University of Dundee

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

A study of aspiration and ambition
the Scottish Treasury Commission and its impact upon the development of Scottish country house architecture 1667-1682

Wemyss, Charles

Award date: 2008

Awarding institution: University of Dundee

Link to publication

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 27. Feb. 2019
A study of aspiration and ambition

the Scottish Treasury Commission and its impact upon the development of

Scottish country house architecture 1667-1682

Charles Wemyss

2008

University of Dundee
A STUDY OF ASPIRATION AND AMBITION:
THE SCOTTISH TREASURY COMMISSION AND ITS IMPACT
UPON THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCOTTISH COUNTRY HOUSE
ARCHITECTURE

1667-1682

Charles Wemyss

Ph.D History
University of Dundee
December 2008
CONTENTS

Part 1

Acknowledgements .............................. i
Declaration .................................. ii
Summary ..................................... iii-v
Notes .......................................... vi

Introduction .................................. 1-19

Chapter 1: .................................... 20-47
Sources of Inspiration for the Classical Country House

Chapter 2: .................................... 48-75
The Role of the Treasury and the King's Revenues in post Restoration Scotland

Chapter 3: .................................... 76-101
The Members of the Treasury Commission 1667-1682

Chapter 4: .................................... 102-164
The Principal Houses of the Members of the Treasury Commission

Conclusion .................................. 165-170

Notes and Bibliography ...................... 171-196
CONTENTS

Part 2

Appendix 1: 1-37
Details of the Treasury Commissioners
(portraits, provenance, culture and finances)

Appendix 2: 38-101
Details of the Principal Houses of the Treasury Commissioners

Appendix 3: 102-113
Details of the Treasury Executives
(portraits, provenance, culture and finances)

Appendix 4: 114-125
Details of the Principal Houses of the Treasury Executives

Appendix 5: 126-184
Survey of Household Inventories

Notes 185-189
Acknowledgements

When a treatise has taken so long to complete, there is a danger that the staff of many of the archives, local, national and private, have moved on to new posts or even retired. Nonetheless, I would like to thank those who have been unfailingly helpful at the Perth Museum and Art Gallery, the A.K.Bell Library in Perth, the National Archive of Scotland, the National Portrait Gallery of Scotland, the National Monuments Record of Scotland, the National Library of Scotland, the RIBA Library, the Royal Society Library, the Beinecke Rare Books Library at Yale University and the Paul Mellon Centre for the Study of British Arts.

I am very grateful to those whose family archives and portraits have been accessed, many of whom are direct descendants of the members of the Treasury Commission: the Duke of Hamilton, the Duke of Argyll, the Duke of Buccleuch, the Duke of Roxburghe, the Marquess of Lothian, the Marquess of Linlithgow, the Earl of Airlie, the Earl of Moray, the Earl of Strathmore, the Earl of Annandale, the Earl of Dalhousie, the Earl of Dundonald, the Earl of Mansfield, Sir Lyonel Tollemache, Sarah Troughton, Gerald Maitland Carew and Jamie Montgomery. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to my uncle, the Earl of Elgin, for his enthusiastic support.

To complete such a protracted project has required mutual support, and therefore I salute my fellow post graduates at the University of Dundee, especially Matt Davis and Kate Newland, with whom much information has been shared. It has also involved discussion with wise men: none more than John Dunbar who was generous enough to share years of painstaking research and David Stevenson who revealed his extensive knowledge of the Kincardine Papers.

In the ten years that it has taken to perfect this thesis, the Department of History at Dundee University has become the pre-eminent force in Scottish architectural history under the leadership of Charles McKean. As the inaugural post graduate, I have enormous admiration for his infectious enthusiasm and his success in transforming the image of Scottish architecture. However, the greatest debt of gratitude goes to my family, who have constantly supported my quest to understand the outdated concept of ‘lineage’.
I, Charles Wemyss, declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. Unless otherwise stated, all references cited have been consulted by myself and the study, of which this thesis is a record, has been carried out by myself. This thesis has not been previously accepted for a higher degree.

[Signature]

I hereby certify that the conditions of ordinance by the University of Dundee have been fulfilled in the preparation of this thesis in order that it may be submitted for the degree of Ph. D. History.

[Signature]
Summary

Until very recently the study of Scottish domestic architecture in the late seventeenth century has been treated only in a national context or as an adjunct to the development of domestic architecture in Britain. It has not been subjected to the scrutiny of European architectural historians. For many years Scottish historians have greeted the first classical country houses as evidence of a renaissance culture, while English historians have treated them as a diversion from the mainstream development of British architecture. In reality, the number of classical country houses that were built in Scotland in the aftermath of the Restoration was very limited. This was in complete contrast to the experience in England, where the Restoration encouraged a very significant number of compact classical houses, whose design was inspired by the architectural treatises of Palladio and Scamozzi.

In attempting to place Scottish domestic architecture in a broader European context, historians have turned their attention to the pattern books of the sixteenth century French illustrator, Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, whose imaginary 'maisons des champs' bear a strong resemblance to many Scottish country houses of the seventeenth century. Unlike Palladio and Scamozzi, whose treatises drew inspiration from the architecture of the ancient Romans and Greeks, du Cerceau designed houses that were specifically suited to the characteristics of the French nobility. Their external appearance was governed by the silhouette of the roofline and not by the classical orders; their internal arrangement was dictated by the location of the escalier d'honneur rather than the central loggia. In an era governed by strict standards of decorum, it is very significant that the Scottish and French nobilities opted for the same distinctive silhouette, while the English preferred the uniform outline of the classical villa. This distinction suggests that their status was measured in different ways. The Scottish nobility shared similar aspirations to the French, but these were different to the ambitions of the English. By using the Italian interpretation of classicism as a yardstick for the development of Scottish country house architecture, historians have failed to compare like with like.

A close analysis of the aspirations and the building works of the members of the Earl of Lauderdale's Treasury Commission between 1667 and 1682, confirms the important role that family lineage played as a measure of status in Scotland. There was a fundamental difference between the houses of the Treasury
Commissioners, who were drawn from the ranks of the ancient nobility, and those of the Treasury Executives, whose fortunes had been recently acquired. The Commissioners, who were saddled with their families’ lineage, reformed their existing houses, retaining significant elements of the original building; while the Executives, with no lineage to display, built new houses on their recently acquired estates. There was a division within the ranks of the Scottish nobility, as there was in France, between the noblesse d’epee, whose status was measured by lineage, and the noblesse de robe, whose status was displayed by wealth.

In Scotland, where the economy was so weak, it was difficult to acquire sufficient wealth to join the ranks of the noblesse de robe. The administration of the king’s revenues was jealously guarded by a tight nexus of Treasury Commissioners whose family history prevented them from building in the classical manner. It was only Sir William Bruce, the principal collector of customs, and Sir Thomas Moncreiffe, the chief clerk of the treasury, who amassed sufficient resources to build in an unfettered way. Like Nicolas Fouquet, the surintendant des finances to Louis XIV, whose splendid chateau of Vaux le Vicomte inspired the envy of the king, William Bruce’s ambitious new house of Kinross also led to his derogation. To display excessive wealth in Scotland or France, where family lineage was the principal measure of status, was considered wholly inappropriate.

Although lineage proved the strongest deterrent to the advent of the classical country house, there were other factors that encouraged the Scottish nobility to follow the example of the French, rather than the English. Until James VI departed for London in 1603, the informal lifestyle of the Scottish nobility was very much closer to that of the French court than it was to the Tudor court in England. This affinity between the Scottish and French courts was reflected in the similarity of their domestic architecture: the Scottish country house not only resembled the chateau in its external appearance, but their internal arrangements and their basic structure were very alike. The traditional circulation and the physical division of Scottish and French country houses had evolved in a wholly different way to those of the English country house. Such longstanding customs were engrained in the national lifestyle and were very difficult to incorporate within the symmetrical plan of the compact villa.
There is also evidence that cultural links between Scotland and France were maintained for a longer period than might be expected. Many members of the Scottish nobility continued to complete their education in France. This was not a phenomenon of the late seventeenth century, as it was in England, but a tradition that had existed in Scotland since the sixteenth century. According to English visitors, this system of education created a culture and a lifestyle that was different to their own. They wrote about the 'stateliness' and 'grandeur' of the Scottish nobility, and reported, as late as the early eighteenth century, that the 'young gentlemen' possessed 'french airs'. It seems that, however strong the inspiration of the English court, it may have been less influential than the traditional links between Scotland and France.

To conclude, as many historians have, that the first classical country houses in Scotland provided evidence of a renaissance culture is misconceived. Their true significance lies in their limited number. There were very few people in Scotland, after the Restoration, who possessed the requisite aspirations to adopt the uniformity of classical architecture. Most members of the Scottish nobility shared the same characteristics as their French counterparts. They preferred to display the symbols of history and lineage, rather than wealth, and opted for the pattern books of du Cerceau, rather than Palladio and Scamozzi. To English visitors, the sight of towers and gunloops reflected a retrospective society: to the Scots and the French, they represented an indivisible link between family, place and status. Until Scottish domestic architecture of the seventeenth century is closely studied by French architectural historians, its significance will continue to be misconstrued.
Notes

Titles: During the fifteen year duration of the Earl of Lauderdale’s Treasury Commission, many members were awarded more elevated titles. The Earl of Lauderdale, for instance, was created Duke of Lauderdale in 1672. In order to avoid confusion, each member of the Treasury Commission is referred to in the thesis by his original title.

Currency: The official exchange rate between the Scots pound and the pound Sterling was 12:1. Unless the term ‘sterling’ is used, all monetary values within the thesis are stated in ‘scots pounds’.

Illustrations: Many of the photographs and drawings used in this thesis have been accessed at the library of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland. Wherever this is the case, the illustration has been designated: RCAHMS.
Introduction

‘All subjects in their manners follow kings
What they do, bids: forbearing forbids things
A king’s behaviour sways his subjects’ lives
As the first mover all the fixt stars drives’.

John Owen 1628.¹

‘The Union of the Crowns took place in the beginning of the seventeenth century, and from that time the situation of Scotland was more deplorable than ever. We had indeed the honour to send a King to England, but this honour cost us dear. We remained in a strange and equivocal situation, little better than that of a conquered province. The nation was dispirited ... Our great men, who had now no wars to wage, and no court to resort to, either retired sullen to the country, or inlisting with foreign princes, vainly lavished their blood in the quarrels of strangers’.

Proposals for carrying on certain Public Works in the City of Edinburgh 1752.²

It suited Sir Gilbert Elliot and the proponents of the new town to portray the old city of Edinburgh as a cultural backwater.³ By depicting the seventeenth century as a continuation of the dark ages, they accentuated the brilliance of the eighteenth century enlightenment and encouraged subscribers to invest in their ambitious scheme; but was seventeenth century Scotland really little better than a province? Were the members of the nobility as dispirited and uninterested as they were portrayed? Was the absence of a royal court responsible for the lack of culture?⁴

On the face of it, Elliot’s hypothesis was correct: seventeenth century Scotland did seem unnaturally backward. According to the reports of English travellers, like Thomas Kirke in 1679, the Scottish nobility still inhabited houses that were built ‘castle wise’:

‘All the gentlemens houses are strong castles, they being so treacherous to one another, that they are forc’d to defend themselves in strongholds: they are commonly built upon some single rock
in the sea, or some high precipice near the mid-land, with many towers and strong iron grates before their windows ... The people are proud, arrogant vain-glorious boasters, bloody barbarous and inhuman butchers. Couzenage and theft is in perfection among them, and they are perfect English haters'.

It is undeniable that Scottish country houses were heavily embellished with military paraphernalia: battlements, gunloops and arrowslits. It is also true that the nobility still entered into kinship alliances, long after the practice had become outdated in other European countries. What is more, Scotland had no royal court: James VI had departed for London in 1603, leaving no regular forum for cultural discussion in Scotland. On the basis of this evidence, the protagonists of the new town were able to argue with confidence that 'the genius of the country remained depressed'. Bit by bit, however, Sir Gilbert Elliot's theory has been disproved. With the publication of Howard's pioneering treatise, 'The Architectural History of Scotland' and McKean's, 'The Scottish Chateau', the perception of the Scottish country house in the early seventeenth century has undergone a very significant change. The traditional image of the defensive 'towerhouse' has been replaced by the majestic profile of the renaissance 'chateau'. This fresh view has been confirmed by Brown's major reassessment of 'Noble Society in Scotland'. Far from backward, the Scottish nobility were active participants in the European cultural renaissance, and what is more, they achieved this cultural development without the physical presence of a king and his court.

These three important treatises have not only changed the perception of Scottish domestic architecture in the early seventeenth century; they have challenged the longstanding theory that it was only with the Restoration that the nobility suddenly emerged from the shadows of the middle ages to embrace the principles of classicism. Although they have altered the background, none of these works has examined the events of the post-restoration era in detail. An opportunity exists, therefore, for a thorough investigation of Scottish domestic architecture and the aspirations and lifestyle of the nobility in this important transitional period. Without a court, what was the principal source of cultural inspiration? The members of the Scottish nobility were well educated and, unlike the English, thoroughly cosmopolitan: did their ideas derive from England or from the Continent? In England, the influence of the court was so strong that it displaced the traditional hospitality of the country house: with no court in Edinburgh, did the Scottish nobility retain their traditional lifestyle for a longer period? It is widely understood that
Renaissance ideas were often initiated by small groups of individuals and then imitated by a wider circle: how was culture disseminated in Scotland and who were the leaders of fashion?\textsuperscript{14} It was at court that the King dispensed the lucrative ‘gifts’ which financed a fashionable lifestyle and encouraged conspicuous expenditure: did Scotland’s isolation and relative poverty affect the pace and the scale of cultural development?\textsuperscript{15} The traditional measure of status of the Scottish nobility was based upon land tenure and lineage: had these longstanding values been affected by the damaging events of the Civil War and Cromwell’s occupation?\textsuperscript{16}

Almost thirty years after the Union of the Crowns, there is evidence that the lifestyle of the Scottish nobility had still not adapted to the culture of the English court. In 1632, Sir Robert Ker, a resident member of the King’s Bedchamber, wrote to his son, Lord Lothian, in Scotland, with recommendations for the reconstruction of the house of Ancrum.\textsuperscript{17} In a long list of proposals for its internal arrangement, Ker suggested that the main reception rooms should be laid out with the accesses of the principal fire rooms, \textit{‘in the fashion of this country or France’}. At the same time, he advised that the gallery should be located on the south side of the house, \textit{‘which in Scotland is a main consideration’}.\textsuperscript{18} Ker then turned to the external appearance of the house, recommending that the tower should be preserved:

‘By any meanes do not take away the battelment, as some gave me counsale to do, as Dalhousy your nyghbour did, for that is the grace of the house, and makes it looke lyk a castle, and henc so nobleste’.\textsuperscript{19}

Yet, retaining the battlements was in direct conflict with architectural developments in England. According to Sir Roger North, houses built ‘castle fashion’ had become obsolete at the beginning of the seventeenth century:

‘A house was not esteemed great, without a tower at the gate, and a moat, defence enough against any sudden assault. \textit{And this held out till neer the Scotch union}. For wee see most ancient seats to be battlemented, toured and moated ... \textit{After the Scotch union, when pease was establish’t, and not before}, did building in England come to be reformed, after the Italian and French examples’. (author’s italics)\textsuperscript{20}
Sir Robert Ker's recommendations give some indication of the difficulties involved in the construction of a fashionable Scottish country house after the royal court had moved to England. It was necessary to take account of the different natural conditions that existed north and south of the border: the climate in Scotland was colder with fewer hours of winter sunlight, whereas the topography of England was less picturesque. These were factors that had serious implications for architectural design. Of equal importance, were the strict rules of decorum by which the status of a house and its owner were measured. According to Ker’s advice, the principal yardstick for a Scottish country house lay in the battlements, which made it ‘noblest’. In England, where castles had become outdated, the battlements would have implied that the house and its owner were somewhat old fashioned. The dilemma that faced the nobility in Scotland was to choose the standard of decorum by which they would be judged: did they retain their traditional culture, adopt the fashions of the court in London or attempt somehow to fuse the two together? If the two countries had enjoyed similar cultures, the decision might have been relatively easy but the traditional Scottish way of life bore very little relationship to the lifestyle of the English: it was much more closely aligned to France.

Before James VI left for London, Sir Henry Wotton reported that the Stuart court differed significantly from the Elizabethan court in England: he described it as being ‘governed more in the French than the English manner’. Bishop Goodman explained the distinction more fully: ‘No King … in Christendom did observe such state and carried such distance from the subjects as the kings and queens of England … There was no such state observed in Scotland’. From these contemporary accounts, it is clear that the lifestyle of the French and Scottish courts was markedly different from the English: the one was informal, the other very formal. By 1640, however, the lifestyle of the Scottish nobility had apparently changed in response to the influence of the court. Patrick Gordon of Ruthven wrote lamenting the transformation; ‘For once that English divell, keeping of state, got a haunt among our nobilitie, then began they to keepe a distance, as if there were some divinitie in them’. Following the restoration in 1660, there were further signs of greater formality in Scotland: a significant number of country houses were reconstructed in order to incorporate a formal state procession: a great dining room, withdrawing room, bedchamber and closet, laid out in enfilade. By the early eighteenth century, the concept had become so popular that the state procession formed an integral part of Scottish country house planning. For whatever reason, the Scots
had not only adopted an English tradition; they had then converted it into a distinctive national feature.

The same was not the case, however, in the development of external aesthetics.

At the end of the sixteenth century, there was a marked resemblance between the external appearance of a Scottish country house and a French chateau: both were embellished with towers, a potent symbol of the owner's noble status.\(^{26}\) As the impact of the Renaissance began to influence the development of European domestic architecture, aesthetic balance, geometric proportion and the correct application of the classical orders became increasingly important factors in house design. Yet the response to classicism was by no means universal: different countries adjusted the principles to suit their own specific national characteristics. In the northern hemisphere, development was strongly influenced by the Italian adaptation of the classical principles espoused by Andrea Palladio and Vincenzo Scamozzi. A compact villa emerged which became the dominant form of domestic architecture in England and Holland in the late seventeenth century.\(^{27}\) In France, something altogether different took place. The French tradition, frequently illustrated by Sebastiano Serlio and Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, involved the construction of a series of pavilions around three sides of a square court; the court was closed on the fourth side by a low wall with the main entrance gateway at the centre.\(^{28}\) With such radically different styles of architecture to choose from, the Scottish nobility was faced with the dilemma of whether to adhere to the long-standing tradition of the French chateau or to opt for the compact Palladian villa that became so popular in England and Holland.

The physical evidence suggests that there was a real divergence of opinion. In the first half of the seventeenth century, two distinct house types emerged in Scotland. On the one hand, there was a tall, astylar format with flamboyant architectural detail at the roofline, typified by the building works of the Bell family in Aberdeenshire and Angus. On the other, there was a more restrained, aesthetically balanced style that was most frequently found on the shores of the Forth and in the environs of Edinburgh. These two very distinctive architectural forms have now been classified in separate groups: the castle and the villa.\(^{29}\) When housebuilding recommenced after the Civil War and Cromwell's occupation, the two divergent styles persisted. A very limited number of compact country houses began to emerge in Scotland, seemingly inspired by the Palladian villa; by 1690, thirty years after the restoration, there were still only four examples of this type: Moncreiffe, Dunkeld, Kinross and Whitehill.\(^{30}\)
The great majority of housebuilding projects in the immediate post restoration period involved the reformation of the 'dynastic seat': ancient family houses were remodelled to provide a greater aesthetic balance. In the process of reformation, much of the original house was preserved and particular care was given to accentuate the importance of the towers. As a result, many of these houses took on an external appearance that bore a marked resemblance to the designs of the sixteenth century French architect, du Cerceau. The circular corner towers at Methven and the recessed centre at Drumlanrig seem to have been inspired by the French, rather than the Italian, tradition of domestic architecture.
Fig 4: Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, *Livre d’Architecture* (1582) Plate XI
(http://www.cesr.univ-tours.fr/architectura)

Fig 5: Drumlanrig, Dumfriesshire
(Vitruvius Britannicus)
As the seventeenth century progressed, the proportion of Palladian houses increased; by the 1730s, William Adam was able to demonstrate in the illustrations of Vitruvius Scoticus that Scotland had finally embraced the concept of the classical country house. However, amongst the drawings in Vitruvius Scoticus there were at least two houses, built in the early eighteenth century that possessed traditional corner towers: Floors Castle and Inveraray Castle. The presence of these two castles amongst so many villas provides evidence that the style survived despite the impact of classicism. By the end of the eighteenth century, with the Gothic Revival, the distinction became even more pronounced. As the drawings of Robert and James Adam clearly demonstrate, there was a marked difference between those clients who selected a castle and those who chose a country villa. If the style of a country house reflected the status of its owner, then the coexistence in Scotland of these two radically different styles suggests that their respective owners must have possessed sharply varying aspirations. It is not clear, however, what image each style was intended to portray.

Fig 6: Design for Airthrey Castle, Stirling, Stirlingshire for Robert Haldane esquire
(Designs for Castles and Country Villas by Robert & James Adam)

Fig 7: Design for a new house at Congalton, near North Berwick, East Lothian, for William Grant esquire
(Designs for Castles and Country Villas by Robert & James Adam)
It is difficult to find another country in Europe with exactly the same distinctive pattern of house styles that existed in Scotland. However, it is possible to find examples where one style or the other became the predominant form of domestic architecture and this may help to explain the divergent aspirations that caused the long standing distinction between the castle and the country villa. In France, the houses of the traditional nobility, the noblesse d’epee, were remodelled in a very similar way to those of many members of the Scottish nobility. Instead of building a new house, they retained substantial elements of the original. According to Girouard’s ‘Life in the French Country House’:

‘All over France one finds chateaux comfortably rebuilt in the seventeenth or eighteenth century, but in which the medieval towers, or at least one or two of them, have been retained along with the moat, or even had new towers built, as the sign of a seigneurial residence’. 36

The reason for preserving important elements of an ancient French chateau stemmed from the particular aspirations of the traditional nobility. Faced with the inexorable rise of the bourgeoisie under Richelieu and Mazarin in the first half of the seventeenth century, the members of the noblesse d’epee had resorted to the one measure of status that could not be achieved by the newly rich, noblesse de robe. Instead of demonstrating their standing in terms of wealth or individual ability, they sought to display their families’ ancient lineage. As a result, they intentionally retained those architectural features that symbolised the ancient military traditions of nobility: the medieval donjon and the moat. 37 Although the Scottish nobility enjoyed few of the tangible benefits of their French counterparts, they did share one very significant characteristic. In Scotland, noble status had been conferred traditionally upon all who held their lands by feudal charter. The charter gave the heritable feu holder the right to occupy his lands, but it also imposed obligations to act as the Crown’s local representative. As a result of this emphasis upon land tenure, an indivisible link was forged between family, place and status. 38 Like the noblesse d’epee in France, the great majority of the Scottish nobility in the early seventeenth century believed that lineage remained the most reliable yardstick of status, and so they too took great trouble to preserve the military symbols of antiquity. 39

The traditional nobilities of Scotland and France may have shared similar architectural aspirations but there was no equivalent in France to the compact classical villa. 40 The new chateaux designed by Francois
Mansart and Louis le Vau were shamelessly extravagant in their appearance and radical in their design. The Château de Maisons and Vaux le Vicomte were not constructed in the traditional French manner around three sides of a courtyard; they were free standing buildings which incorporated the most fashionable concepts of interior planning like the *appartement a l’italienne* and the *grand salon*. It is highly significant that the principal clients of Mansart and le Vau were drawn from the same social background: men like René de Longueil, *President de la Cour des Aides* and Nicolas Fouquet, *Surintendant des Finances* were members of the newly rich, *noblesse de robe*. Unlike the noblesse d’epee, whose housebuilding was constrained by family lineage, these rich government officials who had amassed huge fortunes from the manipulation of state funds were able to give full vent to their architectural ambitions. Instead of focussing on history, they displayed their wealth and cultural enlightenment in the richness and modernity of their new houses.

