Barletta, who had served in the financial administration under Frederick II’s son Manfred, became the architect of the administration of King Charles I; Giozzolino’s father, Angelo, had been one of the chief architects of Frederick II’s financial administration. Count Robert was intimately involved with the highest levels of administration in the kingdom for nine years — indeed, he even served as regent of the realm for several years after the death of King Charles I. Thus, he would have had ample opportunity to learn about the wonders of Frederick’s court.

Van Buren proposed that Count Robert’s interest in mechanical entertainments was inspired not by his direct experience, but by his interest in French romance literature. If that was the case, the Islamic world was still the source for the idea: as Elly Truitt has argued, since the 12th century, French authors of romance literature had associated mechanical entertainments — trees made of precious metals and gemstones, with birds that sang when the wind blew, for instance — with the Islamic world. Those literary descriptions, as al-Kamil’s gift to Frederick II makes clear, had parallels in actual examples of mechanical entertainments at medieval Islamic courts.

One romance story that Count Robert II owned, and whose author he knew very well, the *Cléomadès*, was a recent translation (via Iberia) of the story of the ‘Enchanted Horse’ from the Arabic collection of tales known as *The Thousand and One Nights*. The story, as told in the *Cléomadès*, concerned an Iberian king whose three daughters were wooed by three princes, all of whom brought gifts of magical mechanical statues to the Iberian king’s court. An early manuscript of the *Cléomadès* has an illumination suggesting that Princess Blanche, who was the daughter of King Louis IX of France and the disinherited widow of Prince Fernand de la Cerda of Castile, provided the oral source, from which the poet, Adenet le Roi, composed his versified French version of the story. Blanche was the daughter-in-law of King Alfonso X the Wise, who was the patron of a large body of literary and scientific translations from Arabic into Latin and Castilian. There is no surviving exemplar of a Castilian translation of the story of the ‘Enchanted Horse’, but this is not surprising: because of the limited audience for Castilian literature, several of the texts that were translated into that language have survived only in later Latin or French translations.

In 1276 Count Robert spent time in northern Iberia both putting down a rebellion in Pamplona and negotiating with King Alfonso X of Castile on behalf of Blanche and her disinherited sons. The experience seems to have had a profound impact on Robert and his court: by the 1290s, when Robert’s record-keeping became much more meticulous than it had been before, five men from Iberia — most of them from Navarre — worked for his financial administration and in his office of the stables, primarily as horse breeders.

Count Robert also had close ties with the early manuscript history of the *Cléomadès*: several early manuscripts of the text, including the one with the image of Blanche reciting the original story, end with an *envoi* to Robert, which often includes an illumination depicting Adenet delivering the finished book to him. Given Count Robert’s intimate connection with the story, then, it stands to reason that he would have taken an interest in its descriptions of three magically automated mechanical devices: golden statues of a trumpeter and of a hen with chickens, and an ebony statue of a flying horse. We have no specific information concerning the mechanical entertainments in Robert’s *gloriette*, so it is difficult to determine to what degree they
may have resembled the automated statues of the *Cléomadès*. However, we do know that he installed mechanical monkeys — operated with a system of pulleys — on a bridge to a pavilion deep within his garden park, and that he had mechanised boars’ heads as well.  

It is certainly easy to imagine that Count Robert could have had the automata of the *Cléomadès* in mind when he came up with the ideas for the mechanical monkeys, the boars’ heads and the mechanical entertainments in the *gloriette*.