While the pattern of housebuilding in France was sharply divided between the traditions of the *noblesse d’epee* and the extravagance of the *noblesse de robe*, the development of domestic architecture in England followed a very different path. Although there were English examples of ‘mock castles’ in the seventeenth century, like Bolsover and Lulworth, there was no obvious yearning to retain the physical symbols of antiquity. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, English architecture had enjoyed a brief interlude of extravagant ‘prodigy houses’, like Hatfield and Audley End, but the financial strictures of the Civil War and Cromwell’s Interregnum radically altered the standards of decorum. The display of conspicuous expenditure was deemed inappropriate and it was replaced instead by economy and restraint. It was in this new era that the compact house, based on the Palladian interpretation of classical architecture, became so enormously popular. Its diminutive size fitted the pocket of the recently impoverished English landowner. At the same time, its classical features provided a degree of comfort to the rising generation of merchants and professional men who could be sure that their new houses displayed connotations of a refined culture.

Much the same sentiments were responsible for the popularity of the compact, classical house in Holland. It perfectly suited the aspirations of the eminent citizens, government officials and wealthy merchants who were the most important clients for housebuilding in the seventeenth century. They could relate to the moderation and restraint of the ‘dignified citizen’s house’ and were reassured by its position within
the system of the classical theory of architecture. While the newly-rich opted for the uniformity of the classical villa, the traditional nobility of the outlying provinces of the Dutch Republic adopted the same course as the noblesse d'epee in France; they too sought to display architectural features that stressed their families' ancient lineage: the moat, the drawbridge and the tower. It is clear, therefore, from other countries in Europe that a distinction existed between the aspirations of the traditional nobility, who chose history and lineage as their measure of status and the new rich, who preferred to be judged by their culture and enlightenment. Although the pattern may have differed in Scotland, the coexistence of both the castle and the country villa suggests very strongly that the same division existed within the ranks of the Scottish nobility.

It is alleged that a range of small classical country houses, designed by James Smith at the end of the seventeenth century, was inspired by the same group of people who were responsible for the popularity of the compact villa in England: a new generation of professional middle class who had benefited from significant improvements in the Scottish economy. At first sight, it seems plausible that the Scots should have followed the example of the English, but on closer examination it becomes clear that this hypothesis is seriously flawed. According to the current consensus among economic historians, the fragility of the Scottish economy was a major contributor to the Act of Union in 1707. Without a healthy trading relationship with England, the country would have remained on the verge of subsistence. If the economy was so weak, it seems improbable that a new generation of professional middle class could have amassed sufficient funds to acquire landed estates and build country houses. There must, therefore, be an alternative explanation to the source of wealth and cultural enlightenment that encouraged the construction of James Smith's compact classical villas.

Many of the most influential houses of seventeenth century Europe were financed from the receipts of government office and the manipulation of state funds. Clarendon House in Piccadilly, 'the best contriv'd, the most usefull, gracefull, and magnificent house in England', was built by Edward Hyde, Lord Chancellor to Charles II. Vaux le Vicomte in France was commissioned by Nicolas Fouquet, Surintendant des Finances to Louis XIV. It is no coincidence that these radical new buildings were commissioned by leading courtiers. In order to finance a fashionable lifestyle, it was necessary to acquire an extremely lucrative office; because these posts were available only from the crown, the supplicant was
forced to take up residence at court where he was subjected to its cultural influence. In England and Holland, the court played a central role in architectural development during the seventeenth century. The patronage of James I provided Inigo Jones with the opportunity to display his understanding of Italian classicism at the Queen’s House, Greenwich; Charles I played host to the Whitehall Group, a group of connoisseurs that included such luminaries as Sir Henry Wotton and Sir Balthasar Gerbier. Similarly, Constantijn Huygens, the unofficial minister of culture to the Prince of Orange, encouraged the early Dutch classical architects, Pieter Post and Philips Vingboons.

With no king in Edinburgh to provide the wealth and no court to act as a cultural stimulus, many of those Scots who accompanied James VI in 1603 remained in London. There were those like the Duke of Lennox and the Earl of Holderness who were handsomely rewarded and became entirely anglicised. Others preferred to remain in close proximity to the court but still retained links with Scotland, like the Earls of Dunbar, Kelly and Annandale and Viscount Kinloss. A similar pattern evolved during the reign of Charles I. The Earl of Dysart was rewarded with the riverside villa of Ham near London, which he converted into his principal residence. The Duke of Hamilton and the Earls of Stirling and Nithsdale remained steadfastly at court, visiting Scotland only on official business. Their pockets lined with English gold, many of the courtiers who retained links with Scotland set about building or remodelling houses which displayed the nascent signs of classicism. The Earl of Dunbar and Lord Kinloss commissioned fashionable houses at Berwick and Culross with a strong sense of aesthetic balance and the Earl of Nithsdale incorporated a splendid new lodging at Caerlaverock, heavily embellished with classical details. Because these courtiers visited Scotland so infrequently, it seems certain that the design of their houses was directly influenced by the culture of the English court.

Meanwhile, another group of the king’s closest confidants elected to return to Scotland where they took up permanent residence: men like the Earls of Dunfermline and Haddington who assumed the principal offices of state. Like the resident courtiers, they too indulged in a significant number of house building projects. This raises the important issue of how they managed to amass sufficient wealth in a struggling economy. According to the contemporary account of Sir John Scot of Scotstarvit, ‘the Staggering State of the Scots Statesmen’, there were many senior officeholders in the early seventeenth century who managed to ‘conquest a great estate’. Scotstarvit provided a brief profile for every senior officer of state from
1550 to 1650 and his description of Sir John Stewart of Traquair, Lord Treasurer in 1636, gives some indication of the source of the family’s wealth:

‘It is likely that his family will not be of long subsistence, albeit he has done the utmost of his endeavours for establishing the same to posterity: for it is no marvel he grew rich, seeing he never made compt of his intromissions with the king’s rents, many years before his departure’.

It seems that during his tenure as Lord Treasurer Traquair had failed to account for the rents collected from the king’s Scottish properties in order to profit personally from the prolonged custody of the money. By current standards such misuse of public funds would be deemed illegal, but by the standards of seventeenth century Europe, the practice was considered perfectly admissible. According to the evidence of Scotstarvit, the senior office bearers in Scotland may have followed a well-established path. Like the great prodigy house of Audley End, the reconstruction of Traquair was probably financed from the proceeds of the office of Lord Treasurer.

There is a good deal of circumstantial evidence that links the administration of the king’s revenues with the development of Scottish domestic architecture. The early seventeenth-century U-plan villas of Pitreavie and Winton were both commissioned by senior Treasury officials; as were the late seventeenth-century houses of Raith and Keith Hall, which belonged to Lord Treasurers Depute. What is more, the design of each of these four houses has been attributed to the architect who held the official post of King’s Master of Works or King’s Surveyor at the time. Pitreavie is said to be the work of Sir James Murray; Winton was designed by William Wallace and Raith and Keith Hall have been attributed to James Smith. In a country whose economy was so weak, it was perhaps inevitable that the development of domestic architecture would be influenced by those with access to the royal revenues; but without the motivation of the court, where did they find their cultural inspiration?

The Scottish houses of the expatriate courtiers would have provided examples for others to follow and, as we have seen in the case of Ancrum, there was copious correspondence from the court in London. Yet, the villas of Pitreavie and Winton seem to have been inspired by the drawings of Jacques Androuet du Cerceau. Given the long-standing cultural links with France, it is conceivable that the design may have
been the result of first hand experience. Sir Anthony Weldon, who accompanied James I to Scotland in 1617, was astonished to discover the extent of the nobility’s francophilia:

‘As for the nobles, they are not Scottish men; for as soon as they are torn from the breast of the beast, their mother, their careful father sends them away to France. There they learn to speak, to conge, to dance and to put on their clothes, to converse with women and not to compliment with men.’

Whatever foreign sources may have inspired the design of Scottish country houses in the early seventeenth century, there were also distinctive national or regional styles. It has been suggested that Scotland developed its own court style. A group of houses, loosely linked to the King’s Master of Works, Sir James Murray of Kilbaberton, possessed ‘buckled quoins’; a feature that was not apparent in the contemporary domestic architecture of any other country in Europe. While Murray was designing villas in the environs of Edinburgh, the Bell family was constructing another group of houses in Aberdeenshire and Angus in a style that defied the principles of classicism. There was such an eclectic mixture of architectural styles in the early seventeenth century that it is very difficult to establish a relationship between the aspirations of the owners and the design of their houses.

The problem is well illustrated by the example of Alexander Seton, 1st Earl of Dunfermline, Lord Chancellor and Chairman of the Scottish Treasury Commission who built two houses: Fyvie and Pinkie. As a treasury commissioner, Chancellor Seton had access to significant financial resources and according to Scotstarvit, ‘he conquest many lordships viz the earldom of Dunfermline, by the king’s gift, the lordship of Urquhart, the baronies of Fyvie, Delgaty and Pinkie’. In addition to his obvious wealth, Seton had been educated in Rome and was renowned as a renaissance scholar. According to the ‘Memoir of Alexander Seton, Earl of Dunfermline’:

‘He was held in great esteem … for his learning, being a great humanist in prose and poecie, Greek and Latin; well versed in the mathematicks, and had great skill in architecture and heraudrie.’
With every advantage of money and culture, Seton commissioned houses that were of radically different design. At the suburban villa of Pinkie near Edinburgh the splendid gallery with its painted ceiling and oriel window exuded an image of ‘cultivation and urbanity’.69 (see fig 8) At the castle of Fyvie in Aberdeenshire the massive triumphal arch and the countless corner towers were redolent of history and tradition. (see fig 9) On the face of it, Seton’s decision to build in such distinctive styles suggests that he may have lived two quite separate lives: the head of an ancient family at Fyvie and the man of culture at Pinkie. Yet all was not what it seemed. Chancellor Seton was not the head of an ancient family: he was in fact the fourth son of George, 5th Lord Seton: the traditional appearance of Fyvie was therefore a ‘conceit’.70

Fig 8: Pinkie, Midlothian, the suburban villa of Alexander, 1st Earl of Dunfermline (RCAHMS)

Fig 9: Fyvie, Aberdeenshire, the paternal seat of Alexander, 1st Earl of Dunfermline (RCAHMS)
Given that decorum would have played an important role in the choice of style, there are three possible explanations for this apparent dichotomy. It is conceivable that Seton, who was Scotland's most senior office holder, was influenced by a strong sense of national identity: he selected the distinctive style in order to accentuate his Scottishness. He was also renowned for his dynastic pretensions: he may have hoped that the traditional design of his new house might have passed for an ancient paternal seat. It is also possible that he was influenced by the local castle style; to build in a classical idiom would have drawn the opprobrium of his neighbours. Until a clear pattern has been established for other owners and their houses, Seton's real ambitions will remain a matter of conjecture.

It is the primary objective of this thesis to establish a yardstick for Scottish country house architecture during the seventeenth century: a standard against which any house and its owner can be compared. Instead of relying upon subjective judgements based upon architectural style, a thorough analysis will be undertaken of the ambitions and aspirations of a representative sample of the Scottish nobility in order to ascertain the standards of decorum that governed the design of their houses. This fresh approach to architectural history will examine the source of wealth and the effect of financial resources upon building and furnishing. It will look closely into potential sources of cultural inspiration: education, travel and the court. It will evaluate relationships that may have influenced architectural development: close kinship links and the relationship between architect and client. It will even consider the evidence of contemporary portraits to ascertain the image that members sought to project.

In order to ensure that the yardstick is reliable, those who are included in the survey need to be chosen with considerable care. The members of the 'survey group' must meet certain important criteria. To minimize the possibility of statistical variation, they should be drawn from the same generation and the same social class with similar financial resources. There must be sufficient information regarding their finances, their lifestyle, their ambitions and their houses, and if possible, there should be a contemporary narrative account to provide a guide to their lifestyle.

Such stringent criteria could be very difficult to meet. There is, however, one group that would satisfy each of the requirements. A high proportion of those who were closely related to the Scottish Treasury Commission when it was reestablished in 1667, were involved in country house building projects. They
all had access to financial resources and were members of the nobility, yet there was a clear distinction between those who were members of the traditional noblesse d'épee and those who had recently acquired their wealth, the noblesse de robe. There is also, by good fortune, a contemporary account of their lifestyle: the diary of Patrick, 3rd Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn. A survey of the Treasury Commission would provide a reliable yardstick for the aspirations and ambitions of the Scottish nobility, and resolve many outstanding questions about the development of country house architecture in the late seventeenth century.

What caused such a preponderance of ‘reformed dynastic seats’ and such a reluctance to adopt the concept of the classical villa? These ancient family houses were remodelled in a manner that was very close to the chateaux of the noblesse d’épee in France: did French traditions linger in Scotland long after the Union of the Crowns? Was this caused by long standing similarities in their aspirations and values? Although the majority of the Scottish nobility rebuilt their houses with a distinctly French flavour on the outside, they seem to have been very keen to adopt the English concept of the state apartment. Was the lifestyle of the English court more influential than it might at first appear or did local conditions conspire to encourage greater formality and privacy? Until these questions are resolved, the image of Scottish country house architecture will continue to be dominated by the standards of Italian classicism adopted by English historians, like Summerson, who have unjustly relegated the Scottish baroque to the appendices:

‘If Drumlanrig is the last of the Barons it is also for Scotland, one of the first of the Senators and as such, presumably, Colen Campbell saw fit to include it in the first volume of Vitruvius Britannicus, where, among the works of Jones, of the school of Wren and of the young Palladians, it makes a very strange appearance indeed’.  

It might seem strange that such issues remain largely unanswered, but the study of architectural history in Scotland is still in its infancy. The first significant work on post restoration architecture, Dunbar’s seminal catalogue for the Arts Council, ‘The Life and Work of Sir William Bruce’, which was published in 1970, is still regarded by the cognoscenti as the most authoritative work on the architect’s career. In the intervening period, much has been written about the architecture of James Smith, in particular Colvin’s important treatise which commends Smith as the initiator of ‘palladianism’ in Scotland.
Otherwise, the great majority of work is limited to factual studies based upon the archives of individual
families.

Dunbar's treatise on the building works of the Duke and Duchess of Lauderdale, Marshall's detailed
research into the Duke and Duchess of Hamilton, Clough's work on the Earl of Cromartie and
Kelsey's analysis of the Earl and Countess of Marchmont, have provided invaluable information into the
lifestyle of the nobility, but they still remain individual studies. In addition to these major works, there
has been a consistent flow of fresh case studies. Lowrey has written about the Annandales and the
building of Craigiehall and the furnishing of Queensberry House. Dunbar has written about the
Tweeddales and the building of Yester and the plans of the Southesks for Kinnaird. Marshall has written
about the reconstruction of Kinneil. The author has written about the life of Patrick Smyth and the
reformation of Methven. Each has added to the reservoir of knowledge, but each deals with the specific
story of one individual, one house or one family. An opportunity still exists, therefore, to collate this
material into a broader contextual study.

There is one form of primary material that has been almost completely overlooked by historians.
Household inventories provide a wealth of valuable information about the furnishing, decoration and
internal arrangement of Scottish country houses. In 1920, Warrack drew upon inventories for his
subjective description of 'Domestic Life in Scotland', which sketched the evolutionary process of the
interior from its medieval origins to the end of the seventeenth century. Fifty years later, Marshall
provided a detailed and important account of the household of the Duke and Duchess of Hamilton, one of
the richest and most powerful families in Scotland. In order to gain a comprehensive and objective
understanding of life in the seventeenth-century Scottish country house, a comparative study is required
covering a much wider range of household inventories.

Fortunately, there are numerous inventories tucked away in family archives: an extensive search has
revealed over seventy, dating from 1624 to 1720, which include country houses and town houses
belonging to owners of widely different social standing and levels of wealth. A survey of this material
would provide invaluable information about the factors that determined the process of evolution. It would
clarify whether the internal arrangement of the country house underwent a sudden metamorphosis or a
more gradual change. It would determine the effect of wealth and culture upon standards of accommodation and the quality of furnishing. It would also shed light on the function of the country house; whether there was a difference between the layout of the paternal seat and the villa. Such a study would provide conclusive evidence of the aspirations and ambitions of the nobility as they negotiated with the English over the political future of Scotland, before so many of them departed for London.
Chapter I

Sources of Inspiration for the Classical Country House

'Since the purpose of private building is to enhance the quality of living according to the rank, reputation and status of the owner, and to receive friends and visitors when necessary, it is extremely important to consider the nature of the country in question. In Spain and France houses are built differently from those in Germany. Within Italy itself styles also vary; buildings in Rome are different from those in Venice, Naples, Genoa, Milan and many other cities. There are a wide variety of private building styles, all markedly different from one another. Some people build their houses in great style in order to live splendidly and nobly, as did Crassus, Lucullus, Cicero, Pliny and many others; whereas others build to live in a comfortable, civilised way, or to trade'.

'Concerning the excellent manner in which the Ancients constructed public and private buildings; the praiseworthy building correctly, and the various types of private buildings',

Vincenzo Scamozzi.78

The accession of Charles II is widely acknowledged to have been a watershed in the evolution of Scottish domestic architecture. It was in this period of greater social and political stability that the concept of Scottish classicism was born: 'this was the era of Bruce in architecture'.79 Given its cultural significance, it is surprising to discover that the evidence of classicism in Scotland is still somewhat superficial. The layout of Leslie House in Fife, for example, has been linked to an illustration in Sebastiano Serlio's seventh book of architecture and the aesthetic appearance of Moncreiffe House in Perthshire to the Genoese palazzi illustrated by Rubens.80 (see figs 10, 11,12, & 13) It is undeniable that there are similarities between these Scottish houses and the illustrations of the pattern books, but the links are stylistic rather than substantial. Serlio's house was constructed over a basement with the entrance facing into the courtyard, while Leslie was built without a basement with the entrance facing out. Rubens palazzo was constructed around a courtyard, while Moncreiffe was built in the form of a compact villa. It is clear from these examples that John Mylne and William Bruce, the architects of Leslie and Moncreiffe, were not designing exact replicas of the drawings of Serlio and Rubens.81 They seem,
instead, to have been trying to adapt the principles of classicism to the particular characteristics that existed in mid seventeenth century Scotland. In order to gain a better understanding of its nature and origins, an analysis is required of the sources that may have inspired Scottish classicism and the particular features that distinguished it from other countries in Europe.

Fig 10: Sebastiano Serlio Book VII Plate 24 (ground floor)

Fig 11: Leslie, Fife (first floor)

(Vitruvius Scoticus)
Fig 12: Peter Paul Rubens. *Palazzo Niccolo Spinola*

(*Palazzi di Genova, 1622, Vol. 2, Plate 24.*)

Fig 13: Moncreiffe, Perthshire

(RCAHMS)
Where did Sir William Bruce, who would be acclaimed by future generations as 'the introducer of architecture' in Scotland, find his inspiration? Having visited France and the Dutch Republic, he would have gained first hand experience of houses and municipal buildings in the Dutch classical style and also the chateaux of the French renaissance. However, on his travels he would also have encountered copies of the numerous architectural treatises that had been published in Italy, France and Holland during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. There was already evidence of the impact of these treatises in Scotland before the outbreak of the Civil War. The design of fireplaces at Spedlins Tower and Newark was drawn directly from the fourth book of Sebastiano Serlio's *Tutte l'Opere d'Architettura*. There were fireplaces at Careston that imitated designs from Jacques Androuet du Cerceau's second *Livre d'Architecture*. At Heriot's Hospital, a complete range of pattern books had been consulted: the ground plan was based upon a design from Serlio's seventh book of architecture, the refectory doorway was drawn from Vignola's *Cinque Regole* and the chapel doorway from Alexandre Francini's treatise on architecture. Although it is clear that they were readily available in the early seventeenth century, these famous pattern books seem to have been used as a source of ornament rather than as a means for understanding the principles of renaissance architecture.

At the very heart of the two most widely read treatises in the fifteenth century, Vitruvius' *De architectura libri decem* and Leone Battista Alberti's *De re aedificatoria*, lay three fundamental principles derived from the architecture of the ancient Romans and Greeks: *firmitas* (strength), *utilitas* (utility) and *venustas* (beauty).

'The demands of strength will be met when the foundations are sunk to the bedrock, and the building materials, whatever they are, are carefully chosen without trying to save money; those of utility when the layout of the sites is faultless and does not make their use difficult, and when their arrangement is convenient and in each case suited to its particular situation; and those of beauty when the work has an elegant and pleasing appearance and the relative proportions of the individual parts have been calculated with true symmetry.'

According to both Vitruvius and Alberti, *utilitas* was the architect's primary consideration: different buildings served different purposes. The layout of a town house differed from a country house; the
function of a great man’s house differed from that of a merchant; some houses served the needs of life (necessitas), some were fit for a specific purpose (opportunitas) and others were designed for enjoyment (voluptas). Each building should be arranged in such a way that it served its particular purpose. Both writers were also agreed upon the fundamental principles that governed aesthetic beauty. Because society was rigidly structured, it was of fundamental importance that the external appearance of a house reflected the status of its owner. Decorum was achieved by displaying the appropriate classical order:

‘And considering that one Building differed from another, upon account of the End for which it was raised, and the Purpose which it was to serve, they found it necessary to make them of various Kinds. Thus from an Imitation of Nature they invented three Manners of adorning a building, and gave them Names drawn from their first Inventors. One was better contrived for Strength and Duration: This they called Doric; another was more taper and beautiful, this they named Corinthian; another was a Kind of Medium composed of the other two, this they called Ionic. Thus much related to the whole Body in general’. 91

Having established its function and status, it was the duty of the architect to ensure that every house was correctly proportioned, as a whole and in detail; it must demonstrate harmony (eurythmia) and aesthetic balance (symmetria). According to Vitruvius, proportion could be achieved only by the application of mathematical formulae:

‘The planning of temples is based on symmetry, to whose laws architects must conform with painstaking exactitude. It derives from proportion, which the Greeks called analogia. Proportion is present when all the parts and the building as a whole are based on a selected part used as a measure. From this symmetries are calculated. For without symmetry and proportion no temple can have a rational design, unless, that is, there is a precise relationship between its parts, as in the case of a well-built human body’. 92

Such exacting principles were all very well in theory, but they were very difficult for any potential housebuilder to comprehend. It was this problem that the sixteenth century pattern books sought to rectify.
by providing practical examples that could be readily understood ‘by any average person’ rather than by ‘great minds’.  

In his sixth, unpublished, book ‘on domestic architecture’, Sebastiano Serlio followed the Vitruvian principle of *utilitas* by providing examples of many different grades of houses both in the country and the city.  

‘I shall discuss all the different dwellings which are used today, beginning with the worst level of barrack that one could speak of, then following from level to level, arriving at the most ornate palace for a Prince, in the country and the city.’  

Having acknowledged the difference between ‘country dwellings’ and ‘city dwellings’, and illustrated houses ranging from ‘the farmhouse of the poor citizen’ to ‘a dwelling for a King’, Serlio attempted to demonstrate the distinction that existed between Italian and French architecture. In a series of six drawings, which compare the two styles, certain distinctive national characteristics can be readily identified. It is immediately evident that the construction of the two types of house is different: although each house is designed with two storeys over a raised semi basement, the arrangement of the Italian villa is more compact than that of the French *maison des champs*. (see fig 14) They also differ in their aesthetic appearance: the façade of the villa is focussed upon a central *loggia* adorned with the classical orders; the entrance to the *maison des champs* is balanced with matching pavilions. The *maisons des champs* incorporate the traditional steep French roof with pedimented windows; the windows have been arranged in such a way that they create distinctive vertical bays; the roofs of the villas are shallower with small windows set below the eaves.  

These two very distinct formulae create buildings with quite different visual silhouettes. Yet, the divergence between the Italian and French styles is not limited only to their aesthetic appearance; their internal arrangements are also dissimilar. In each instance the basic layout of the villa is the same: the *loggia* opens into a central *salla* with square *camera* on either side, providing a symmetrical plan. (see figs 14, 17 & 18) The arrangement of each of the three *maisons des champs*, on the other hand, differ from one another in significant ways. (see figs 14, 15 & 16)
In the smallest of his three designs, Serlio has achieved the typical French arrangement of the salle and the chambre in enfilade, by inserting a corridor from the main entrance: the layout therefore satisfies national tradition but fails to meet the requirements of symmetry. In the next drawing, he has followed French tradition by locating the principal stair at the centre of the building and achieved greater symmetry by positioning chambres and garde robes on either side, but in so doing he has been forced to move the salle to the floor above. In the third layout, the main entrance opens into a central vestibule, with corridors leading to separate apartments on either side: one containing the salle, the other containing the chambre. Having occupied the entire floor space with this symmetrical arrangement, he has been compelled to locate the stairs in the two matching pavilions at each corner of the building.
Fig 15: House for a richer citizen or merchant or similar person

Sebastiano Serlio

‘Houses in the French manner’

Fig 16: House for a citizen or merchant similar to the past project
Fig 17: House for a richer citizen or merchant

Sebastiano Serlio

‘Houses in the Italian manner’

Fig 18: House for a citizen or merchant different from the past project
Unfortunately, Serlio’s sixth book ‘on domestic architecture’ remained unpublished and therefore his comparison between the architectural styles of Italy and France was unavailable to prospective architects and house builders in the seventeenth century. The same distinction was, however, manifest in the pattern books of two other sixteenth century architects: the Quattro Libri dell Architettura of Andrea Palladio and the Livres d’Architecture of Jacques Androuet du Cerceau. Du Cerceau’s first book, published in 1559, provided imaginary drawings of a wide range of houses; ‘50 buildings to serve princes, great lords and gentlemen of medium and small estates’. His third book, published in 1582, was more limited in its appeal: it provided illustrations of thirty eight maisons des champs, suitable for courtiers of Henri III seeking to build country houses on the outskirts of Paris. In neither of these two pattern books did du Cerceau provide an explanation of how the principles of architecture had influenced his designs. This was in complete contrast to Palladio’s second book of architecture, which not only provided illustrations of villas that he had designed for clients in the Veneto, but included a comprehensible text which explained how the classical principles could be applied in practice.

Palladio claimed to have followed the Vitruvian theory of classical architecture. It was of primary importance, therefore, that his villas should reflect the status of their owners while fulfilling the dual function of summer retreat and working farm. The owner’s status was displayed in the corps de logis. (see fig 19) On the outside, the villa was constructed above a raised basement in order to achieve the maximum visual impact and the central loggia was adorned with the requisite classical orders superimposed with a large pediment. On the inside, the meticulously proportioned principal rooms were of dimensions appropriate to the scale of the house; the principal rooms were exposed to view, while the ‘smallest and ugliest parts’ were concealed ‘as far from our eyes as possible’. Above all, the Palladian villa was perfectly symmetrical both in plan and elevation; every part was arranged so that they matched both the whole and each other. In every instance, the symmetrical plan was achieved in the same way: the loggia and the sala were located on the central axis of the building and the remaining rooms and the stairs were distributed on either side. Yet this hallmark of Palladio’s planning also served a practical purpose: the sala was positioned at the centre of the house in order to avoid the extreme summer heat of northern Italy. What suited the climate of the Veneto and the principles of symmetry did not necessarily accord with the particular characteristics of other countries in Europe.
Unlike the villas of Palladio, the imaginary *maisons des champs* of Jacques Androuet du Cerceau bore no relationship to the Vitruvian principles of architecture. 107 (see fig 20) Although every one of his designs was symmetrical, the status of the owner was never displayed in the classical orders. The language used by du Cerceau suggests that in France it was the outline of the house, rather than its ornament, that determined the owner’s status: ‘Le logis de seigneur est eleve en forme de donjon.’ 108

Whatever their scale, du Cerceau’s houses were constructed in the traditional French manner of a series of interlinked pavilions: the central pavilion containing the *corps de logis*. 109 A modest country house was made up of three pavilions, one at the centre and one projecting from either side; a palace consisted of five linked pavilions set around a central courtyard. As a result, they were not only less compact than the Palladian villa, they also possessed a very different profile. The visual impact of du Cerceau’s houses was not focussed on the classical portico and the tympanum; it was concentrated instead at the roofline, which tapered down from the pavilions on each side toward the centre. 110

---

Fig 19: Andrea Palladio. Villa Sarego at Miega.
(Palladio, The Four Books on Architecture, Book II)
Having opted for the traditional aesthetic appearance of the chateau, du Cerceau also tried to arrange the internal layout of his houses to suit local tradition. The French country house was divided into four essential elements: the salle (the principal reception room); the private appartements (consisting of chambre, garde robe and cabinet); the means of circulation (the stairs and corridors); and the domestic offices. Each of these four elements had to be distributed within the building in a perfectly symmetrical plan. Having experimented with a variety of different layouts in his earlier books, du Cerceau finally adopted a formula that he applied to each of the thirty eight houses, ‘pour seigneurs, gentilhommes et autres qui voudront bastir en champs’. The domestic offices were conveniently relegated to a basement, leaving the rest of the building free to accommodate the remaining elements: the salle, the private apartments and the means of circulation. In order to achieve a symmetrical layout, one of these three elements had to be located on the central axis. According to French tradition, the principal staircase would normally lie at the centre of the house, but du Cerceau very seldom followed this precedent. He preferred instead to locate the salle at the centre, in the longitudinal fashion of the Italian villa. Despite the perfect symmetry of this arrangement, it was only very rarely adopted in practice: the tradition of the central staircase was so strong that the French could not bring themselves to do away with it.
**Fig 21: Livre d'Architecture (1582). Plate XXI**
*Salle/Chambre at centre of corps de logis*
(http://www.cesr.univ-tours.fr/architectura)

**Fig 22: Livre d'Architecture (1582). Plate XII**
Principal stair at centre of corps de logis
(http://www.cesr.univ-tours.fr/architectura)

**Fig 23: Livre d'Architecture (1582). Plate VIII**
*Salle at centre of the corps de logis*
(http://www.cesr.univ-tours.fr/architectura)
Anyone from another country seeking inspiration in the architectural treatises of Vitruvius and Alberti, and the pattern books of Serlio, Palladio and du Cerceau would have found that their contents were confusing, for although each of them espoused the importance of symmetry, they interpreted the principles of architecture in very different ways. The French chateau had evolved in a different way from the Italian villa, with its own distinctive appearance, its own method of construction and its own layout: all of which stemmed from the particular aspirations and lifestyle of the French nobility. So strong were these traditions that neither Serlio nor du Cerceau attempted to alter the fundamental aesthetic appearance of the chateau. Therefore, the reader of the pattern books was offered a choice; he could select either the Italian façade, adorned with the classical orders, or the French skyline; he could opt for the compact construction of the villa or the single pile of the maison des champs with its linked pavilions. There was a very sharp distinction between the aesthetic appearance of the Italian style and the French, but at least the choice was unequivocal. The options for internal planning were considerably more complex. The layout of the Palladian villa demonstrated that perfect symmetry could be obtained by locating the salla and the loggia on the central axis, but when the same formula was adopted by du Cerceau in France, it met with considerable resistance. As Scamozzi made clear, it was the duty of the successful architect to devise an arrangement that satisfied national characteristics within the confines of a symmetrical plan.

The notebooks of Sir Roger Pratt provide a valuable insight into how the classical principles were interpreted by an English architect. Pratt was very well travelled. Between 1643 and 1649, he visited France, Italy, Flanders and Holland, examining the chateaux of Richelieu and Blerancourt and the hotels of Paris, the palazzi of Genoa, Venice, Florence and Rome, and the villas of the Veneto. He was also well acquainted with many of the architectural treatises, quoting extracts from the works of Palladio, Serlio, Scamozzi and Rubens. His library contained editions of Vitruvius, Alberti, Serlio and du Cerceau. With such a wealth of knowledge, he was fully aware of the differences that existed between Italian and French architecture:

‘As to the several forms of building, it is most certain, that no man deserves the name of an Architect, who has not been very well versed both in those old ones of Rome, as likewise the more modern of Italy and France etc’.
At the end of his notebook, Pratt compared the different aesthetic appearance of the two national styles, drawing attention to their distinctive features. Writing about the Palladian villa, he commented upon its compact structure and classical façade:

“They are generally but small, as from seven windows to nine, which are without ornament, and their height is sometimes one whole storey and two half ones; the one in the base, nigh the foundation; the other in the frieze near the roof adjoining ... their chief adornment is a portico with a frontispiece, which for the most part is built in the middle of the front of them”.  

He described the courtyard structure of the French chateau with its linked pavilions and the steep pitch of the roof with its conspicuous silhouette:

“The roofs for the most part are very high and acute ... if the chief front be more than ordinarily long, the roof of it is then divided in the middle by some dome or great pavilion. Those at the corners are generally higher by one storey than the rest of the building”.  

Having given a very accurate description of the external appearance of ‘the most noble houses of Italy and France’, Pratt confirmed his personal preference for the strict Italian interpretation of classicism:

“To conclude, these houses of France in the extent and cheerfulness of their courts; multiplicity and curiosity of their ornaments and carvings; neatness and variety of their roofs; and delicacy of their whole composure, outdo the Italian ones; but these in the greatness of their breadth; loftiness of their height; distinctness, regularity and judgment in all their ornaments, and proportions; manliness of their strength, and majesty of their aspect, do by far surpass them”.  

He then went on to compare the ‘inward contrivance’ of the great houses of France and the Italian Palazzi. According to Pratt, the four basic elements of the house were distributed around the central courtyard in different ways. In France, the principal reception room was located in the corps de logis, on the side opposite the main entrance to the courtyard; in Italy, the ‘chief rooms’ were housed on the same side as the entrance. The private apartments in France were housed in pavilions at either end of the corps
de logis: those at the front contained rooms 'commodious for eating', those at the rear were 'ordained for sleeping'. On one side of the courtyard there was a gallery and on the other, a library. In Italy, the 'places of fresco' were located opposite the principal reception rooms, and the sleeping quarters on each side of the courtyard. In France, the principal stair lay at the centre of the corps de logis; in Italy there were four staircases, one in each corner of the courtyard. The kitchens in France were housed in the pavilions on either side of the entrance; in Italy they were located in a basement below the rooms of fresco. Although his observations were confined to two paragraphs and referred only to courtyard houses, it is clear from Pratt's description that the layout of the French house had evolved in a different way from the Italian. Furthermore, the distinction between the two styles was evident even to a foreign visitor.

Inspired by what he had seen and read Pratt applied his knowledge to the design of the English country house. Fully aware of the Vitruvian principle of decorum, he differentiated between the size and the adornment of houses according to 'the usual estates' of princes, noblemen or gentlemen. He recommended the compact construction of the Palladian villa. The single pile was considered to be 'most inconvenient' because the rooms led directly from one to another and lay 'open to all winds, and weather, and having through lights, look too glaring'; the double pile was warmer, allowed greater flexibility between the different rooms and provided additional space for such conveniences as backstairs; but above all, the double pile was cheaper to construct than the single pile. Pratt also favoured the concept of the raised basement, citing a number of advantages:

'An ascent to a house is more graceful than a plane ... A prospect is more pleasant to a house than where none ... An ascent on the outside of a house adds majesty to the height and majesty of a building ... It is much easier ascending 12 steps on the outside of your house than 22 within ... By this means is avoided both the digging of the cellars, rising of the springs, and carting of all the earth ... Here is place sufficient both to keep the servants from encumbering the upper parts of the building by their appearing, or lodging, as likewise all those who shall address themselves to them.'
Turning to the internal layout of the house, Pratt again followed the strict interpretation of the classical principles by accentuating the need for a symmetrical plan; ‘as we find it to be in our own bodies’. He also placed great stress upon the achievement of ‘convenience’. Convenience involved the relegation of the domestic offices to the basement, ‘in that no dirty servants may be seen passing to and fro by those who are above, no noises heard, nor ill scents smelt’. It also necessitated the location of withdrawing rooms next to the principal reception rooms and the provision of a closet, a servant’s room and a pair of backstairs for each bedchamber. To achieve these two objectives of symmetry and convenience, he recommended that the house should be arranged in such a way that the ‘great rooms’ lay at the centre and the ‘closets, servants rooms and stairs at the ends of the building’.

Sir Roger Pratt’s principles were first put into practice at Coleshill in Berkshire (1649): a house that has been widely acclaimed for its revolutionary design. According to his declared preference, Coleshill was constructed in a compact double pile over a raised basement; the façade remained unadorned, relying upon the rhythm of its fenestration rather than a portico or a pediment. (see figs 24 & 25) The internal arrangement of the house was also successful in meeting Pratt’s stated objectives. The domestic offices were located in the basement; the hall and the great parlour were both located on the central axis of the house, one immediately in front of the other. The great dining room on the first floor was accessed by a great stair, built around the walls of the hall; the private apartments, in each corner of the house, were accessed by a long lateral corridor running the full width of the house with backstairs at each end. This ingenious layout achieved a high degree of symmetry and convenience, yet one feature of the plan was never replicated. In striving for symmetry, Pratt had followed the French precedent of locating the principal staircase at the entrance to the building, when English tradition dictated that it should be sited in a separate range beyond the high end of the hall. Such scepticism stemmed from the historical significance of the Great Hall in England and the Escalier d’Honneur in France.
Fig 24: Coleshill, Berkshire  
(Girouard, Life in the English Country House)

Fig 25: Plan of Coleshill, Berkshire  
Note: the plan is reversed showing the entrance hall at the rear.  
(Gunther, The Architecture of Sir Roger Pratt)
It was as a result of the different characteristics of the royal court that the relationship between the hall and the stair in an English country house evolved in a different way from that of a French chateau. Under the early Tudors, the great hall had acted as the principal room of reception in the English palace, but by the reign of Elizabeth I many of its ceremonial functions had been transferred to the ‘Great Chamber’. It was in the great chamber that the Yeomen of the Guard were stationed and before long its title was changed to the ‘Guard Chamber’. Next in sequence to the guard chamber lay the ‘Presence Chamber’: the main audience chamber of the palace in which the throne was located and where the monarch dined in public. Beyond the presence chamber was the ‘Privy Chamber’ where Henry VIII ate in private and was dressed by a few well-trusted companions, the gentlemen of the privy chamber. Finally, the ‘Privy Lodgings’ in which the king actually slept and worked: the ‘King’s Bedchamber’ and ‘Closet’.  

In order to obtain any kind of privacy in a court that was expanding inexorably in its numbers, the Tudor monarchs had been forced to establish more and more rooms and guard their access very strictly.  

When James I succeeded to the throne of England in 1603, he found a state apartment that consisted of no fewer than six separate elements: guard chamber – presence chamber – privy chamber – withdrawing room – bedchamber – closet.

In France, where the king lived in the midst of his courtiers, the sequence of rooms in the state apartment was much shorter. When Louis XIV took up residence in the royal pavilion at the Louvre, the great stair of Henri II still led directly to the grande salle on the first floor where the Swiss Guard was stationed: an arrangement that was very similar to the great chamber in England. Next to the grande salle lay the grande antechambre, where the king ate in public, and beyond the grande antechambre, the chambre de parade: the principal reception room in the palace. The king did not, however, sleep in the chambre de parade; he ate there and was dressed there. The state bed, which stood on a raised platform behind the balustrade, represented the power and dignity of the monarchy and was saluted by everyone who entered the room. The king actually slept in his own private bedchamber or grand cabinet. There was no separation in the French state apartment between the public ceremonial of the outer chambers and the private world of the privy lodgings. The sequence of rooms was, therefore, limited to only four elements: grande salle – antechambre – chambre de parade – grand cabinet.
From the earliest arrangement of the hall and chamber, there had been a difference between the French chateau and the English country house. In England, the status of the owner and his family had been displayed in the magnificence of the hierarchical ground floor Great Hall. (see fig 26) The hierarchy radiated down from the owner and his immediate family, who sat at the high end, to his servants in their three levels of gentlemen, yeomen officers and grooms, who sat at the low end. When visitors were entertained in the great hall, whether visiting noblemen or mere tenants, they too would be fitted into the appropriate level of the hierarchy. As a result of this strict grading, the arrangement of the English country house evolved horizontally, in an H shape. The family was accommodated in rooms beyond the high end of the hall; the domestic offices were located beyond the low end. The main entrance to the house led into a screens passage, which separated the low end of the hall from the servants’ accommodation.

![Annotated plan of the ground floor of Ham House, Surrey, pre 1672 reconstruction (author). Red line shows the route from the entrance](image)

In France, there was no equivalent to the English great hall. A grande salle of two storeys with an arched timber roof was a feature confined only to royalty; it never became a standard part of the French chateau and was never used to entertain people below the rank of the nobility. Instead, the chateau was provided with two salles: the salle haute on the first floor, which served as the principal reception room for the owner and his peers, and the salle basse on the ground floor, which was normally reserved for those below the rank of nobleman. (see fig 27) In order for members of the nobility to reach the owner’s
domain in the *salle haute*, a staircase was incorporated immediately within the main entrance to the house. As a result, the structure of the French chateau evolved in a vertical format.\textsuperscript{138}

Fig 27: Annotated floor plans of Azay-le-Rideau, Val de Loire (author)

Top: First floor  Bottom: Ground floor.

Red line shows the route from the entrance
As concern grew for exclusivity and the proper entertainment of guests during the sixteenth century, the layout of the English country house followed the pattern of the Elizabethan court. Instead of gathering in the hierarchical hall alongside the entire household, the English landowner and his family began to entertain formally in the first floor Great Chamber and informally in the ground floor parlour. This was a transition with profound implications. On the face of it, the layout of the English country house had become much more like that of the French chateau; the principal reception room now lay on the first floor in both countries. There were, however, a number of significant differences. The state procession in England was much longer than it was in France. In order to reach the salle haute in France, the visitor had only to climb a stair that lay immediately at the main entrance. To reach the great chamber in England, the visitor still had to enter the house at the low end of the great hall and walk to the high end before climbing the great stair. The household servants were also accommodated in different locations. When the owner and his family abandoned the hierarchy of the great hall in England, the household servants continued to eat there in their serried ranks. In the seventeenth century, when the function of the great hall became that of an entrance hall, it was necessary to find alternative accommodation for them in a ‘servants’ hall’. In France, where the principal stair led directly to the salle haute, there was no such problem: the household servants were already lodged in a salle commune or salle des serviteurs nearly a century earlier than they were in England. By clinging to the ceremony of the hierarchical great hall, the arrangement of the English country house evolved in its own distinctive fashion.

Standards of privacy in the English country house and the French chateau also reflected the particular characteristics of their respective courts. Like the chambre de parade at the Louvre, the French chambre acted as a bed sitting room, which was used for the reception of visitors and for private meals as well as for sleeping. Because the chambre was so public, the cabinet took on particular significance as a private sanctuary and therefore the layout of the French chateau evolved into a series of appartements linked to the salle: each consisting of a chambre, garde robe and cabinet. In contrast, access to the English bedchamber was strictly controlled, reflecting the king’s bedchamber and closet at court, and therefore the privacy of the closet was less significant than the French cabinet. As a result, the concept of the apartment only became a regular feature of the English country house in the seventeenth century. The state apartment was first adopted in England by courtiers who hoped to curry favour by entertaining the king and queen in their own houses: visits that required accommodation of suitable formality. Although
the state apartment was similar in many respects to that of the French court, it was arranged in a distinctively English way. At Hatfield, the visitor entered the house at the low end of the ground floor great hall, walked the length of the hall to the high end, climbed the great stair to the first floor great chamber where they encountered a withdrawing room, bedchamber and closet.¹⁴⁴ (see fig 28) At the Louvre, the visitor entered the palace and was immediately confronted by the great stair to the first floor salle, which was followed by an antechambre, chambre, garde robe and cabinet.¹⁴⁵ (see fig 29)

The way in which these two state apartments were arranged reflected exactly the process of evolution that had taken place in their respective countries. In England, the evolution had been dominated by the hierarchical great hall; in France it had been governed by the escalier d'honneur.