The cumulative evidence from the five British and French *gloriettes* of the late 13th and early 14th centuries indicates that they shared more characteristics with *La Zisa* of Palermo than they did with the *gloriette* of the *Prise d’Orange*. The fact that they were not garden pavilions but that they nevertheless shared a number of other salient characteristics with *La Zisa* suggests that scholars may have been too narrow in their interpretations of the ways in which elite visitors to Palermo would have experienced *La Zisa* and the other Norman garden pavilions, and the memories that they would have carried with them of those famed Palermitan architectural monuments and their relationship with the surrounding landscape. With its upper-storey private apartments and a ground-level footprint of approximately 720 m², *La Zisa* was much more than a simple garden pavilion. Perhaps we could even go so far as to argue that, like the *gloriette* of the *Prise d’Orange*, it was basically a freestanding royal residence. Unlike the *gloriette* of the *Prise d’Orange*, however, it was located in a garden park rather than in a town.

When they built their *gloriettes* at Leeds and Hesdin, King Edward I of England and Count Robert II of Artois may have drawn on memories of the park setting and dramatic water features at *La Zisa*. Moreover, while we can only surmise that all of the northern patrons decorated their *gloriettes* with luxurious decor, it seems likely that at least four of them placed their *gloriettes* in locations that commanded breath-taking views. Several of the patrons, moreover, including Edward I and Robert II, associated their *gloriettes* with towers. It was Robert, however, who went the furthest in developing the parallels between his *gloriette* and *La Zisa*, by including an indoor architectural fountain, and by associating his *gloriette* with paradise and with the glory of the Capetian royal line. Robert further associated his *gloriette* with the wonders of Islamic centres of entertainment by including mechanical devices for the entertainment of his guests; and he was the first elite leader of northern Europe to sponsor such devices.

It makes sense that, of all of the aristocratic and royal patrons who sponsored the *gloriettes* of late 13th-century northern France and Britain, Robert II of Artois went the furthest in imitating models from Palermo and from Islamic, or Mediterranean, courts in general. Between the ages of twenty and forty-one, he spent almost half his time abroad, advancing the interests of members of the French royal family in North Africa, northern Iberia and southern Italy. While he spent only a few weeks in Sicily, Count Robert spent almost a decade in the kingdom of southern Italy, where he gained intimate knowledge of Emperor Frederick II’s watery hunting lodges, such as Gravina and San Lorenzo, and of other centres of repose that had been built by Frederick. The grandson of King Roger II of Sicily, Frederick drew on the models of his childhood in Sicily when he developed, in the region of Apulia, his own water parks, hunting lodges and leisure centres. Indeed, it seems that Frederick had a special taste for rural residences with panoramic views: he named three of his rural residences ‘Belvedere’, and one account emphasises that a room in one of his residences had an ocean view.
Upon his return to his country in 1292, Count Robert included in his entourage not only five men from Iberia, but also nine from southern Italy, including a chief administrator from Apulia, who oversaw Robert’s renovations at the chateau and park of Hesdin, a gardener from Apulia who oversaw tree grafts at Hesdin, and a physician from Sicily, who, as a member of Robert’s intimate circle, would have provided his patron not only with medical services but also with intellectual and aesthetic advice. Robert’s entourage also included a converted Muslim woman who resided, first, at Robert’s estate of Domfront, but then moved to Hesdin after the count’s death. She probably came from the Muslim colony of Lucera, in Apulia, with whose residents Robert had worked closely during his time in Italy; her name — Roberta — suggests that Robert himself sponsored her conversion.

These immigrants, whose skills had been partially shaped by Islamic traditions in Sicily and southern Italy, played a major role in reshaping the administrative and physical culture of late 13th-century Artois. Their impact enhances our understanding of the ways in which northern European engagement with the Mediterranean world, during the age of the crusades, transformed European culture itself. The evidence concerning the similarities between the Arabo-Norman pavilions of Palermo and the gloriettes of Artois, England and Wales points in the same direction.