---

**Fig 28: State Apartment at Hatfield, Hertfordshire**

1: Great Hall  2: Great Stair  3: Great Chamber  4: Withdrawing Room  5: Bedchamber  6: Closet

(from Girouard, Life in the English Country House)
The life of the first floor state apartment in England was relatively shortlived. After the restoration, such a formal arrangement was considered retrospective and was only adopted by peers, like the Earl of Sunderland at Althorp, Lord Montagu at Boughton, the Earl of Devonshire at Chatsworth and the Earl of Lauderdale at Ham. Most of the new country houses of the second half of the seventeenth century were of compact construction. Like Coleshill, they too required radical replanning in order to compress the essential elements within a confined space. Yet even in compact form, it is still possible to distinguish the arrangement of an English country house from a French chateau. At the chateau of du Plessis-Belleville (1628), Francois Mansart deepened the central pavilion so that that the main stair lay at the centre of the building, leading directly to the salle haute, and positioned the chambres on either side of the salle with their requisite garde robes and cabinets. Such an arrangement was traditionally French. (see fig 30) At Chevening in Kent (1631), Inigo Jones positioned the main stair beyond the hall, with the...
parlour wing to one side and the family wing to the other, in traditional English fashion. Even though the domestic offices were now relegated to the basement, the way in which these two houses functioned was different. Each reflected long established national customs, inherited from the lifestyle of their respective courts, which segregated the family, visitors and servants into different zones. These were traditions that had been established over many generations and were therefore very difficult to break.

Fig 30: Plan of the Chateau du Plessis-Belleville. Top: First floor Bottom: Ground floor (from original drawings by C. Mignot, Francois Mansart, Le Genie de l’architecture)

Fig 31: Plan of Chevening, Kent. Top: First floor Bottom: Ground floor (from Vitruvius Britannicus)
It might be assumed, from such strong evidence, that the lifestyle of the court would have had a similar influence upon life in the Scottish country house; that particular traditions would have become entrenched as they did in England and France. However, the situation in Scotland was different. Because the king had abandoned the court in Edinburgh, the Scots were left with a conundrum: did they adopt the formality of the English court or did they retain their own longstanding traditions? The arrangement of the Scottish court had borne a marked resemblance to the informality of the court in France. Judging by the state apartments at Linlithgow and Stirling, there was no separation between the public ceremonial of the outer chambers and the private world of the privy lodgings. The sequence of rooms consisted only of a Guard Hall, Presence Chamber, Bedchamber and Cabinet, all of which were administered by the same official: the Great Master of the Household. There were even similarities between the titles of the Scottish and French court officials: the masters of the household were the same as the maîtres d'hôtel, the great master of the esquerie equated to le grand écuyer and the lord great chamberlain to le grand chamberlan. The relationship between the three courts has been summed up in Starkey’s ‘The English Court’ in one very succinct sentence:

‘The English court was designed for the preservation and manipulation of distance: the Scots for the management of relatively free and open access. The English etiquette was English, while the Scottish was French’.

Given the similarity between the lifestyle of the Scottish and French courts, it is understandable that the layout of the Scottish country house should have evolved in the same way as the chateau. (see fig 32) There was neither a hierarchical ground floor great hall nor a parlour: the hall was located on the first floor and was approached by a stair that lay immediately within the main entrance; the domestic offices and the low hall lay on the ground floor. The principal chamber or ‘chamber of dais’ adjoined the hall and the remaining bedchambers lay on the floor above, each accessed by narrow turnpike stairs. In its basic structure, therefore, the Scottish country house resembled the vertical format of the chateau, in which the principal stair played a vital role, rather than the H shape of the English country house, which revolved around the hierarchical great hall.
If James VI had not succeeded to the crown of England and the informal lifestyle of the court in Edinburgh had continued, it is conceivable that the design of the Scottish country house would have evolved in a manner similar to that of du Cerceau’s maisons des champs. The external appearance of the house would have been balanced without losing the traditional silhouette of the castle and the customary arrangement of the rooms would have been retained, in a more symmetrical plan, with the principal staircase at the centre. At first sight, it seems that was exactly what happened. A number of Scottish country houses were remodelled during the seventeenth century so that they closely resembled those of du Cerceau in their external appearance, but their internal layout was radically different.
almost every instance, a state apartment was incorporated into the house, which consisted of a great
dining room, withdrawing room, bedchamber and closet, all linked together in enfilade. 157

The same formula was also adopted in the new houses that were built in the compact style of the Italian
villa: the rooms were carefully arranged in such a way that they led immediately from one to another. Yet
the state apartment was a feature found only in the grandest of English country houses, like Althorp and
Chatsworth. This was a formula that was going out of fashion in England, yet it was growing in
popularity in Scotland. For some reason, the informal lifestyle that had existed while the court remained
in Edinburgh underwent a dramatic change. So radical was this metamorphosis, that the Scottish nobility
was pursuing a way of life by the latter half of the seventeenth century that was unusually formal even by
English standards.

It was this change from a public to a private lifestyle that posed the greatest challenge to architects like
John Mylne, William Bruce and James Smith. The longstanding traditions of the Scottish country house
were similar to those of the French chateau with its distinctive skyline, its vertical structure and its focus
upon the principal stair, yet the length of the formal state apartment was better suited to the horizontal
structure of the English country house. Did they retain the traditional skyline as happened in France or did
they abandon the castle style as happened in England? Did they forego the traditional relationship
between the stair and the first floor hall? Should they adopt the separation that existed in England
between the formal function of the state apartment and the informal function of the parlour? These were
decisions of fundamental importance to the development of Scottish domestic architecture, which could
not be taken only by the architect. The architect could draw from his reservoir of knowledge, gained first
hand or from the pattern books, but he was ultimately responsible to his clients: it was their aspirations
and ambitions that would finally determine the design of the classical Scottish country house.
Chapter 2

The Role of the Treasury and the King’s Revenues in post Restoration Scotland

‘Scotland’s Noble families are almost gone; Lennox hes little in Scotland unsold, Hamilton’s estate, except Arran and the Baronie of Hamilton, is sold ... the Gordons are gone, the Douglasses little better, Eglintoun and Glencairn on the brink of breaking, many of our chief families Estates are cracking’.

Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, Principal of the University of Glasgow. 1658.158

‘We had the good fortune to see all the flower of the nobility then to pass in state, attending Duke Lauderdale who was sent down High Commissioner. And indeed it was a very glorious sight, for they were richly accoutred and as nobly attended with a splendid retinue, the heralds of arms and other officers that went before were wonderful gay and finely habited, and the servants that attended were clad in the richest liveries; their coaches drawn with six horses, as they went ratling along, did dazle our eyes with the splendour of their furniture; and all the nobles appeared in the greatest pomp and gallantry; the regalia, which are the sword of state, the scepter, and the crown were carried by three of the antientest of the nobility, and on each side the honours were three mace-bearers bare headed, a nobleman bare headed with a purse, and in it the Lord High Commissioner’s commission, the last of all the Lord High Commissioner with the dukes and marquesses on his right and left hand’.

‘Travels over England, Scotland and Wales’, James Browne. 1672.159

If an Englishman’s account of the procession to the opening of Parliament is to be believed, the Scottish nobility had made a seemingly miraculous recovery from the financial depredations of the Civil War and Cromwell’s occupation. Indeed, a significant number of major housebuilding projects were already underway by 1672; among them the reconstruction of Thirlestane for the Earl of Lauderdale, the King’s Commissioner, and the reformation of Balcaskie for Sir William Bruce, the King’s Surveyor.160 Despite the relative wealth of Lauderdale and Bruce, debt remained a very serious problem for the great majority of the nobility. James, 2nd Earl of Airlie, for example, found himself in serious difficulties. Having
travelled to London in 1660 to attend the coronation and pay his respects to the new king he had decided, much to his father’s fury, to follow a military career. In the six years that he remained in the south he managed to accumulate an almost legendary level of debt, while completely neglecting the family estate of Cortachy. Even when he did return to Scotland, Airlie proved to be an inept administrator and the family estates remained poorly managed. By 1668 his plight was so bad that he was forced to resort to the desperate measure of applying to the Treasury for an annual pension of £500. ¹⁶¹ What then, was the difference between those whose fortunes had recovered and those who remained in a state of financial ruin?

Airlie’s inactivity was in complete contrast to his neighbours, the Earls of Panmure and Strathmore. Patrick, 3rd Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn was one of many members of the nobility who suffered from the guarantees that had been granted by the previous generation. So encumbered were the family’s estates that the rents no longer met the annual interest payments on his debts:

‘The debt qch my father left behind him was, by inventars whereof some are yet extant no less then four hunder thousand pounds much of which debt was contracted by him for paying great sowmes of money for qch he engaged himself cautioner for relations and others. This debt still increasing, the annual rents exceeding the rents of the unlyfrented lands in so much as the verie Mains of Glammis was wedsett.’ ¹⁶²

Strathmore’s overriding concern lay not in the level of his father’s personal debts but in the potential liability of the cautions (guarantees) that his father had given to secure the debts of others. These included some of the worst financial casualties of the Civil War: the Earl of Seaforth, Lord Spynie and most serious of all, William, 7th Earl of Morton.¹⁶³ Under Scots law, such guarantees were secured upon the heritable assets of the guarantor and not on his own personal effects as in England.¹⁶⁴ Because the ancestral lands of the Lyon family stood as security for the debts of the Earl of Morton, it was possible for a group of creditors to club together and obtain a sequestration order. This is exactly what had happened in 1653: the family’s ancestral lands had been awarded to a consortium of creditors led by James Butter, Clerk Depute of Edinburgh.¹⁶⁵
Not prepared to stand by and see the ancestral estate acquired by others, Strathmore took action to relieve his family's financial plight. In the first instance he made full use of his kinship links. His uncle, George, 2nd Earl of Panmure was an active and successful administrator whose ancestral estates had prospered over two generations and who was now in a position to consider expansion. Panmure agreed to buy off Butter and his fellow creditors, 'knowing full well that if he had not done it the consequence would have been my utter ruine'. He then went further and acquired an outlying Lyon estate, the lands of Belhelvie in Aberdeenshire, 'at a just and equal price', allowing Strathmore to redeem the wadsets (mortgages) on his lands in Angus. This concerted action had clearly benefitted both families: the Lyon estates had been saved from sequestration and the Panmure estates had been significantly enlarged. However, in 1662, the roles were reversed.

During his negotiations with James Butter, Panmure had taken the opportunity of adding still further to his landholdings by acquiring the Earl of Morton's estate of Aberdour. He retained ownership of the estate until shortly after the restoration, when he finally agreed to sell it back to William, 9th Earl of Morton, who had pledged it as a jointure for his new wife, Grizel, eldest daughter of John, 1st Earl of Middleton. Despite having recovered his family's ancestral seat, the Earl of Morton still deeply resented the opportunistic way in which Panmure had acquired it and set about trying to exact revenge:

'He and a number of his friends and relations powerfull enough att the time and had no small interest with the Earle of Middleton then commissioner and many counsills wer held by him and his friends how to overtake my Lord Panmure as if he had done some notable iniquity ... That to be sure when the Committee of Parliament for imposing of fines should sitt they would informe so strongly against him as to get him severely fin'd'.

Middleton's friendship with the King gave him very significant influence. As a result, his daughters were clearly considered to be a good match. Having successfully married his eldest daughter to the Earl of Morton, his younger daughter, Helen, was then betrothed to the Earl of Strathmore. By marrying the daughter of a man of influence, who just happened to be the sister in law of his principal debtor, Strathmore must have hoped to settle the question of the Earl of Morton's debts and his father's caution once and for all. As a result of Middleton's intervention, Panmure was able to free himself from 'the
snare in which they thought to have intrap’d him’ and Strathmore received £27,000 of the £100,000 that was owed to him:

‘Had it not been that the E. of Morton married att that time a sister of my wife and daughter to the E. of Midlton, I cou’d never have gott any releife att all’. 170

By 1672 Strathmore had successfully warded off the worst of his father’s creditors but there still remained much to be done before his estates generated a significant annual surplus. He began a rigorous reorganisation of his affairs. He set about the appointment of factors to specific areas of his estates with the task of collecting the rents and paying off the interest on specific debts, and retained for himself the task of uplifting rent from the ‘inner circle of Glammis’ and paying the interest on the largest of his debts. 171 By the time that he had sold Belhelvie and received his wife’s dowry, the wadsets on the estate had been reduced to £175,400. The annual interest payments on these debts amounted to £10,524.172 Meanwhile his reorganisation had increased the annual rent roll to almost £26,205, leaving an annual surplus of £15,685.173 Strathmore had proved that by effective management it was possible to recover from a parlous financial state, but it could not be achieved by management alone: influence was also essential. Without the good fortune of strong kinship links and a judicious marriage to the daughter of the King’s Commissioner, he would never have relieved himself of the worst of his father’s cautionaries.

Another example of the importance of influence lay in the financial affairs of John, 2nd Earl of Tweeddale, whose father had guaranteed the debts of Charles, 2nd Earl of Dunfermline, pledging his own estates as security. In order to satisfy Dunfermline’s creditors, the 1st Earl had been forced to borrow £40,000 from Francis, 2nd Earl of Buccleuch, in anticipation that the money would be repaid from the sale of Dunfermline’s estates. However, the sale of the estates was prevented by the continued existence of a liferent due to the Earl of Dunfermline’s mother. Faced with the prospect of impending financial ruin, the 1st Earl of Tweeddale fled to London where he died in 1654, leaving his son to rescue the estates.174

The 2nd Earl of Tweeddale did not inherit a completely lost cause. Although he was confronted with enormous debts, he had gained possession of Dunfermline’s properties at Fyvie, Pinkie and Dalgety. He also retained the hope that, under the entail of the 2nd Earl of Buccleuch, his wife, who was Buccleuch’s
sister, might inherit that family’s legendary wealth. The only people who stood between him and financial
salvation were Lady Mary and Lady Anna Scott, Buccleuch’s daughters by his marriage to Lady
Margaret Leslie, sister of John, 7th Earl of Rothes. If either of the two daughters should marry, their
progeny would inherit the title and lands of Buccleuch. So Tweeddale set out to do everything in his
power to prevent it. In 1659, he complained that Lady Mary’s marriage to Walter Scott of Haychesters
had taken place while she was still in her minority and was therefore null and void. In 1660, when Lady
Mary was on her death bed, he conspired with the Earl of Rothes to ensure that Lady Anna would marry
his own son. It was not until 1663 that Parliament finally dashed any lingering hope that he might have
retained by ratifying the marriage between Lady Anna and James, Duke of Monmouth, the favorite
illegitimate son of King Charles II.

In 1666, Tweeddale employed another tactic in an attempt to reduce the scale of his debt to the
Buccleuchs. He proposed the marriage of his eldest son to Mary Maitland, the only daughter and heiress
of John, 2nd Earl of Lauderdale, the Secretary of State for Scotland who wielded considerable influence at
court. The advantage to Tweeddale was enormous; the progeny of this marriage would inherit
Lauderdale’s estates. Meanwhile Lauderdale hoped that if the Duchess of Monmouth died childless, his
grandchild would inherit the Buccleuch fortunes.

The next stage in the Tweeddale saga represents an excellent example of the dangers of factionalism. In
1672, the Earl of Lauderdale remarried. His new wife was the notoriously covetous Elizabeth, Countess
of Dysart. Almost immediately after their marriage, Lauderdale disinherited his grandson as heir to the
Maitland estates and replaced him instead with his younger brother, Charles, Lord Hatton. Tweeddale was
incensed. He completely lost sight of the advantages to be gained from an association with the King’s
Commissioner and resigned his position as President of the Privy Council. While he had worked closely
with Lauderdale, his debts had fallen from £65,000 in 1667 to only £15,600 in 1671, but as soon as he
deserted him they began to rise again. By 1679, he found himself owing the Buccleuch estates £111,853.
The debt was only finally extinguished in 1686, when he was forced to sell his family’s ancestral lands in
Tweeddale to the Earl of Queensberry.
The Earl of Tweeddale had relied entirely upon influence to resolve his financial plight. Unlike the Earls of Panmure and Strathmore who had taken active steps to manage their estates efficiently, he seems to have been more interested in the construction of a new deer park.\textsuperscript{179} A gulf was beginning to open up in the relative prosperity of different members of the Scottish nobility. Those who were actively involved in the better management of their estates, like Panmure and Strathmore, began to thrive. Those who showed less interest in the management of their estates, like Airlie and Tweeddale, remained in debt.

John, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Atholl was another member of the Scottish nobility who undertook a fundamental reorganisation of his estates. By lineal descent, the Earl of Atholl was chief of the Murray family of Tullibardine, who had been granted their lands in 1284 by Malise, Earl of Strathearn, on the marriage of his daughter Ada to Sir William de Moray. Until 1600, the Murrays had played no great part in national politics, but everything changed when William, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Tullibardine became instrumental in the rescue of King James VI at the Gowrie Conspiracy.\textsuperscript{180} From that moment, the fortunes of the Murray family began to improve dramatically. The 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Tullibardine was immediately awarded the hereditary post of Sheriff of Perthshire, but in 1628, he was also granted the title and lands of the Earldom of Atholl by King Charles I. The Earldom of Atholl, with the ancestral lands of Atholl and Balquidder, had been the heritage of the Stewart family until the death of James Stewart, 6\textsuperscript{th} Earl, without a male heir. Rather than amalgamate the two ancestral estates, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Tullibardine arranged for the Earldom of Atholl to pass to his eldest son and the Earldom of Tullibardine to pass to his brother. His son therefore became the first Earl of Atholl of the Murray family.\textsuperscript{181}

Remaining in royal favour, the 4\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Tullibardine was granted the lands and title of Huntingtower in 1663: the paternal seat of the Ruthven family. However, the 4\textsuperscript{th} Earl also died without a male heir and in 1670, his estates of Tullibardine and Huntingtower passed to his cousin, the Earl of Atholl. By extraordinary good fortune, John, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Atholl had fallen heir to the ancestral lands of three different families: the Murrays of Tullibardine, the Stewarts of Atholl and Balquidder, and the Ruthvens of Huntingtower. In addition, he had managed to acquire from his kinsman, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Annandale, 'the park, grounds and castlestead of Falkland, with the offices of Keeper of the Palace, Forester of his Majesty's park and Ranger of the Lowmonds'.
With such an impressive power base, Atholl became increasingly involved in post restoration politics. As a result, he left the reorganisation of his extensive estates to others and entered into an agreement with a number of ‘Friends’,

‘Anent the better management of his Lop’s estates and uplifting of his Lop’s rents, and anent the more effectuall and better payment of his Lop’s debts and annual rents yearly, and for the better management of his Lop’s other affairs in tyme comeing’. 182

Unlike his kinsman, the Earl of Strathmore, Atholl took no part in the day to day management of his estates. The collection of rents, payment of debts and the supply of provisions for his household were all placed in the hands of specific kinsmen or friends. Once a year, on 1st April, a committee of the rent collectors would meet to review Atholl’s financial affairs. Atholl did not even participate in discussions about his principal debts; prioritisation was left to a subcommittee of three of the ‘Friends’. As a result of the reorganisation, Atholl’s affairs were regularised. By 1677, the total value of the outstanding wadsets on his estates amounted to £139,889. The annual interest on these debts was £8,358. Meanwhile, the total income from the estates amounted to £32,259; two thirds paid in cash and the remainder in kind. The annual surplus was therefore £23,901. However, there was an annuity due to his wife of £12,000, which left Atholl with £11,901 to meet the expenses of three households: Falkland, Tullibardine and Blair. 183

Unfortunately, there is no accurate measure in late seventeenth century Scotland against which to compare the annual surpluses available to the Earls of Strathmore and Atholl. However, the income from the two estates seems to have been broadly in line: £15,685 was available to Strathmore, £11,901 to Atholl. When compared to the wealth of a rich English landowner, like Sir John Brownlow of Belton in Leicestershire, whose advantageous marriage had netted him an annual surplus of some £6,000 sterling (£72,000 scots) their income appears to be very modest. 184 What is more, Strathmore and Atholl were enlightened, successful administrators, unlike Airlie and Tweeddale. Against this background it is very easy to understand how important it was to maintain the closest possible links with the authority of the king. It was the king who personally dispensed largesse by way of salaries, pensions and other lucrative appointments, which might help to supplement such a meagre annual income and he did so with the
assistance of his closest advisers. In 1672, the King relied upon the advice of only one man, his Secretary of State and High Commissioner, John, 2nd Earl of Lauderdale. 185

During the reigns of James VI and Charles I, there had been many Scottish courtiers at Whitehall with sufficient influence to promote the interests of family and friends with the king, but everything changed with the restoration of Charles II. The members of the Bedchamber, the king’s closest confidants, were now drawn from ‘the prime nobility of England’. 186 As their numbers declined, the influence of the few Scots who remained at court greatly increased. In the immediate aftermath of the restoration, there were three Scottish officers of state who possessed the ear of the king: the Earl of Middleton, the King’s Commissioner, the Earl of Lauderdale, Secretary of State, and the Earl of Rothes, President of the Privy Council. In 1662, an unseemly struggle broke out when Middleton attempted to discredit Lauderdale. 187

With the support of the Earl of Glencairn, the Lord Chancellor, and the other senior legal officers, Middleton managed to pass the Billeting Act through the Scottish Parliament: legislation that required members of parliament to list those individuals whom they considered unsuitable for government office. Lauderdale’s name was, of course, at the top of the list. However, Middleton made the great mistake of failing to present the act for royal approval in person; instead he delegated the task to Sir George Mackenzie of Tarbat. 188 When Middleton did eventually travel south to pay court to the king, he received an extremely frosty reception, as Sir Robert Moray reported with evident glee in September 1663:

‘After the King was retired & he (Middleton) had followed him into the Queen’s Bedchamber without conversing with him; he stayed in the privy chamber till supper was on the table about 9 aclock, and then when the gentleman usher went in to give his My. notice supper was come, E. Mid. & Newb. Stept to him just as he was coming out at the Bedchamber dore, E. M. stopt his way, clapt briskly down on his knee & taking (I say taking) his My by the hand, kist it & so did Newb. After him, without one word spoken. The K. past without further looking after them: went into the presence & they home. This was a feast of warre I had not seen before’. 189
In the government reshuffle that followed Middleton’s demise, the post of King’s Commissioner was awarded to the Earl of Rothes and the vacant post of President of the Privy Council to the Earl of Tweeddale. By March 1664, according to John Evelyn, Lauderdale had become the pre eminent Scotsman at court: ‘Came to visite & dine with me the E: of Lauderdail his Majesties greate favourite’.  

As the king’s great favorite, Lauderdale’s influence was enormous. He was the channel through which all supplications to the king had to be made. Writing to his nephew, Lord Tarras, Sir Gideon Scott gave an excellent description of Lauderdale’s pre eminence at court:

‘When ye are come to London ye would be as litle seen or knowne to be ther as can be, untill you come to kisse his Majestie’s hand; for till then it is not fitt to apeare att Court openlie, and it is the Earle of Lauderdail’s place, as Lord Secretarie for Scotland, to present all noblemen and persons of qualitie quhen they come to be honoured with a kisse of his Majesties hand … I know no other way bot by my Lord Lauderdail, unles ye would ingadge him to be your enemie, and if he should doe you that office slightlie, or to your disadvantage (quhich indeed is verie much in his power to doe), ye must beare it patientlie and without replying. And whither his Lordship present you to his Majestie or not, ye would not neglect to pay him those respects that are dew to his dignitie and place’.

Having organised the appointment of Tweeddale as his representative in Edinburgh, Lauderdale was able to exert greater control over the day to day management of Scottish government, but he still did not control the country’s purse strings. In 1663 the Earl of Rothes had succeeded the Earl of Crawford Lindsay as Lord Treasurer, and it was he who administered not only the collection and distribution of the King’s revenues in Scotland, but more importantly, the destination of the country’s most lucrative sinecures. If Lauderdale was to achieve absolute domination, he must take control of the Treasury. In 1667, he instigated the final phase of his plan for the complete domination of Scottish government. With the approval of the king, Rothes was ‘promoted’ to the office of Lord Chancellor, despite knowing nothing of either the law or Latin, and Lauderdale himself was appointed Commissioner of Parliament in addition to his role as Secretary of State. At the same time, the office of Lord Treasurer was abandoned and replaced instead by a committee. Lauderdale could at last feel secure. By sidelining the Earl of
Rothes had successfully outmanoeuvred the last of his serious challengers for the king’s ear at court, and had gained control of the king’s revenues in Scotland, which were essential to the establishment of a loyal faction.

In the same year that the Scottish treasury was placed in commission, a similar body was established in England, whose objective was to gain closer control of the collection and distribution of the king’s revenues. For generations the Lord Treasurer of England had benefited privately from the dispensation of offices and contracts for the collection of taxes. It was this culture that the new Treasury Commissions in England and Scotland were intended to stamp out. The Commissioners were empowered to appoint collectors, receivers and chamberlains, to receive all rents and casualties due to the sovereign, customs and excise, supply and profits of the mint and to manage all forfeited property; they were responsible to the king for every penny of revenue. In order to avoid any nepotism the King even went to the lengths of selecting the new commissioners of the English Treasury personally, without recourse to his ministers. He chose three executives, Sir William Coventry, Sir Thomas Clifford and Sir John Duncombe whom he considered ‘rouger hands, ill-natured men, not to be moved with civilities’, and two non executives, the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Duke of Albemarle.

The newly appointed commissioners set to work with alacrity. In 1668, an order in council was issued which decreed that all orders and appointments relating to the collection and disbursement of the revenue must first pass the Treasury’s scrutiny. Defaulting tax farmers were soon placed under arrest and the whole revenue system was submitted to intense scrutiny. In 1671, the collection of customs was placed under the direct control of the treasury secretary, Sir George Downing. The new broom had very quickly proved to be extremely effective.

Meanwhile, the formation of the Scottish Treasury Commission was recorded in the diary of David, 2nd Earl of Wemyss, Rothes’s brother in law:

‘The Treasury in Scotland was settled by way of commission on the 22 July 1667 by His Majesty’s order and command and John, Earl of Rothes was sole treasurer before, so now it is
settled on seven, to wit Earl Rothes is still president in Exchequer, then Lauderdale, Kincardine, Lords Cochrane, Ballantyne and Sir Robert Murray, who was once colonel in France'. 199

The first task of the new Treasury Commissioners in Scotland was to establish an effective executive. Sir Thomas Moncreiffe was awarded the post of Chief Clerk, with the job of recording and implementing the transactions of every treasury meeting. Sir William Sharp, the brother of James Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrews, was appointed Cash Keeper, with the daunting task of ensuring that the treasury books balanced.200 Then having established the requisite personnel, the Commissioners set about an audit of the revenues; each of the principal collectors was charged with producing up to date accounts:

‘At Holyroodhouse 8th July 1667
At a Meeting of the Commissioners of the Treasury
Present
Lord Commissioner his Grace
The Earle of Tweeddale
Lord Bellenden
Lord Cochrane
Sr Ro: Moray

‘That all the Receavers of the King’s Revenues, Taxations, Cesse, Excise, Customes, Fines viz The Duke of Hamilton for the Txation, Sr William Bruce for the ffines and Cess, Sr Adam Blair, Sr John Strauchan and John Campbell for his Maj Revenues, Sr Walter Seaton for the Customs and excise of fforrain comodities, Thomas Moncreiffe for Inland Excise, Mr Patrick Broun for Compositions of Signators Doe bring in to the Commission of the Thesaurary in the Excheker house als exact ane accompt as they can of what sumes they have at present in their hands and what is yet in arrear. The Duke of Hamilton, Sr William Bruce, and Thomas Moncreiffe against ffryday next in the morneing’. 201

Having completed the initial audit, it appears from the ‘sederunt books’ of the Treasury Commission, assiduously written up by Moncreiffe, that there were three serious problems requiring urgent attention. The first concerned the quartering of troops. The cost of maintaining a standing army to subjugate the
covenantors was greater than the revenue allocated to its upkeep from the cess and fines. Both the King’s Commissioner and the principal collector of fines had been forced to intervene personally to ensure that the troops were paid on time.202 As a result, new measures were introduced to reduce the size of the army and to ensure that the revenues were more carefully accounted for:

‘28th January 1668
In order to the presentation of his Maj Comands in the matter under written, Resolved. That Sr William Bruce stand in reddiness betwixt and saturday morning with such moneys as he hes in his hands of Cess and Ffines. To be receaved and tok from him by Mr Wm Sharp Cashkeeper and put up in baggs each bag not exceeding 100 lib ster, wch ar to be sealed by the Cashkeeper and raised up to Edr Castle, put in trunks, wch ar to stand in that vault whear the stones ly. The 3 keyes of the Doores of the vault to be keept by a quorum of the Commissioners, and the keyes of the Trunks to be keept by the Cashkeeper. And hereafter such moneys as comes in of Cess and Ffines not under 500 lib ster, at a time to be receaved sealed and paid up in maner forsaid. All moneys comeing in so not to be disposed of any other way. And that the Constable of the Castle sett a Centinell at the vault doore night and day’. 203

The second pressing problem facing the Treasury Commission concerned the collection of customs and excise duty, which was by far the most significant contributor to the royal revenues. It appears from the correspondence between the Earls of Lauderdale and Tweeddale in 1669 that the principal collector of customs, Sir Walter Seton of Abercorn, had been less diligent than he might have been in maximising the revenue available to him.204 Following a rigorous inspection of Seton’s books, it was clear that he been dishonestly claiming abatements of duty to which he was not entitled. Determined to achieve recompense, Lauderdale wrote to the Commissioners with official instructions:

‘My Lords; Heir inclosed is the Kings answer to the letter of the 26 January last, signed by your Lordships & 3 more of the Committee for re examination of the abaitments granted to Sir W Seton of 16,892 lib sterlin upon his ferm for the yeers 1664 & 1665. I am by his Majestie commanded to direct it to your Lordships and to send yow this inclosed copie of his letar by which yow may see his finall declaration of his pleasure … His Majestie did carefully peruse the whole report and is very positive & peremptorie in this determination. Yet because he is willing
that the matter be transacted as smoothly and secretly as is possible, I am commanded to
authorise yow or any two of yow to send for Sir Walter Seaton before yow deliver this enclosed
letter to the Exchequer ... and if yow finde him willing to pay 5,000 lib sterlin & to quitt his tack
of the salt for the two last yeers yow shall keep up & not deliver the King’s letter to the
Exchequer ... But if he accept not this offer, then yow are to deliver the King’s letter to the
Exchequer to the end the proces may be intented & carefully pursued till it come to a legall
determination’.

The third, and most potentially damaging problem, involved the future of the Scottish salt industry. Until
the 1560s, ‘bay salt’ from France, Spain and Portugal had been readily available throughout Europe, but
when war broke out between Spain and the Low Countries, supplies were severely disrupted. Scottish
salt makers, who had always sold their output in the home market, suddenly found lucrative new markets
for their output in Holland and the Baltic. So profitable did the salt industry become that Sir George
Bruce increased the number of salt pans at Culross from five to forty four. In 1648, hostilities between
Spain and Holland came to an end; the Scottish salt makers were forced to find alternative markets for
their greatly increased production. They succeeded in selling large volumes of salt in the north of
England, until 1668, when the English threatened to impose a trade embargo. The implications for the
Scottish salt industry and the Treasury’s revenues were very serious indeed.

After much discussion about alternative European markets, the Commissioners finally opted for a scheme
that was first proposed by Sir Robert Mylne, Provost of Linlithgow, and his son, Alexander, a merchant
of Linlithgow. In order to avoid unnecessary and damaging competition between producers in a
shrinking market, the Mylnes planned to establish a monopoly of all salt in Scotland, whether it was
produced locally or imported. Sir Robert Moray described the implications to the Earl of Kincardine, a
fellow commissioner:

‘You speak as if you & everybody could sell their salt well enough though it were not all in one
hand. And I shall not easily be persuaded of that, and if without such a bargain every body will
be great losers, a reasonable price as 42s is, should not be continued. You confess some will sell
cheap, and I presume that if a few sell cheap it will spoil the market for the rest’.
The evidence of the ‘sederunt books’ and the correspondence that took place between the commissioners over the problems of the salt industry suggest a considerable depth of knowledge and experience of business affairs. Yet, such a level of experience is hardly surprising: the Earl of Kincardine was the grandson and inheritor of Sir George Bruce’s great salt empire at Culross who knew more about overseas markets for coal and salt than anyone else in Scotland. They may not have been as ruthless and single minded as their English counterparts in trying to gain control of the king’s revenues but the Scottish Treasury Commissioners clearly understood the issues with which they were confronted and were not fearful of taking active steps to remedy them.

However, the same records reveal a second, less savoury, theme. Extracts from the sederunt books reveal the extent to which commissioners and officers took advantage of the Treasury’s powers to further their own and their family’s interests. The Treasury was responsible for the granting or regranting of feudal charters and the collection of feudal grassums. It was much easier therefore to complete land transfers and register feudal rights. Following the conclusion of the marriage between Lauderdale’s only daughter and Tweeddale’s eldest son, it was recorded in the sederunt book:

‘13th September 1667

Infeftment to the Ld Yester and Lady Mary Maitland his lady of the lands and Barony of Beltan erected in ane Erledome and Lordship to be called the Erledome of Tweeddale and Lordship of Yester.

Infeft to the said Lady Mary and the said Lord Hay of Yester upon his owne and his fathers resignation of the Lands and Baronies of Thirlestane, Torbolton’.  

The Treasury Commission was also responsible for the payment of salaries and pensions to the king’s officials in Scotland. A long list entered in the ‘sederunt book’ on 15th July 1669, gives details of the ‘pensions and fies’ that were due for the previous six month period. It includes senior members of the judiciary, a host of clerks, the master of works, the king’s wardrober, even the king’s trumpeters, but at the top of the list were the ‘pensions and fies’ due to the Commissioners themselves:

‘List of Precepts drawn on the Cash Keeper for pensions and fies to the persons following for the term of Whitsunday last
The salaries paid to the leading officials appear to have been generous. As King’s Commissioner, the Earl of Lauderdale received an annual fee of £24,000, topped up by a further £600 per day while he remained in Edinburgh on official business. The Earl of Rothes, in his role as Lord Chancellor, received an annual salary of nearly £14,000, the Earl of Tweeddale, as President of the Privy Council, received £8,000, and the other commissioners, £6000 each. In relative terms, the annual salary of the Earl of Rothes was roughly equivalent to the net surplus on the Strathmore estates. If the Earl of Tweeddale had directed his entire salary to the repayment of his debts, this would account for their significant reduction between 1667 and 1671. In comparison, the level of fees paid to the numerous clerks was very low. Sir Thomas Moncreiffe received only £900 per annum for his work as chief clerk of the Treasury and Sir William Sharp, his Majesty’s cashkeeper, only £660. However, in addition to the payment of annual salaries, there is evidence that significant one-off payments were made at the particular request of the king. For instance, Rothes received £30,000 in recompense for the wardship of the Duchess of Monmouth and the Duchess of Hamilton was finally awarded £24,000 for the losses sustained by her family during the Civil War.
'20th February 1669
Precept on Mr Sharp for 1500 lib ster to the Lord Chancelour wch with 1000 lib paid his lop formerlie is in full of the 2500 lib ster appoynted by his Maj to be paid his lop upon consideration of his pretences to the Wards of the Dutchess of Bucleuch as is at mor lenth exprest in the Kings warrand wherupon the precept on the Cashkeeper is drawn'. 216

'10th July 1669
To be paid out of what is resting of the first two yeeres and whole third yeeres taxation Conforme to his Maj List viz To the Dutches of Hamiltoun 2000 lib ster'. 217

It is clear therefore from the evidence of the ‘sederunt books’ that involvement in the Scottish Treasury provided significant monetary benefits to the individual commissioners. They do not, however, reveal the extent of the profits that could be gained from the most lucrative ‘gifts’, such as the gift of wardship, the gift of seizures or the sale of shipwrecks.218 These were traditional sources of royal revenue that had once been awarded by the king in recognition of loyal service and which had formed the basis of royal patronage, but which now in the era of factionalism were used by the Earl of Lauderdale to gather support. Their importance is illustrated by the significance that was placed upon the grant of ‘prize wrecks’. Whenever a ship went aground off the Scottish coast, the value of the vessel and its cargo became the property of the crown. Rather than carry out their own salvage operation, the Treasury would sell the shipwreck to a third party for a fixed sum, leaving the purchaser to generate as much profit as he could from the sale of the cargo. The significance of ‘prize wrecks’ as a source both of treasury revenue and patronage was well illustrated in a series of letters written by Lauderdale to Sir Robert Moray in 1668:

‘I am much more troubled that I cannot serve honest Earl of Kincardine. That ship was appointed to be broght hither, but ten dayes agoe it was reported to the Council board how unfitt that would be, so she was appointed to be sold, and the money is either for the guards or navie’.
‘I am more greiv’d than yow that I can nothing for honest Kincardin, I knew that ship was impossible, money is not to be parted with heir; She is sold for 1200 lib ready money & without my knowledg till it was done’. 220

The ‘honest’ Earl of Kincardine was also involved in the extraordinary affair of the ‘west india prize’: a long running saga that featured off and on in Lauderdale’s correspondence for nearly four years. It appears that a Dutch vessel went aground off the shore of Shetland in the winter of 1668, whose cargo would have provided much needed revenue for the treasury. Unfortunately, nobody knew the value of the cargo because the ship’s manifest had gone mysteriously missing. Suspicious of ‘vile imbezellments’, Lauderdale ordered an official treasury enquiry, which was to be headed by Kincardine.221 The enquiry uncovered the alleged involvement of Sir Thomas Moncreiffe, the chief clerk, who was of Orcadian extraction and who had maintained close contacts in Orkney and Shetland. Moncreiffe had apparently been party to the concealment of the ship’s log, in the hope of acquiring the vessel at a price much below its real value, but when faced with the evidence of the enquiry he decided to confess his part in the affair. Somehow, he managed to avoid criminal proceedings, despite the fury of the Earl of Lauderdale, who complained to the Earl of Tweeddale; ‘As to Tom Moncreif his vile miscarriage I know not what to say’. 222

It may not be possible to quantify the precise level of profit that could be earned by those who were closely related to Lauderdale’s Treasury Commission but the story of the ‘west india prize’ gives some indication of its culture and the methods that were used to reap rewards. It also explains how someone, as poorly remunerated as Sir Thomas Moncreiffe, could have earned his contemporary reputation:

‘As yet he has no issue but is the richest and has the most opulent fortune that ever any of the name had in the Kingdom, and is a Knight Baronet having risen to Riches and Honour by the favour and means of John Earl of Crawford Thesaurer of Scotland and by his own Industry and Parsimony’. 223

There was one final advantage from which the commissioners and officers of the Treasury appear to have benefited greatly. In an economy that was desperately short of specie many private financial transactions
were made through the issue of personal bonds: family archives of the period are full of bonds issued to local tradesmen, many of which have been assigned to a third party. Similarly, the distributions made by the Treasury were issued not in cash but in the form of promissory notes or 'precepts'. It was the primary duty of Sir William Sharp, his Majesty's Cash keeper, to ensure that the value of precepts issued by the Treasury did not exceed the value of the revenue collected. Because he and his guarantors were personally liable for any shortfall, he was exceedingly diligent about ensuring that his books balanced. When it came to items of major expenditure, like building projects, it was of enormous advantage to the purchaser to offer payment by way of a precept backed by the reserves of the Treasury, rather than a personal bond. It was also an advantage to know the current state of the Treasury's balances and when a precept would become available. If you were either a commissioner or an officer of the Treasury, you had the benefit of both. When Lauderdale wrote to Sir William Bruce from London in 1672, regarding his plans for the reconstruction of Brunstane, he was clearly writing to someone who, as a senior tax collector, would know how to proceed:

‘Now the reason why I recommended secrecy to you when I first called for the draught was because I stood in awe of Sir William Sharp, and was unwilling to give him an alarme before I had taken my resolutions. But now there is no remedy; I am resolved to build this summer, and therefore you must adventure to tell him the whole matter. I hope he will not beat you. The worst is but a chiding, and clawing of his lugg divers times, and calling ‘where is the cash?’

By 1672 the Treasury Commission had achieved some success in applying greater discipline to the collection and distribution of the royal revenues. The commissioners themselves were able men who had established an effective executive who recorded every transaction and carefully balanced the books. Like their counterparts at the English treasury they had taken steps to root out corruption in the collection of customs and excise duty. Beneath the surface, however, there was already evidence that the underlying culture had actually changed very little: self-interest was as prevalent as it had ever been. In sharp contrast to the indebtedness of many other members of the nobility, the commissioners enjoyed enormous financial benefits: they were well remunerated, they were awarded lucrative 'gifts' and they enjoyed excellent credit. Yet these benefits also carried a cost. If the Earl of Lauderdale wished to dispense with their services, he could do so overnight. Similarly, if Lauderdale himself lost the ear of the king, they
would fall with him. The government of Scotland was now as deeply embedded in factionalism as the government in England.  

Close relationships were a fundamental part of the operations of the Treasury Commission. Amongst the commissioners there was a hard core of Lauderdale's relations, but in addition to these immediate family bonds, there were other very close links like the relationship that developed between the Earl of Lauderdale, Sir Robert Moray, Alexander 2nd Earl of Kincardine and Sir William Bruce. Sir Robert Moray had a most unusual background: he was both a courtier and soldier of fortune. In 1641 he had been approached by the Marquis de la Ferte-Imbault, the French ambassador in London, for assistance in recruiting Scottish troops for the French army which was active in the Spanish Netherlands: Richelieu had offered to form a regiment of 'Scottish Guards' with Moray as colonel. Two years later, Moray's new regiment had been routed at Tuttlingen on the Rhine and he himself had been imprisoned at Ingolstadt in Bavaria until 1645. Over the next ten years Moray played an active role in the negotiations that took place between the Scots and the Crown. It was in this period that he established himself as a close confidant of both Charles I and Charles II and also of the Earl of Lauderdale. Having taken part in the Glencairn Rising, the aborted attempt to restore Charles II to the throne, Moray had finally travelled to Maastricht in Holland where he spent the next five years in exile.  

When the king was eventually restored to the throne, it was Moray's impeccable connections, which ensured that his brother, Sir William Moray, was awarded the post of Master of Works. However, the same connections led to his becoming an integral part of Lauderdale's quest for power. When Lauderdale travelled to Edinburgh in June 1663 to attend a session of Parliament, shortly after the demise of his rival the Earl of Middleton, he did so in the knowledge that Moray would successfully represent his interests at court. In 1667, when the time came to displace the Earl of Rothes, Lauderdale remained at court and sent Moray, who was renowned for his tact and diplomacy, to Edinburgh to carry out the coup d'etat. For this singular service Sir Robert Moray was awarded a seat on the newly formed Treasury Commission.  

Moray also enjoyed an extremely close relationship with Alexander, 2nd Earl of Kincardine. The extent of their friendship is revealed in the Kincardine Papers, a series of almost a hundred and twenty five letters written by Moray to Kincardine between 1657 and 1673. The great majority of the letters were written
between September 1657 and December 1658, while Moray was living in exile at Maastricht and Kincardine was incarcerated at Bremen suffering from 'ane quartane ague'. During this period, Moray wrote twice a week to 'his dear friend', attempting to raise his spirits during his illness. However, interspersed amongst a flow of paternal sympathy and advice, the letters reveal that a plan existed whereby Moray, Kincardine and another individual known only as 'Will:' would spend the winter of 1657 together at Maastricht. Unfortunately, the meeting was postponed because of Kincardine's illness, but a letter written in August 1660 finally reveals the identity of the mysterious third man. 'Will:' was none other than William Bruce, a first cousin of the Earl of Kincardine and Sir William Moray's successor as Master of Works. Although the meeting at Maastricht never took place, all three would-be participants became integral members of the Treasury Commission: Kincardine replaced Moray as a commissioner when he returned to London in June 1668 and Sir William Bruce became principal collector of the fines and cess.

Sir Robert Moray was responsible for another, very extraordinary, feature of the Treasury Commission. Of the twelve individuals who served as Commissioners between 1667 and 1682, four were members of the recently established Royal Society in London: Sir Robert Moray and the Earls of Kincardine, Tweeddale and Argyll. Indeed Moray and Kincardine were actually founding fellows. Unlike their counterparts at the English Treasury who were hard and disciplined accountants, there was a strong core at the Scottish Treasury of natural philosophers: men who followed the rapidly growing interest in scientific experimentation that was now firmly established in London. Their interest in science may have been dilettante but the Kincardine Papers give some indication of the range of subjects that were discussed. Moray's letters were full of references to his observations and experiments. He was able to converse knowledgeably with Kincardine on a plethora of practical issues, often citing examples that he had experienced during his travels:

'The trick they have here of cooking coals would do well in many places: but in Scotland it is hard to get people to begin new experiments. I remember they have an odd kind of fewell in the Carse of Gowry...'
If you would transport carpes the surest way will be before they spawn, but whether they have spawned or not, they must be carried in the largest hogshead or butts you can get ... here is all my skill, but to help you to better satisfaction I intend to speak with experts fishers about them...  