One question that still needs to be resolved, however, is how the English and French patrons of the northern gloriettes might have come to understand that the name ‘La Zisa’ derived, ultimately, from a word that meant ‘glorious’. Most Arabic words that became a part of western languages in the middle ages — such as diwan or emir — were absorbed as Latinised forms of the original Arabic, rather than being translated. Thus, emir became amiral in French and ‘admiral’ in English; diwan became doana (and, later, dogana) in Italian and douane in French. Written records from Palermo suggest that the same was true for La Zisa: one Latin chronicle refers to it as Sisa, and several administrative records refer to it as Azisa or Asisa; these were Latinised forms of the Arabic word al-‘Azīz. I am not aware of any Latin, French or Anglo-Norman sources that referred to La Zisa as ‘gloriosus’ or ‘gloriette’. If, then, the actual meaning of La Zisa’s name provided a source of inspiration for the northern term ‘gloriette’, the method of transmission for that meaning must have been oral.

We can look to the multilingual environment and the international connections of the Norman court itself for a possible setting for that oral transmission. According to Michele Amari and Giuseppe Bellafiore, it was probably King William II who commissioned La Zisa’s Arabic inscription, with its play on the Arabic words — Musta’izz and al-‘Azīz — describing the glorious qualities of the king and of the palace that he built. The message of that inscription served to enhance William’s reputation; the language in which it was written advertised his facility with his Mediterranean environment.

Although the inscription was engraved in Arabic alone, it seems highly unlikely that William intended to limit its audience to Arabic speakers. William’s diplomatic relations in western Europe and his marriage to the daughter of King Henry II of England suggest, in fact, that his ambitions were hardly limited to the Mediterranean world. If he wanted the wider world to take note of his accomplishments — as the Arabic inscription seems to suggest — William must have endeavoured, from time to time, to translate La Zisa’s inscription for the English and French dignitaries who served and visited his court. And surely, at some point during the dozen years that he was married to her, he must have done the same for Joan of England. Joan, in turn, may well have recounted that meaning to her brother King Richard I, with whom she spent
time during the third crusade. It seems likely, then, that at some point in the last third of the 12th century, rough translations of the inscription at *La Zisa* arrived in England, along with descriptions of the pavilion itself.

By the 1270s, when Count Robert II of Artois and King Edward I passed through Palermo, the context for cultural transmission had changed dramatically. The glories of the Norman court of Sicily had ended with the death of William II in 1189; and, while the Emperor Frederick II had been, like his Norman forebears, well acquainted with the languages and style of Mediterranean courts, he also carried out — from the mid-1220s to the early 1240s — the massive relocation of the entire Muslim population of Sicily to the town of Lucera in Apulia. Nevertheless, Arabic-speaking Christians and Jews still resided in Palermo when Count Robert and King Edward passed through Sicily. Indeed, in 1239, after Frederick II had already relocated most of the Muslims of Sicily, his chief Sicilian administrator entrusted the care of the royal date palms of Palermo to recently immigrated Arabic-speaking Jews from the Magreb, who were known for their horticultural skills; those Jews were subsequently asked to grow indigo and henna on land around the castle-Pavilion of *La Favara/Maredolce*. Other Arabic speakers translated learned Arabic medical texts for King Charles I of Naples/Sicily, who was Count Robert II’s uncle. At some point, then, an Arabic-speaking resident of Palermo with connections to the royal court may have conveyed to Count Robert II or King Edward I something about the message in the inscription at *La Zisa*. Another possible source of transmission for traditions relating to *La Zisa* and its name could have been the monastery of Monreale, which the French royal party (including, possibly, Count Robert II) visited in 1270, after King Louis IX’s entrails were interred there.

Of course, by the time Robert II and Edward I began to make plans for their *gloriettes* at Hesdin and Leeds, the custom of employing the name *gloriette* for certain well-appointed chambers had already gained traction in England and Wales, so Edward, and possibly Robert, may have borrowed the name from pre-existing British usage. But even if that was the case, similarities between the pavilions of Palermo and the *gloriettes* at Leeds and, especially, Hesdin, suggest that the aesthetic impact of the Palermitan pavilions may well have had a lasting effect on one or both of these late 13th-century rulers.
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