I saw the pond at Islington dry 20 years ago, and all the pipes thereabout taken up whereof many were faulty then, & all furred with that green wormy moss I told you of long ago, and I was then in company of some ingeniers that did pretend to great skill in Aqueducks who were then on a new project of bringing a new river to London in the old Roman way...  

He was able to recommend the most suitable books for a library and their most reliable source. He wrote about gardening and the source of plants and seeds. He discussed the use of mathematical instruments and the design of watches. He declared a love of music. He provided a continuous flow of advice on the cure of Kincardine’s illness. Throughout the correspondence Moray alluded to the existence of a far greater knowledge that would only be revealed when they finally met at Maastricht; ‘8 Chapters and some 5 or 6 and 40 sections’.  

After the restoration, when Moray had returned to London and Kincardine was living at Culross, the correspondence took on a fresh perspective. In the early letters, Moray seems to have acted as Kincardine’s mentor. In the later correspondence, his role had altered: he was now acting as his agent and business confidant. The reason for this change was the death of Kincardine’s elder brother in 1662. Kincardine had not only succeeded to the earldom; he had also inherited the family’s coal and salt enterprise at Culross. Although the business had been highly profitable, the problems of the salt industry had caused real difficulties. Kincardine was forced to investigate new production techniques, new markets and even new products. If he could control the water level in the mineshafts, he would be able to extend his coal workings. Moray wrote offering his advice:

‘If your wastes be great, and your coal level; 6 fathom of water will be a tedious work to draw out, unless your wheels master the growth very easily at other times; or that you can much promote it by bringing more water and bettering your Engyn. The doubling of the size of your
buckets will be a mighty addition, so they move as quickly as before, else you will lose time, there is nothing or little got by augmenting the content of the wheels... 248

By 1664, Kincardine had started a new venture: the extraction and sale of building stone. 249 However, he was faced with the age-old problem of finding markets for his output. Moray was, of course, the ideal agent. As an active member of the Royal Society, with the most valuable contacts, he was able to promote Kincardine’s stone to Sir John Denham, the King’s surveyor, for use as a suitable lining material in St Pauls Cathedral and as a foundation stone at Greenwich. 250 Yet, try as he might, the venture was consistently frustrated by the cost of freight and the imposition of customs duty:

‘It is hard to give a reason why your stone should not be more sought for here then it is if humor be not it. If your Dutch bargain hold it will do well, and I doubt not but you will get others from there ere long. But I do not see anybody here disposed to fetch stone there upon any termes...’ 251

However, the subject that interested Moray and Kincardine more than any other was the design of clocks and it was this interest that brought them both into direct contact with one of the most remarkable scientific brains of the century: the celebrated Dutch astronomer and mathematician, Christiaan Huygens. In April 1658, Moray wrote to Kincardine with the news of a recent discovery:

‘I have yet to tell you that I have this day seen an exceeding pretty invention of a new way of watch which, indeed, I take to be the very exactest that ever was thought upon. The Rhyngrave shew it me, it is long since I heard of it but did not expect what now I did see: the inventor undertakes it shall not vary one minute in six moneths. Verly I think he is not much too bold. He is a young Gentleman of 22, second son of Zulicon, the Prince of Orange’s Secretary, a rare Mathematician, excellent in all pairts of it...’ 252

What Moray had seen was Huygens’ revolutionary design for the world’s first pendulum clock, but what Kincardine saw was the potential that the pendulum watch offered in solving one of the great problems of seventeenth century navigation: the determination of longitude. 253 If successful it would bring untold wealth to the designers. In what appears to have been a joint venture, Kincardine and Huygens managed
to design an improved version of the clock that was sent for sea trials in 1663.\textsuperscript{254} There then began an unseemly row about patent rights, which was only solved by the intervention of Sir Robert Moray who proposed that the patent should be held by the Royal Society, rather than the two individuals.\textsuperscript{255} Unfortunately, the sea trials were unsuccessful but Moray's intervention did result in Huygens' election to the Society. Through his extraordinary network of acquaintances in Europe, Moray managed to recruit a number of other distinguished scientists to the Society: Gottfried Leibniz, the celebrated German mathematician and philosopher, Johann Hevelius, the influential Polish astronomer and Nicolas Mercator, the great German map maker.\textsuperscript{256}

Moray's discussions with other members of the Royal Society were hardly the sort of cutting edge science that was debated by luminaries like Robert Boyle, Robert Hooke or Christopher Wren.\textsuperscript{257} His role was very similar to that of his great friend and fellow founder of the Royal Society, John Evelyn, who was in constant demand as a consultant. In July 1670, Evelyn recorded in his diaries just such a visit to the Master of the Mint:

\begin{quote}
'I went to Lond. to accompany my worthy friend, that excellent man (Sir Rob. Morray) with Mr Slingsby Master of the Mint, to see his Seate and Estate at Burrow Greene in Cambridgeshire: desiring our advice for the placing a new house Mr Slingsby was resolved to build ... This had ben the entient seate of the Cheekes (whose daughter Mr. Slingsby married) formerly Tutor to K. Edward the Sixt: The old house large & ample & built for ancient hospitalitie, ready to fall down with age; plac'd in a dirty hole, a stiffe clay, no water &c ... so we pitch'd upon a spot, on a rising ground, & adorn'd with venerable woods, a dry & sweete prospect E; & West, & fit for a Parke, at some mile distant, but no running water to be found'.\textsuperscript{258}
\end{quote}

It is evident therefore that within the ranks of the Scottish Treasury Commission there existed a core of individuals, with enterprising and enquiring minds, who would take a genuine interest in the last of the Treasury's official duties: the upkeep of the king's castles and palaces in Scotland.
Since the restoration, the office of Master of Works had been held by Sir William Moray, the younger brother of Sir Robert Moray, but in 1670 he was forced to resign under mounting financial pressure. As a result, the Treasury Commissioners needed to find a replacement to carry out a survey of repairs at Stirling Castle. They turned first to James Gregory, Professor of Mathematics at the University of St Andrew's, who must have been assumed to possess sufficient technical qualifications for 'preparing a draught of ye plan of ye Castle of Sterling' but for some unaccountable reason, they changed their minds. Only a fortnight later it was recorded in the 'sederunt book':

8th July 1671
In obedience to his Maties letter concerning the reparation of ye Castle of Sterling The Lords recommend to ye Earle of Kincardin and L Ther Deput to go to Sterling and view ye said Castle and see what reparation will be necessarie for ye same and Sr Wm Bruce Surveyor generall to go along with them.

William Bruce had, of course, been one of the trio who had planned to meet at Maastricht in 1658 and had participated in the broad ranging correspondence that took place between Moray and Kincardine. He had spent several years in La Rochelle and Rotterdam where he traded as a merchant, probably as an active participant in a well-established triangular trade that existed between the hinterland of Germany and the South Netherlands, France, and England, Scotland and Ireland, a trade that was centred on Rotterdam. Bruce was therefore resident in Holland when Italian classicism was at the height of fashion amongst the rich Dutch merchant class, while Jacob van Campens' great new Town Hall was under construction in Amsterdam. What is more his mentor, Sir Robert Moray, had even participated in the location of the new Town Hall at Maastricht, proposed by another celebrated Dutch architect, Pieter Post. William Bruce possessed all the experience that the English gentleman architect, Sir Roger Pratt, considered essential for a successful architect.

Having been involved in negotiations with General Monk for the restoration of the king, William Bruce returned to Scotland in 1660 and was first awarded a post in the judiciary as Clerk of the Bills. With the accounting skills that he would have learned as a merchant in Holland, Bruce was then selected by the Earl of Rothes, the Lord Treasurer, as principal collector of the cess and fines. When the Treasury Commission was established in 1667, William Bruce was an integral member, but as a tax collector rather
than an architect. In the same year he obtained his first employment on a building project in Scotland. On
the death of the Master Mason, John Mylne, Bruce was appointed custodian of ‘draughts and mapes’ for
the Earl of Rothes’ new palace at Leslie. 266 In 1670, Bruce was selected, as a senior tax collector, to
participate in the negotiations that were to take place in London for an act of union between England and
Scotland. 267 It was while he was in London, negotiating the future of the Scottish economy, that he began
discussions with Sir Robert Moray about the proposed plans for the Earl of Tweeddale’s new house:

‘Sir W Bruce & I are to hold a consultation about your new house at Yester. The addition to your
Edinburgh house will do well, for I presume you will make the same stair be usefull to it that
serves the other; but your present weariness will go over & you will think of what I suggested
when you are put to it’. 268

On the surface it seems that Bruce may not have taken his responsibilities as a negotiator seriously.
However, it has to be remembered that while he was in London he was acting as a representative of the
Treasury Commission and the Commission was, of course, responsible for both the collection of the
king’s revenues and the upkeep of his palaces. In 1670 Bruce was clearly beginning to believe that one
person could successfully manage both functions: a year later, he would have the opportunity to prove it.

Following Sir Walter Seton’s impropriety, a lengthy debate took place between the Treasury
Commissioners as to the most effective method for the future collection of customs duty. The options
were either to ‘farm’ the collection as they had done in the past, or to follow the example of the English
Treasury Commission and appoint their own collector. Tax ‘farming’ offered one enormous advantage:
the Treasury did not have to wait until the customs revenue had been collected before they could spend
the money. Whoever acquired the ‘farm’ was obliged to guarantee a sum for five years against which his
Majesty’s cash keeper could immediately issue ‘precepts’. In addition, there was a particular project that
the king wished to set in motion. In February 1671, the Earl of Kincardine reported to the Earl of
Lauderdale:
‘Then did L. Hatton after clerks & all officers were removed tell us that it was the kings mynd the customs should be farmed, that his Matie designed the reparation of the Palace of Holyroodhouse & the bestowing upon it 10 or 20,000 libs ster’.269

In March, the new ‘farm’ was put up for sale at public auction; it was won by a syndicate, headed by Sir William Bruce, which guaranteed the enormous sum of £26,000 sterling for a five year ‘tack’.270 By winning the roup, Bruce had ensured that he was not only the surveyor of the Holyrood project, he was also its chief financier.

However, he was far from being given a free hand. William Bruce was only one member of what seems to have been an executive committee of the Treasury Commission in charge of the King’s buildings, which consisted of himself, his cousin, the Earl of Kincardine, and Charles, Lord Hatton, the Earl of Lauderdale’s youngest brother who had been appointed Lord Treasurer Depute in 1670.271 Kincardine’s primary role seems to have been that of devil’s advocate. It was he who questioned the scale and cost of the original proposals:

‘I have been with LH at Will Bruce’s twice concerning Thirlestain Castle & LH had written all that needs be said concerning it. We talked likewise concerning Holyroodhouse & LH and I are afraid this great design run too high but there is enough to advise’.272

Hatton’s role is more difficult to define. As Treasurer Depute, he was directly responsible to his brother for the day to day operations of the Treasury but like Kincardine he was possessed of an enquiring mind. As early as 1666, he had been commissioned by Lauderdale to draw plans for the park at Lethington. A year later he was able to report that work on the park was well under way and that plans for remodelling the house were in the hands of the Earl of Tweeddale and Sir Robert Moray ‘who are to utter some of their thought to gid ye about it’.273 For nearly three years, Kincardine, Hatton and Bruce seem to have worked as a team. Together they toured between Holyrood, Thirlestane and Brunstane, discussing the details and progress of each project and berating the unfortunate master mason, Robert Mylne, whenever work fell behind schedule.274 In 1673, the working relationship was good enough for Bruce to be invited to advise on the reconstruction of Hatton’s own house:
‘The last post is the first I have neglected to write since I came to Scotland & it was not
avoidable being necessitate to go in haste with Sr Wm Bruce to Haltoun to prevent some danger
in taking downe of my Tower’.

The close cooperation between Kincardine, Hatton and Bruce lasted only until 1674, but in that period a
method was devised by which the Earl of Lauderdale’s wishes could be translated into reality despite his
absence. Thirlestane was far from being a provincial building project inspired and financed by the king
and the court in London; the house was designed by Scots and was funded by Scottish revenues.

Without Lauderdale’s active participation, it is difficult to imagine how Scottish country house
architecture would have evolved in the aftermath of Cromwell’s Interregnum. A number of houses were
already under construction before his appointment as King’s Commissioner: the Earl of Rothes had
commissioned John Mylne to remodel Leslie and the Earls of Panmure and Wemyss had begun the
reformation of their respective paternal seats; but it was not until Lauderdale took outright control of the
king’s revenues that the pace of construction accelerated. With all the pecuniary advantages that
Lauderdale’s patronage provided, the commissioners and executives of the Scottish Treasury became
involved in a frenzy of housebuilding. The Earl of Tweeddale extended the old house of Yester. The Earl
of Dunonald acquired and improved the Commendator’s house at Paisley Abbey. The Earl of Kincardine
acquired and extended Culoss Abbey House. Lord Hatton remodelled his wife’s house of Hatton and
acquired and remodelled Dudhope. The Earl of Atholl built a new lodge at Dunkeld. The Earl of Argyll
acquired and reformed the lodging of Sir William Alexander in Stirling. The Earl of Queensberry
remodelled Drumlanrig. Sir William Bruce acquired and rebuilt Balcaskie, and then constructed the new
house of Kinross. Sir Thomas Moncreiffe acquired the lands of Moncreiffe and built a new house. (see
appendix 2 & 4) Sir Andrew Ramsay acquired and rebuilt Abbotshall. Sir Robert Mylne acquired and
extended the house of Barnton. Each house was funded either directly or indirectly from the king’s
revenues in Scotland.

A similar ‘great rebuilding’ took place in England after the restoration, yet it was accomplished in a quite
different way. The English Treasury, like its Scottish counterpart, was responsible for the administration
of the Office of Works and the appointment of the King’s Surveyor, but because there was such a heavy workload of churches, palaces and public buildings, Sir Christopher Wren was unable to establish a private-house practice. The design and construction of country houses fell instead to a group of architects like Sir Roger Pratt, Hugh May, Robert Hooke and William Talman, each with his own distinctive style. In Scotland, there was only one official royal building project to absorb the talents of the King’s Surveyor, the rebuilding of Holyroodhouse. Unlike Wren in England, Sir William Bruce had time to act as ‘consultant architect’, not only to the Earl of Lauderdale, but to almost all of his fellow members of the Treasury. As a result, the development of country house architecture in Scotland remained within the confines of a very small group who were both resourceful and cultured.
Chapter 3

The Members of the Treasury Commission 1667-1682

'I am much addicted to a general reformatione, and have not a little propagate that humour in the
cuntrie where I live, as generally improvements have been more since the time of the King's happie
restauratione then has been in a hundred years before, and every on almost att the instance or
example of some leader has done more or less'.

'The Book of Record': the Diary of Patrick, 3rd Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn. 280

The importance of the Treasury's role in the cultural and architectural development of Scotland in the
post restoration period is confirmed by the testimony of Patrick, 3rd Earl of Strathmore, who was himself
a Treasury Commissioner and believed that he was one of the 'leaders' of culture and fashion in
Scotland. 281 His diary provides an invaluable contemporary account of the lifestyle of a member of the
Scottish nobility and the issues that were considered important in the late seventeenth century. Using the
'Book of Record' as a guide, the survey will compare the individual characteristics of a survey group
drawn from the ranks of the Treasury in order to establish a comprehensive picture of their aspirations
and ambitions.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to include in the survey everyone who benefited from the king's
revenues: there are individuals for whom insufficient data is available. The Commissioners are well
represented: only Sir Robert Moray and Sir William Bellenden, Lord Treasurer Depute from 1667 to
1671, have been omitted. Moray spent only a brief sojourn in Edinburgh in 1677/8 and neither acquired
an estate nor built a country house; Bellenden had been forced to dispose of his family's properties of
Saughton and Saughtonhall in 1625 and never acquired a replacement. 282 With these two exceptions, all
eleven commissioners who served between 1667 and 1682 have been included in the survey group. It is
much more difficult however, to find suitable representatives of the Treasury Executive: so many of their
houses have been destroyed or emasculated. Fortunately, there is plentiful archive material relating to Sir
William Bruce and Sir Thomas Moncreiffe, and their houses. In order to provide a balanced analysis, another numerate 'man of affairs' has been added to the group. Patrick Smyth of Braco, a merchant of Orcadian origins, became principal financial adviser to the Earl of Atholl. In 1664, he acquired the lands and barony of Methven in Perthshire where he constructed a new house. These fourteen individuals together with their houses will form the basis of the survey. (see appendix 1, 2, 3, & 4)

Even the most cursory glance at the profile of each member of the group shows the clear distinction that existed between the Commissioners and the Executive. There were only two out of eleven commissioners who did not inherit an earldom: Charles Maitland, Lord Treasurer Depute, and Sir William Cochrane, who was created Earl of Dundonald in 1669. Of the remainder, three inherited earldoms created before the reign of James VI and six inherited earldoms created during the reigns of James VI and Charles I. (see appendix 1A) Although the Earldom had been created in 1606, the charter of the lands of Glamis had been granted to the Lyon family in 1372. By the time of the restoration, the family had been resident at Glamis for nearly three hundred years. This pattern was repeated by a majority of the Treasury Commissioners: seven out of ten commissioners inherited estates that had been gifted to their respective families before the fifteenth century, and another, the Earl of Moray, was descended from the half brother of Mary, Queen of Scots. There can be no mistaking the fact that the great majority of the Treasury Commissioners were members of the noblesse d’epee who could trace their families' lineage back over many generations.

The Earl of Strathmore inherited three estates from his father: Glamis, Castle Lyon and Belhelvie in Aberdeenshire, which was sold to his uncle, the Earl of Panmure. He also inherited two houses: Glamis 'the ancient seat of my family' and Castle Lyon, which had been acquired by his grandfather from Lord Gray, 'a place of no consideration'. This pattern of multiple inheritance was repeated by a very high proportion of the Treasury Commissioners. The Earl of Lauderdale inherited Thirlestane and Lethington. The Earl of Tweeddale inherited Yester and Neidpath. The Earl of Rothes inherited Leslie and Ballenbreich. The Earl of Atholl inherited Blair and Dunkeld. The Earl of Argyll inherited Inveraray and Castle Campbell. The Earl of Moray inherited Darnaway, Castle Stewart and Donibristle. The Earl of Queensberry inherited Drumlanrig and Sanquhar. In each instance, one of the houses would be described as the family's 'ancient paternal seat'. (see appendix 2A)
When he was offered Pinkie by the Earl of Tweeddale, the Earl of Lauderdale refused the opportunity on the grounds that he could not afford it:

"In the first place I give you heartie thanks for yor kinde offer of Pinkie, but my minde is not changed as to the purchas, I dreaded it so when my father was fond of it that I cannot reconcile myself to it: Besides I have too many houses & so little land, you know I am not in condition to lay out such a summa for so small a rent & the house were to me ane useles chargeable burden". 286

According to this evidence, it was deemed a prudent commercial decision to acquire land that generated an annual return: a house without any land was regarded as an expensive luxury. Despite their inheritance, there were two commissioners who did acquire new houses. The Earl of Atholl acquired Falkland from his close kinsman, the Earl of Annandale in 1664 and the Earl of Argyll purchased Sir William Alexander’s lodging at Stirling in 1665. 287 It seems likely that these acquisitions were the result of convenience: the principal residences of the Earls of Argyll and Atholl were geographically remote and would not provide accommodation within reach of Edinburgh. The Earl of Kincardine was another commissioner who purchased a convenient house without an accompanying estate. In 1672, he acquired Culross Abbey House from his cousin the Earl of Elgin. 288 It seems, however, that Kincardine’s motivation was different from the Earls of Argyll and Atholl. On inheriting the earldom from his elder brother, he had taken possession of the family’s diminutive townhouse, the ‘Palace of Culross’, which had no potential for expansion or refinement. 289 By acquiring the Abbey House, he had purchased a building that could be easily remodelled into a country house befitting his new status as an hereditary peer.

The two commissioners who received no inheritance took a much more aggressive approach to property: Charles Maitland and Sir William Cochrane. By his judicious marriage to Elizabeth, the only daughter and heiress of Richard Lauder of Hatton, Maitland not only inherited his father-in-law’s house and estate but also took the title, Lord Hatton, when he was admitted an extraordinary lord of session. 290 Then in 1668, he persuaded his brother to intercede on his behalf to acquire the ancient seat of the Scrymgeour family at Dudhope near Dundee:
‘I forgot to tell you he hath a designe upon Dudhops gift of ultimas hares, but that will keep cold, for I told him there is too long of setting out, but ther is no remedie now’. 291

Meanwhile, Sir William Cochrane acquired numerous houses and estates during his lifetime. Having inherited the estate of Cowdons in Ayrshire from his father, he acquired the ancient royal castle of Dundonald, which provided the destination of his earldom. He also purchased the house and lands of Auchans, Ochiltree, Kilmaronock, and the Commendator’s house at Paisley Abbey, where ‘he fix’d his abode and lived in great splendour’. 292 By acquiring such extensive property interests, Charles Maitland and Sir William Cochrane had become indistinguishable from the other commissioners whose lands had been inherited.

If the great majority of the Treasury Commissioners represented the ‘ancient nobility’ of Scotland, the provenance of the Executives was much closer to that of Maitland and Cochrane. None of them inherited a title, although William Bruce and Thomas Moncreiffe both acquired baronetcies. 293 Likewise, none of them inherited ancestral lands, yet all of them acquired substantial estates. (see appendix 4A) Each of them prospered by their own diligence and each of them was highly numerate. Sir Thomas Moncreiffe was born in Orkney, the son of a merchant from Kirkwall, whose father had escaped from the mainland following a bloodfeud. Sir William Bruce was the second son of a Fife laird, Robert Bruce of Blairhall, whose uncle, Sir George Bruce of Carnock, had prospered handsomely from his coalmines and salt pans at Culross during the reign of James VI. Patrick Smyth was the eldest surviving son and heir to another Orcadian merchant, Patrick Smyth of Braco. Each of the executives stemmed from a background in trade.

Contemporary accounts of Sir Thomas Moncreiffe provide no explanation for his decision to leave Orkney and take up residence on the mainland. However, it is alleged that he acted as ‘servitor’ to the Earl of Crawford Lindsay, Lord Treasurer from 1660 to 1663, and had been awarded the post of collector of the inland excise before the Treasury was placed in commission in 1667. 294 Before his return to Scotland in 1660, Sir William Bruce was involved in a nefarious range of business ventures. He shipped timber from Norway and wine to Holland; he attempted to sell Scottish coal in Rouen; he invested in the Greenland whaling industry and even considered taking up residence in Antigua in the West Indies. 295
Patrick Smyth also began his career as a merchant. In 1646, he seems to have served an apprenticeship in the cloth trade in Danzig 'in the employ' of Alexander Johnstoun, an Edinburgh merchant. In 1650, he was involved in local trade in the north of Scotland, transporting 'bere' from the estates of the Earl of Morton on Orkney to buyers at Cromartie and Chanonrie. In 1654, he entered into an agreement to procure salmon from the Speyside estates of the Earl of Dunfermline for export to France. In addition to his trading operations, he began lending money to indebted members of the Scottish nobility: Kenneth, Earl of Seaforth, Hugh, Lord Lovat, Sir William Sinclair of Mey, Sir Thomas Urquhart, David Lindsay of Edzell, Robert Moray of Abercairney and the Laird of Kilravock. Like William Bruce, Patrick Smyth was both numerate and resourceful.

However, with the restoration of the monarchy, the careers of the executives began to change. Fresh opportunities for profit became increasingly dependent upon patronage. In a letter dated May 1665, it is clear that Sir William Bruce owed his appointment as Collector of the Fines to the influence of the Earl of Rothes, the King's Commissioner and Lord Treasurer, and the Earl of Lauderdale, Secretary of State:

'You will excus expressly seing you know how willing I will ever be to serve you: in this particular of your Commission & salariie it was impossible to serv you better. Only this I must in justice be as witnes that our noble frend My Lord Bellenden doe press almost to the degree of importunity that your salariie might be twelv ponds, but it was so farr beyond the greatest poundage heir that it was absolutely impossible; the best that could be obtained was that wch you will find in the commission'.

Only two years later, Bruce had become sufficiently affluent to offer personal surety for payment of the troops that were engaged in the suppression of the covenantors. By 1671, when his syndicate acquired the five-year tack of the collection of customs, William Bruce had become indispensable to the effective management of the king's revenues in Scotland and was rewarded with an unusually appreciative and friendly letter from his patron, the Earl of Lauderdale:

'I am very glad by yrs of the 9th to heare that you have with so much advantage to his Maties service farmed his customes. I have acquainted his Matie with it who is very sensible of so
seasonable a service. As for myself I doe say very heartily well become minister, I shall be very
readie to serve you in that any other occasion, for amongst other kindnesses of yrs I can not
forget yor franc journey in the year 1663. I like very well the way you have taken to bring those
things for me from Holland. 301

The career of Patrick Smyth followed a very similar course after the restoration: he too became less
involved in trade and more dependent upon patronage, but instead of using patronage to obtain a lucrative
post at the Treasury, he became ‘man of affairs’ to the Earl of Atholl. From 1658 when he advised upon
the purchase of Falkland until 1685 when he was present at the defeat and arrest of the Earl of Argyll,
Smyth accompanied Atholl on every major event in his patron’s career. 302 It seems that Smyth’s
reputation as a successful and numerate merchant must have recommended him as a ‘man of affairs’, but
he was also the consummate networker. Through his connections in the north of Scotland, Smyth had lent
6000 merks to Sir William Sinclair of Mey; this loan was guaranteed by a caution from Sinclair’s brother-
in-law, Sir George Mackenzie of Tarbat. 303 In 1677, Smyth entered into a contract with David Bruce of
Clackmannan for the purchase of 3000 chalders of coal: Bruce of Clackmannan was Sir George
Mackenzie’s son-in-law. 304 It is not clear whether these arrangements were made at Mackenzie’s behest
to alleviate any potential embarrassment that the indebtedness of his family might have caused to his
political ambitions but they certainly provided Patrick Smyth with an opportunity for profit. In 1678,
Mackenzie was appointed Lord Clerk Register and readmitted to the Privy Council. As such he was in a
position of considerable influence and Smyth was considered ‘so gratlie his frend and servant’. 305 So
close was Patrick Smyth’s relationship with his two patrons, Atholl and Mackenzie, they were both
named as executors to his last will and testament. 306

Having profited in different ways from the patronage system, each of the three executives then followed
exactly the same course. Like Charles Maitland and Sir William Cochrane, they all set out to acquire
landed estates in the same opportunistic fashion that typified their business affairs: by taking advantage of
the financial difficulties of the owners. In 1665, Sir William Bruce purchased the estate of Balcaskie in
Fife from Sir John Moncreiffe, 2nd Baronet, who had inherited the lands in 1651, ‘under great burthens
through the profuseness of his Mother, which he could not overcome’. 307 When Patrick Smyth bought
Methven, the last of the Duke of Lennox’s estates in Scotland, over half of the purchase price of 44,000
merks was committed to relieving reversionary mortgages incurred by the Duke during the Civil War. There were, however, serious difficulties in acquiring an estate from an impoverished owner because it was likely that the property would be encumbered with numerous mortgages and liferents. When Sir Thomas Moncreiffe acquired his family’s ancestral lands of Moncreiffe in Perthshire, it took nearly fifteen years to settle the liferents of Sir John’s two sisters and redeem the numerous bonds and mortgages that had been issued to local merchants and neighbours. The complications of acquiring an indebted estate could cause protracted legal arguments as Sir William Bruce discovered when he entered into an agreement with the Earl of Morton for the purchase of the estate of Kinross.

The financial problems that faced the Earls of Morton had been caused by the 7th Earl’s magnanimous support of the royalist cause during the Civil War. He had not only sold his family’s ancestral seat of Dalkeith but had also incurred enormous debts. As a result, the 9th Earl found himself under very considerable pressure from his creditors. Because the debts had been guaranteed, the successors of the original cautioners also found themselves in a precarious situation: one of those successors was his brother-in-law, the Earl of Strathmore. In order to resolve this potentially ruinous situation, Morton and Strathmore had entered into an agreement in 1664 whereby Strathmore agreed to reduce his claims against Morton in return for two bonds. In the first bond Morton agreed to pay Strathmore the sum of £27,840. In the second bond, Morton promised to relieve Strathmore of all outstanding debts and cautions. However, it was also agreed that if Morton failed to meet the terms of either bond, Strathmore could take recourse by disposing of a half share of the lands of Kinross.

Ten years later, the financial plight of the Earl of Morton was still unrelieved. In 1675, he agreed to accept an offer from Sir William Bruce to acquire the estate of Kinross in return for his relieving outstanding debts estimated at 673,333 merks. Believing that he had entered into a legal transaction, Bruce began to prepare the site for his splendid new classical house, but in so doing he seems to have incurred the jealousy of the Earl of Morton who claimed that Bruce had bought the estate for a song. In support of his claims, Morton persuaded the Earl of Strathmore to revisit the validity of his original agreement, by which he had been granted a reversionary interest over the Kinross estate. For ten years a protracted and costly lawsuit ensued about the rights and wrongs of the price that Sir William Bruce had paid. Bruce argued passionately that he had paid a full and honest price:
‘Sir William will make it appear and instruct that he made a generouse and honest purchass and full payment for ye adequatt value of ye said estate, without the least relation to base and sneaking advantages, by unquestionable documents’.

Strathmore retaliated by describing Bruce as ‘a teuch lawer’ who had acquired ‘ane noble Lordship, att ane undervalue’ and declined to employ him on the reconstruction of Glamis.

Charles Maitland, Sir William Cochrane and the three executives, Sir Thomas Moncreiffe, Sir William Bruce and Patrick Smyth each took advantage of the financial turmoil of the Civil War and Cromwell’s occupation to acquire landed estates. Yet, the risks that they were prepared to undertake and the tactics that they employed demonstrate just how strongly they aspired to landownership. It is clear, therefore, that the traditional measure of noble status had not changed since the beginning of the seventeenth century: the indivisible link between family, place and status still remained as strong as ever. Although every member of the survey group possessed at least one landed estate, there was a fundamental difference between an ancient family inheritance like Glamis, which had been in the hands of the Lyon family for three hundred years, and an estate like Kinross, which had been acquired by William Bruce within the last ten years.

Having acquired the status that a feudal charter bestowed, there was one aspiration that the executives could not immediately attain: a noble wife. By entering into a marriage with the daughter of the Earl of Middleton, the Earl of Strathmore was following a precedent that was commonplace amongst the ancient nobility in the seventeenth century. Seventy percent of Scottish earls extant at the restoration married the daughters of other Scottish earls and seven out of eleven Treasury Commissioners did the same thing. In so doing, they ensured that the noble status of future generations was not in any way endangered by hybrid vigour. Meanwhile, not one of the executives married the daughter of an hereditary peer, neither did Charles Maitland nor Sir William Cochrane. Instead, they married the daughters of local lairds or members of the judiciary. Yet, it is interesting to note how quickly these members of the noblesse de robe were assimilated into the ranks of the noblesse d’epee. Charles Maitland’s eldest son married a daughter
of the Earl of Argyll; Sir William Cochrane's eldest son married a daughter of the Earl of Cassillis and Sir William Bruce's only son married a daughter of the Earl of Rothes.

By marrying within such a small gene pool, there was sure to be a degree of consanguinity between the Treasury Commissioners, but the incidence in Lauderdale's treasury was very high indeed. Charles Maitland was his brother, the Earl of Tweeddale was his first cousin (both were grandsons of Chancellor Seton), the Earl of Moray was his nephew and the Earl of Argyll was married to his niece. (see appendix 1B/1 & 1B/2) It seems, therefore, that Lauderdale must have selected members of his family intentionally. If he was forced to remain at court in order to maintain his influence with the king, it was imperative that he left a team of managers in Scotland in whom he had complete faith. In placing his trust in his family, he was perpetuating a tradition that had always been a feature of landed society in Scotland.317

Throughout the sixteenth century, family bonds had been extremely common: written agreements of mutual interdependence in which the signatories became 'as kinsmen to one another'.318 In 1586, the last recorded Bond of Association was subscribed between those of the name of Murray:

‘being convenit for the assurance and ordertaking of our own estates the defence of our rowmes tacks steddings and gear whilk be the invasion of broken men and the unthankfull unnaturall neighbours may appear to be in danger’.319

By the seventeenth century, the need for mutual defence had been replaced by the desire for political advancement and financial protection. Those same Murrays who had signed the Bond of Association became beneficiaries of the Gowrie Conspiracy. For their part in ridding the country of the troublesome Ruthven family, James VI showered them with offices and titles. So generous was the king that many of the original signatories were subsequently ennobled: three were created Earls (Tullibardine, Annandale and Dysart), three were created Lords (Elibank, Balvaird and Scone) and one received a Viscountcy (Stormont).320 What happened in the Murray family was endemic in Scotland during the latter half of the seventeenth century. Kinship pervaded every aspect of life. Patrick Smyth's business empire was built around his immediate family. His brother, David Smyth, acted as baillie at his newly acquired estate of
Methven. His cousin, David Graham, was the local representative of his interests on Orkney. John Gibsone and Richard Murray, his brothers-in-law, advised on local trading conditions in the north of Scotland and collected interest from his creditors. Patrick Monteith, another brother-in-law, who was chamberlain to the Earl of Morton in Orkney, provided him with bere and dealls for sale in Edinburgh. Because he was constantly travelling, Smyth required a reliable support team who could be guaranteed to carry out his instructions. Like the Earl of Lauderdale, he chose members of his family because he knew instinctively that he could trust them. William Bruce followed the same example: his custom’s syndicate included his brother-in-law, Sir Charles Halket of Pitfirrane, his cousin, William Preston of Valleyfield and his kinsman, Sir Alexander Bruce of Broomhall. Even the legal profession was inundated with kinship links. The Mackenzies, Dalrymples and Lockharts held every senior post in the judiciary: Lord President of the Court of Session, Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Advocate and Lord Clerk Register.

Kinship thrived in the milieu of factional government. Lauderdale’s family supported him because they knew that his influence at court would provide a stream of lucrative gifts. Yet, the faction that grew up around the Earl of Lauderdale was overshadowed by the tarantula’s web surrounding the Duke of Hamilton and the members of the Drummond family. The Marquess of Queensberry, Lord Treasurer, and the Earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor, were Hamilton’s brothers-in-law. The Earl of Melfort, Secretary of State, was the younger brother of the Earl of Perth. Viscount Strathallan, General of the Ordinance, was a close kinsman of the Earl of Perth and George Drummond of Milnab, Lord Provost of Edinburgh, a more distant kinsman. Then in 1684 an event took place that was unprecedented, even by Scottish standards. To coincide with Drummond of Milnab’s re-election as Lord Provost, thirty-nine members of the Drummond family were elected burgesses of Edinburgh. Lord Basil Hamilton, the Duke of Hamilton’s youngest son spoke with some experience when he proclaimed:

‘There is some strange thing in blood, I believe most in Scotch of any nation non knowing of clanship so much’.

Whatever the mutual benefits of kinship, there were still grave dangers inherent in factional government. The Earl of Tweeddale had been so enraged by Lauderdale’s decision to disinherit his grandson that he took the rash and costly decision to desert his faction and join forces with the Duke of Hamilton. In so
doing, he lost his annual salary as President of the Privy Council and was eventually forced to sell the family estate of Neidpath in order to repay his debts. Sir William Bruce also fell victim to the vagaries of the patronage system. Lauderdale’s friendly letter in 1671 marked the high point in their relationship. In 1678, he wrote to his secretary in London, Sir Andrew Forrester, with instructions to rescind Bruce’s commission as King’s Surveyor:

‘The warrant for Sr William Bruce … present it to the King for his Royall signature: Tell his Majesty from me That Knight is the bitterest factionalist partie man of his quality in all Scotland, and it is pittie that so rich a man should keep 400 lib per annum for nothing especially he having cost the King many thousand pounds most impertinently’. 329

It was Bruce’s sin to have demonstrated disloyalty to the Lauderdale faction. Between 1668 and 1672, it had become increasingly clear that the Earl of Lauderdale held the Scottish parliament in scant respect and, if possible, he would have preferred to govern the country by decree. 330 In 1670, Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh had complained about his increasingly domineering attitude:

‘Lauderdale never consulted what was to be done; nor were the members of parliament solicited by him, or his friends, upon any occasion; whereas on the contrary, he would of times vent at his table, that such act should be past in spite of all oppositions’. 331

For four years, Lauderdale had been able to impose his own policies upon Parliament because the opposition to them was so fragmented, but in 1673 he was faced with the united forces of the Duke of Hamilton and the Earl of Tweeddale. 332 When the new session of Parliament was opened, Lauderdale’s faction faced a genuine threat for the first time: a moment for every member of the faction to remain united. As the Countess of Lauderdale reported to the Earl of Kincardine in a letter dated the 5th March, Sir William Bruce had proved an unreliable ally:

‘The relation I gave yo last post, of ye entry of Duke Hamilton & his cariage the day ye Parl. was adiorned, was as particular as I could then give it. Now I can further informe yo that so soon as my Lord did acquaint ye Chancl: of the adiornment, he took occasion to whisper it to Sir
Will Bruce who went immediately to tell it to Duke Hamilton whom he found at Parl. Hous. with all his attendance. 333

Enraged by Bruce’s disloyalty, the Countess decided to exact her revenge. Writing again to Kincardine in London, she planned to deprive him of the lucrative gift of ‘seizures’:

‘Send all materials to empower my Lord to examin the Gift of ye Seasors: that my Lord may sett right before he goes: that is to say that his Matie may take the intension he had of the gift to extend to as small a sum as is possible: for the insolence of yt Creature is insufferable: & he keeps out of ye way in hope that my Lord will leave the affaire as he found it’. 334

The holder of the gift of ‘seizures’ was empowered to sell for his own profit any prohibited imports that were seized by the customs; these included brandy, Irish livestock and grain. According to Kincardine’s testimony, William Bruce had been double accounting. He had not only sold prohibited goods to his own account as he was permitted to do; he had also instructed the customs collectors to enter them into their ledgers in order to inflate the level of customs duty. By this ruse, it was estimated that Bruce had earned in excess of £24000: a sum equivalent to the annual salary of the King’s Commissioner. 335 Whether it was the result of disloyalty or malpractice, Lauderdale eventually decided to dispense with Bruce’s services and deprive him of any further access to the king’s revenues: a decision that proved the turning point in Bruce’s career. Although he had amassed sufficient funds to acquire the estate of Kinross and set about the construction of his new classical house, he was unable to complete the task without the income that he had generated from the Treasury. 336

The saga of William Bruce and the gift of ‘seizures’ provides a valuable insight into the particular characteristics of factional government in Scotland, where the economy was so weak and traditional kinship links were so strong. The sheer scale of the wealth that Bruce acquired under Lauderdale’s patronage demonstrates just how attractive the system must have been: the estimated income from the gift of ‘seizures’ was equal to two years’ net income from the Earl of Atholl’s estates. It is hardly surprising given the potential rewards that kinship should have remained such a dominant feature of society. It also demonstrates the extraordinary power that Lauderdale was able to wield. He could provide enormous
benefits to those who supported him and he could ruin the careers of those who opposed him, but as the
defection of William Bruce proved, money was no guarantee of loyalty. The only way that Lauderdale
could establish a reliable faction was to employ supporters whom he could trust and so he selected
members of his family.

In a society where the tradition of kinship still played such an important role and where family lineage
was such an important measure of status, it seems inevitable that people would do whatever they could to
ensure their family’s preservation. The Earl of Strathmore’s diary is littered with references to his family:

‘Inflam’d stronglie with a great desire to continue the memorie of my familie, I looked upon
nothing as too hard hopeing still to doe it …’337

‘I take God to witness it has been and is the utmost indeavour of my life to order all my affairs
both for the honour and credit and preservation of my family …’338

The whole purpose of his diary was to provide a record for posterity of the actions that he had taken, as
trustee for a generation, to rescue his family from what he described as ‘almost a total eclipse’:

‘I doe entreat my successor to beleive I have wt my best and utmost endeavours served my
familly in my generatione and have been still uncessant goeing about the interest and
advancement thereof with equall labour and diligence in the time past as I hope the method qch I
now am to followe in setting doune the whole particulars as they are daylie transacted will
evidence as to the future and as I have done hitherto all that I was able and am fully bent to
continue so to doe it is my opinion that I am bound in duty to improve all which lawfully I can
doe to the profit and behoove of my familly and that every man in his age is but ane
administrator to the nixt of his familly and if he doe no good deserves no less reproofe then the
man in the Gospel which put his talent in a napken’.339

Although he complained bitterly that his father, as trustee for the previous generation, had incurred
eenormous debts, Strathmore seems to have been more concerned about the damage that the debts had
done to the family's image and status. So bad was the financial state on his inheritance that he felt in danger of derogation:

‘And tho. since the time of my father’s death in the month of May 1646 I have brooked the Title and the dignity yet to any considering persone who shall read what is before written that I was but a nominal Earle and in every man’s apprehensione the estate was irrecoverable’. 340

Even the lands immediately surrounding Glamis, the most visible symbol of the family’s fortunes, had been mortgaged:

‘For the first three years of my life wch I only reckon since the year 1660 I could not endure allmost to come near to, or to see it, when the verie Mains was possessed by a wedsetter’. 341

It was his duty not only to redeem the family’s status but to live the life expected of the titular head of an ancient family:

‘It is not to be imagined that I could possiblie pay these and many other debts, redeem the wedsetts and make the purchase of lands before mentioned, build and support the necessary charges thereof, make three journeys to London besyd the first mentioned, make two severall expeditions to the west cuntrie which I did by public order, furnish both my houses in the way they are when I found only bare walls, make a considerable collection of silver plate, maintaine a great familly, support my lawsuits, and my owne necessary travelling staying att Eden: many times more then half of the yeare, maintaining my eldest son abroad tho. I cannot say but that allwayes he hes been so stayed and moderat as to keep himself within bounds, without being in considerable debt’. 342

The aspirations that Strathmore expressed so clearly in the ‘Book of Record’ are confirmed by two pictures that he commissioned: an engraving of Glamis by Johan Slezer and a portrait of the Lyon family by Jacob de Witt. 343
Fig 33: ‘The frontispiece of the Castle of Glammiss, given by King Robert, the first of the Stewarts, in ye year 1376, with his daughter, to John Lyon Lord Glammiss, Chancellour of Scotland, as it is now reformed by Patrick Earle of Strathmore his Lineall heire and Successour An: Dom: 1686’. 344

(RCAHMS)

Fig 34: The Earl of Strathmore and his three sons with the reformed seat of Glamis.

(in a private collection)
Both pictures engender the same historical image. The roman dress and the presence of Glamis, the ancient paternal seat, in the background would have left the viewer in no doubt about the antiquity and impeccable lineage of the Earl of Strathmore and his family. The same theme was repeated in the portraits of many members of the survey group. (see pages 92 & 93) De Witt painted the Earl of Atholl dressed in the guise of a roman general, surveying his military victory over the covenantors at the battle of Bothwell Bridge. John Michael Wright depicted the Earl of Rothes in full armour with a plumed helmet and lance: the traditional military symbols of nobility. The same format was adopted by Adriaen Hanneman in his portrait of the Earl of Kincardine, by Mary Beale in her portrait of the Earl of Argyll and by David Scougal in his portrait of the Earl of Moray: each sitter was portrayed in armour. Yet, the strangest of all these contemporary portraits were those of Charles Maitland and Patrick Smyth: the Lord Treasurer Depute and the Orcadian merchant were both dressed in breastplates.

If one assumes that the sitter actually elected to be depicted in armour or in a toga, there can be little doubt of the importance that history played in the aspirations of the Scottish nobility. It seems, however, that when the same group sat for their portraits in England, the results were quite different. Instead of a breastplate, Lely’s portraits of the Earl of Lauderdale, Tweeddale and Strathmore and Kneller’s portrait of the Earl of Queensberry show the sitter dressed in a silk cloak. It appears that there was a clear distinction between England and Scotland in the way that noble status was transmitted: the silk cloak depicted wealth; the breastplate portrayed tradition.

Amongst these portraits of the focus group there is one in particular that stands out. John Michael Wright’s portrait of Sir William Bruce, painted in 1665, depicts a man dressed in a striped smock with a stylus in one hand. This painting evokes the image of a man of learning, a Restoration virtuoso. It seems to reflect the Vitruvian concept of an architect: a man trained in many disciplines. Yet it was painted two years before Bruce’s first architectural commission at Leslie, while he was still acting as collector of the fines. If there was ever a painting that disguised the true character of the sitter, then surely this is it. Bruce’s career at the Treasury was marked by avarice and opportunism, and yet it is clear from this portrait that he wished, even from the earliest years, to be recorded for posterity as a ‘Gentleman Architect’.
According to many contemporary inventories, these family portraits were hung in large groups either on the great stair, in the great dining room or in the gallery. At Pinkie, for instance, an inventory of 1689, listed thirty eight portraits in the gallery, in addition to those of the royal family: ‘Lord Yester, Lady Tweeddale (by Kneller), the Countess of Tweeddale (by Lely), Lord Tweeddale, Lady Yester, Lord Yester (as a child), the Master of Yester and his brother, My Lady Jean (my Lord’s daughter), the old Earl of Tweeddale, old Lady Yester, My Lord Yester (done in Italy), Lt Col Hay (his Lop’s brother), Lady Jean Hay, Lady Sophia Hay, the old Earl of Tweeddale and his lady, Lady Roxburghe (with a lute in her hand), the Earl of Roxburghe, Countess of Roxburghe, Lady Jean Drummond (Lady Roxburghe), Earl of Drummelzier, Lord Seaton, Lord Dunfermline (as a child with his nurse), Chancellor Seaton, Earl of Dunfermline (done at length in his robes), Dame Isobel Hamilton (Lady Seaton), Dame Grizel Leslie (Countess of Dunfermline), Earl of Buccleuch, Lord Buccleuch, Mr David Scott (brother to to the Earl of Buccleuch), Lady Cassillis, Francis Earl of Errol, Earl Stafford, Countess of Argyll, Chancellor Hay, Countess of Lauderdale, Mr George Buchan, Mr Henderson (the minister) and Mistress Margaret Baird’. Of the thirty eight portraits in the gallery at Pinkie, there were only six that were not blood relations of the Earl of Tweeddale. Further evidence, if it was required, of the importance that the Scottish nobility placed in family and kinship.

Having travelled extensively in Europe before the restoration, William Bruce could probably justify his image as a cultural leader, but the Earl of Strathmore remained steadfastly in Scotland. So preoccupied was he with restoring his family’s reputation that he made only three trips to London during his lifetime and never travelled abroad. Living such an isolated existence, Strathmore could only have gained the inspiration for his building works and his expensive taste in furnishing from his contemporaries. Yet access to the culture of the court had been significantly reduced at the accession of Charles II; the Earl of Lauderdale was the only member of the focus group in permanent residence in London. Given his enormous political influence, it seems logical that he should also have been a strong cultural inspiration.

According to Lord Yester, who attended the wedding of the Earl and Countess of Lauderdale in 1672, the event was a highly fashionable affair:
‘My Lop’s marriage being put off til Saturday throw my Ly’s indispositione ... My L Arlington My L Ashley and Sr Thom: Clifford were here at dinner, after which the contract was signed’. 351

The ceremony took place at Ham, the riverside villa outside London that Lady Lauderdale had inherited from her father, William, 1st Earl of Dysart. The house had been extensively remodelled in the 1630s by the celebrated interior designer, Franz Cleyn, who had employed the most advanced taste of the court of Charles I. From 1670 to 1677, it underwent a second, even more extravagant, reformation under the aegis of the Lauderales. 352 Despite its relatively small scale, Ham was rearranged in an immensely grand format with two separate apartments: a family apartment on the ground floor and a state apartment on the first floor. 353 According to contemporary inventories, the house was completely refurnished with the most fashionable furniture that money could buy. So impressive was Ham that it inspired a eulogy from John Evelyn:

‘After dinner I walked to Ham, to see the House & Gardens of the Duke of Lauderdale, which is indeede inferiour to few of the best Villas in Italy itself. The house furnish’d like a greate Princes, the Parterre, flo: Gardens, Orangeries, Groves, Avenues, Courts, Statues, Perspective fountaines, Aviaries and all this at the banks of the sweetest river in the world’. 354

If someone as discerning and experienced as Evelyn was impressed by Ham, it must have left an indelible mark on Lord Yester, who was less well acquainted with the suburban villas and country houses of post restoration England. Yet Lord Yester was not the only Scottish visitor to Ham; his father, the Earl of Tweeddale knew it well, as did the Earl of Kincardine. 355 Sir William Bruce is alleged to have taken some part in its design; Charles Maitland even had his own bedroom there. 356 It seems from a contemporary lampoon that the Earl of Atholl was also well acquainted with the house and its owner. 357 There may have been fewer Scots at the court of Charles II than there had been during the reigns of James VI and Charles I, but Lauderdale’s closest political confidants still travelled regularly to London. When they were in the south, they gained first hand experience at Ham of how the new French fashions of the court of Louis XIV could be adapted to a private house. 358
Because he never travelled abroad, Strathmore could not have seen for himself the influence of the architectural treatises upon Italian, Dutch or French domestic architecture. Unlike the Earl of Kincardine or Sir William Bruce who had spent so long in Holland or the Earls of Queensberry and Argyll who had completed their education in France, he had never seen the new town hall of Amsterdam or the renaissance chateaux of the Loire. As a result, he could have had no specific building in mind when he began his reformation of Glamis. Yet Strathmore encouraged his two elder sons to complete their education in Europe, despite the cost: an ambition that he shared with many members of the focus group, commissioners and executives alike. The Earl of Tweeddale paid for his two eldest sons to travel through Holland, Italy and France in 1674. The Earl of Kincardine financed Lord Bruce’s education in the Netherlands and at the Parisian academy of ‘M. Bernard, Rue de Conde, Faubourg St Germain’ from 1675 to 1677. The Earl of Queensberry sent his eldest son, Lord Drumlanrig, to Paris in 1682. Sir William Bruce encouraged his son, John, to attend the academy in Paris, returning via Antwerp and Amsterdam in 1683. Sir Thomas Moncreiffe met the expenses of Thomas, his nephew and heir, when he attended the University of Utrecht in 1694 and then travelled extensively in Italy. (see appendix 1B/2, 1B/5, 1B/10, 3A/1 & 3A/2) Judging by the frequency of their complaints about excessive expenditure, parents made very significant sacrifices to send their children abroad to complete their education. It must, therefore, have been deemed an essential part of their upbringing. 359

By sending his son abroad to complete his education, the Earl of Kincardine anticipated that he would learn to become ‘a gentleman’:

‘It is now you must indeavour to learne to be a man, you must observe all you see in order to get improvement by it. Go frequently into good company & shake off childish bashfullness which is so unbecoming a gentleman & for that purpose practice dancing much & that before companie and I pray faile not to write to me frequently at least once a weeke. Let me have an accompt from you of all you do, of all places you go to, what remarkeable things you see & your observations upon them and take some pains to write handsomely’. 360

From Kincardine’s copious letters, which contained much fatherly advice, it seems that there was a good reason for sending Lord Bruce first to Holland and then to France, for each country offered a slightly
different curriculum. In Holland, the accent was placed more upon reading and study; in France the emphasis was placed upon social etiquette. It was only by visiting both countries that he would gain the universal education befitting a gentleman. In a letter addressed to Utrecht, Kincardine recommended lessons in surveying:

'I thought you should have taken your mathematicall instruments with you but I found them here ... I thinke it were good that you should leame before you leave the low countries the art of surveying or measuring land & takeing of heights and distances & making maps. If you can get a good master who will show it quickly you may learne it in a weeke, the chief is to see the practice of it in the fields'. 361

In a letter addressed to Paris, Kincardine recommended the benefits of dancing:

'I wold have you looke upon dancing as one of the most necessary things you learne, for it gives a mien & grace to a gentleman's cariage of his body without which he lookes like a cloune ... It is only in the company of Ladyes of quality that the politesse of breeding is to be learned. I thinke that on your days of conge you would do well to play tennis'. 362

Much the same pattern is revealed in the letters written by James Halket, who accompanied Sir William Bruce's son to France and Holland. At the academy in Paris, John Bruce was taught an extraordinary range of social skills, which kept him occupied from morning to night:

'He rides from seven till halfe ane hour after nine, and after breakfast rides again till after eleven, then comes his master of the flute which he takes a pleasure in and hes good disposition to learn; about halfe ane hour after dinner comes the fencing and vaulting masters, when they are gone he hes a dancing master comes to his chamber, then he dances with the rest in the salle, this continues till four and a halfe, then comes he that teaches fortification ... between five and six comes his Geographie master. After supper he goes with the others to the Hall where they sit discoursing or playing cards for little stakes til near bed time which helps him much to his
French; Sometimes after supper he goes to his chamber where I take pains to cause him to read and understand exactlie the french. 363

The desire to adopt French manners and etiquette was a longstanding tradition amongst the Scottish nobility; it did not arise from the sudden popularity of the Grand Tour in the late seventeenth century. 364 English visitors to Scotland often seem to have been struck by the strong French influence on the local culture. Sir Anthony Weldon had remarked upon it in 1617, James Browne referred to it again in 1669:

‘Nor is their grandeur disproportionate to their demeanour, which is high and stately, but courteous and obliging, having all the additional helps of education and travel to render it accomplish’d, for during their minority there is generally great care taken to refine their nature, and improve their knowledge, of which when they have attain’d a competent measure in their own country, they betake themselves to foreign nations to make a farther progress therein’. 365

Another important aspect of this universal education was to broaden the mind: to experience at first hand the architecture of different European countries. 366 James Halket described the ‘petit toure’ that he and John Bruce planned to make in April 1682, between Paris and La Rochelle, ‘taking Fontainebleau in our way thence down the Loire sometimes by water sometimes by land taking Richelieu in our way’. 367 In August they made another tour: ‘wee resolve to goe for Versailles and stay some dayes there till wee have seen all what’s to be seen, then goe see Chantilly and Liancourt two fine houses near Paris’. 368 Writing from Saumur in 1674, Lord Yester made a very similar journey down the Loire, which also included a visit to Richelieu:

‘I writ to your Lop to say we parted from Paris from whence we hav had a very pleasant journey this length where we arrived Saturday last, having been four days in coming by water, munday I made a little journey out to Richelieu and other places near this and returned but this morning’. 369

According to the itineraries, these excursions did not include modern chateaux like Vaux le Vicomte and Maisons Lafitte; they focussed instead upon the most lavish examples of French domestic architecture.
The palaces of Versailles, Fontainebleau and Richelieu were not renowned for their radical appearance, but to anyone accustomed to the relative poverty of Scotland, their colossal scale must have been awe inspiring. By travelling up and down the Loire, they would have gained first hand experience of the great French renaissance chateaux. There they would also have found something much more familiar: houses that were very similar in so many respects to the ones to which they were accustomed at home with circular stair towers and pavilions.

Famous gardens were also deemed worthy of a detour. Having inspected the work of Le Notre at Versailles, James Halket and John Bruce went out of their way to visit the celebrated gardens of Enghien near Brussels; ‘which has some things in it as fein in the keind as any that I have seen, particularly the walks and the hedges which are pritiestly cut’. The garden, which had been created by Prince Charles of Arenberg from 1650, was reputed to be the most beautiful in the world. Arenberg, who was both an architect and a capuchin friar, had dug canals and fish ponds; he had planted thousands of trees and shrubs; he had constructed parterres, triumphal arches, pavilions and fountains. Enghien was arguably the most celebrated example of a ‘house in its setting’ in Europe and was probably the prototype for Versailles.

Although the itineraries of the Bruces did not include Italy, Thomas Moncreiffe spent nearly a year there. After learning the language from an Italian master for two months in Turin, he planned to travel all over the country:

‘We go straight to Rome to see the Ceremonys there dureing the holy week. If we find it not to warm we go after that week to Naples and about the monthe of May or so return thence through Rome to Florence wher we pass the summer’.

Moncreiffe visited almost every famous city in the country: Genoa, Lucca, Siena, Rome, Naples, Bologna, Padua and Venice. In Florence, he received further coaching in Italian and also learned to fence. Lord Yester’s trip to Italy followed a very similar pattern:
'To Pisa where we stayd one day, and from thence hither we have had a very pleasant journey, where we arrived but this day and tomorrow intends back to Pisa and so to Luca on our way to Florence where I resolve to stay as long as I cane and be at Rome 4 or 5 days before Christmas which is the opening of the holy year and it is lickly after I have seen the first ceremonies I shall goe to Venice to pass the carnivalle and after return to Rome'.

Far from being an expensive jaunt, there is evidence that overseas travel did provide significant cultural inspiration. James Smith, William Bruce’s successor as King’s Surveyor, attended the Scots College in Rome from 1671 to 1675 and then travelled extensively in Italy. With this experience he produced a large number of drawings of houses that were clearly linked to the Italian interpretation of classicism. In this collection, for which Smith has been acclaimed the founder of British palladianism, there are proposals for Melville, Dalkeith, and Raith, but there is also a design for the new house of Yester. Both Smith and Lord Yester, who commissioned the plan, were visitors to Rome at precisely the same time.

For those who remained at home, like the Earl of Strathmore, inspiration can only have been gained second hand from those who had enjoyed the benefit of overseas travel and regular visits to London. There may have been no court in Edinburgh to act as a regular forum for cultural discussion, but this did not restrain the exchange of ideas between members of the Scottish nobility. Like John Evelyn in England, they spent much time conversing about art and architecture. Sir Robert Moray discussed the design of the park at Lethington with Charles Maitland; he also discussed the plans for the reformation of the old house of Yester with Sir William Bruce and the Earl of Tweeddale. William Bruce discussed the design of Thirlestane and Brunstane with the Earl of Lauderdale, Charles Maitland and the Earl of Kincardine. The Earl of Kincardine discussed the design of Ham with the Earl of Lauderdale. The Earl of Queensberry discussed the design of Kinneil with the Duke of Hamilton. The Earl of Rothes discussed the plans of Leslie with William Bruce. Sir George Mackenzie discussed the design of New Tarbat with Patrick Smyth. Patrick Smyth discussed building works with the Earl of Atholl and Sir Thomas Moncreiffe. This discourse simply reflected the changing culture of the nobility all over Europe:
'The ability to demonstrate good taste in fashion as in art and architecture ... and a good but practical rather than a learned education were much more important than mere physical prowess at the end of the seventeenth century.' 382

On the face of it, the values of the nobility had changed very little since the early seventeenth century. Yet, there were underlying signs that their confidence had been seriously eroded by the events of the Civil War and Cromwell’s occupation. The personal guarantees that had once been a feature of family finance before the outbreak of the Civil War, had become serious liabilities; in the hands of unscrupulous speculators, they now threatened the very existence of inherited estates. Faced with such a competitive environment, the traditional expedient of family trust provided a very convenient solution. Kinship survived in Scotland for so long, not because the nobility was outdated, but because it served a very useful practical purpose. As a result, the physical embodiments of kinship remained important symbols; the leader of the family must live in a style befitting his status and the ancient paternal seat must reflect the family’s standing. 383

It was against this very traditional background that the members of the survey group showed such an interest in culture and fashion. Whatever the source of inspiration, whether it came from Europe or from the court in London, it was sure to be adapted to this distinctive lifestyle. As so many of their portraits demonstrate, there was a fundamental difference between the values of the Scottish and the English nobility. The Scots continued, as they always had, to adopt the manners and social etiquette of the French. Like the noblesse d’epee in France who had inherited their ancient family estates, the commissioners sought to project an image of history and lineage, rather than wealth. It was only the members of the executive, like the noblesse de robe in France who had no family history to preserve, who possessed the freedom to design new houses.
Chapter 4

The Principal Houses of the Members of the Treasury Commission

‘One must describe as suitable a house which will be appropriate to the status of the person who will have to live in it and of which the parts will correspond to the whole and to each other ... Therefore, as far as possible one must pay particular attention to those who want to build, not so much for what they can afford as for the type of building that would suit them ...’

‘On the decorum or suitability that must be maintained in private building’. Andrea Palladio.384

‘Mr Hammeltoun has promised to be verie carefull to make ane exact copie of all ye grounds your Lop. designes to build in & inclosures for gardings & courts wch I shall reduce to as good order as I can & designe ane house fitt for ye place, your qualatie & my Lady’s eas & convenience wch I will concerne myselfe to doe for I am verie much her Lady’s servant & my Lord’s.’

Letter from Sir William Bruce to John, 7th Earl of Cassillis, 1672.385

It is clear from the terminology of Sir William Bruce’s letter to the Earl of Cassillis that the concept of decorum was well understood in Scotland in the late seventeenth century. Unfortunately, the Earl of Cassillis was beset with financial problems and Bruce’s house was never built. As a result, there are no plans that might indicate the sort of house that he considered ‘suitable’ or ‘fit’ for a member of the Scottish nobility who had recently married the daughter of the Duke and Duchess of Hamilton, and whose family lineage stretched back to 1360.386 Yet, those who did have access to funding entered into building projects with great enthusiasm. The extent to which the members of the Treasury Commission built new houses or reconstructed their existing ones is demonstrated in Schedules A1 and A2 (see pages 103 & 104): every single member of the group, with the exception of the Earl of Moray, was involved in one or more projects. At the same time, there was a clear distinction between the building works of the Commissioners, the majority of whom were drawn from the ranks of the ancient nobility, and the Executives, whose wealth was recently acquired. Only one Commissioner, the Earl of Atholl, built a new house: the remainder concentrated their principal works on improving the ‘ancient paternal seat’,
retaining large parts of the original building. This was in complete contrast to the building activities of the Executives who, in every instance, built a new house on a recently acquired estate.

### Schedule A1

**The Principal Houses of the Treasury Commissioners and Executives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Principal/ Reformed/</th>
<th>Post 1660 Reformed/</th>
<th>Reformed/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paternal Seat</td>
<td>Building Works</td>
<td>de Novo</td>
<td>de Novo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Lauderdale</td>
<td>Thirlestane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunstane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lethington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Tweeddale</td>
<td>Yester</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinkie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neidpath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Rothes</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballenbreich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Dundonald</td>
<td>Place of Paisley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auchans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Kincardine</td>
<td>Culross Abbey House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palace of Culross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Maitland</td>
<td>Hatton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dudhope</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Atholl</td>
<td>Falkland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tullibardine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunkeld</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Argyll</td>
<td>Inveraray</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argyll's Lodging</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Moray</td>
<td>Darnaway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castle Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donibristle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Queensberry</td>
<td>Drumlanrig</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanquhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strathmore</td>
<td>Glamis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castle Lyon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Moncreiffe</td>
<td>Moncreiffe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>Balcaskie</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinross</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Smyth</td>
<td>Methven</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule A2

The Location of the Principal Houses of the Treasury Commissioners and Executives

Red=principal seat  Yellow=second house
The scale of the great post restoration rebuilding extended far beyond the repair of those houses that had been damaged during the Civil War and the Cromwellian occupation. There were a few buildings, like Dunkeld and Blair, that had been severely ravaged, but in the majority of cases the decay was only superficial: at Glamis, for example, it was limited only to broken windows and furniture. There must, therefore, have been more profound reasons why so many landowners should have suddenly decided to expend substantial sums on their country houses.

It has long been argued that the restoration represented some sort of watershed in the development of Scottish domestic architecture: this was the moment when the discomfort of the towerhouse was replaced by the luxury of the country house and the corbel and the crowstep gave way to the cornice and the pediment. Yet, the evidence suggests that this was far from being the case. Scotland had already undergone a very significant rebuilding in the early seventeenth century: long before the restoration, there were houses that bore the hallmarks of classicism. At Sir William Alexander's lodging at Stirling, the main entrance had been carefully located at the centre of the corps de logis. At Pitreavie, the house had been designed in such a way that it combined aesthetic balance with a new state apartment, comprising a great hall, withdrawing room and bedchamber; each leading from one to the other. Alongside these modern houses there were others, like Castle Lyon, which remained almost unchanged: its aesthetic appearance was asymmetrical and its internal arrangement incorporated little more than the traditional hall and chamber. There was no pattern to the development of Scottish domestic architecture at the outbreak of the Civil War: some houses, whose owners had been close to the court, were relatively fashionable and convenient, while others had changed very little from their medieval origins. In the normal process of evolution, the outdated houses would have been refashioned when sufficient funds became available, but this evolutionary process came to a halt in 1639 and was only resumed with the restoration of the monarchy in 1660.

What were the standards of decorum that dictated the great rebuilding of the post restoration era? There was a choice between the profile of the French chateau, as premised by du Cerceau, or the Italian villa, as illustrated by Serlio and Palladio. There was a clear distinction between the formality of the court in London and the accessibility of the court in France. At the same time, there were strong national traditions that had dictated custom and practice for many generations. How were these different influences
incorporated into the design of the Scottish country house? Did the members of the ancient nobility interpret them in a different way from the new rich? In order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the factors that influenced their design, it is important to look at four different aspects of Scottish country houses of the late seventeenth century: their setting, their external appearance, their internal layout and their furnishing.
Writing about the 'contrivance' of the house and its setting, John Reid, the author of the contemporary 'Scots Gard'ner', adopted a Vitruvian tone when he stressed the importance of regularity:

'Situate your House in a healthy Soyl, near to a fresh-spring, defended from the Impetuous westwinds, northern colds and eastern blasts: and mind regularity, viz. Make all the Buildings and Plantings ly so about the House, as that the House may be the centre; all the Walks, Trees and Hedges running to the House. As the Sun is the Centre of the World: as the Heart of the man is the Centre of the man: as the nose the Centre of the face: and as it is unseemly to see a Man wanting a leg, ane arme &c. or his nose standing at one side the face or not streight, or wanting a cheek, ane eye, ane eare, or with one great at one side and small on the other; Just so with the House-courts, Avenues, Gardens, Orchards, &c. where regularity or uniformity is not observed. Therefore whatever you have on the one hand, make as much, and of the same form and in the same place, on the other'.

Although Reid’s advice took account of the vagaries of the Scottish climate, his emphasis on symmetry was very difficult to achieve in practice. It was relatively easy to set the house at the centre of a greenfield site, but it was much harder to achieve in a situation where the house already existed and the terrain was unsuitable.

When Sir William Bruce acquired the estate of Kinross from the Earl of Morton in 1675, he was faced with an existing house, which lay so close to the shores of Loch Leven that it could never be the central point of a symmetrical setting. As a result, he took the costly decision to start all over again with a clean sheet, abandoning the old house in favour of a perfectly uniform setting with a new house as the focal point. (see fig 35) Bruce's design mirrored the guidelines set out in the 'Scots Gard'ner'. The stables were located on either side of the main gateway. The outer court was flanked by cherry gardens and a bowling green. The kitchen court and the women's court were positioned on either side of the inner court, discreetly hidden behind high stone walls. The house was surrounded by a carefully contrived parterre and two square flower gardens. Every element of the composition was balanced. At the same time, he
devised a new relationship between the house and its surroundings. The main axial avenue ran from the town of Kinross in the west, intersected his new house, and terminated on the castle of Loch Leven in the east. This created a symbolic relationship between the burgh at one end, which provided his noble credentials, and a site of historical importance at the other, which generated an aura of antiquity. However uniform, the setting of Bruce’s new house still retained strong overtones of history and status.
Having opted for a fresh site at Kinross, William Bruce had complete freedom to design a perfectly uniform setting, but when acting for his clients he was often compelled to refashion the landscape around an existing house. Unfortunately, there are no surviving drawings for the houses of the members of the Treasury Commission that illustrate their setting before Bruce embarked upon the process of reformation. It is difficult, therefore, to understand the extent of the process and the problems involved. There are, however, contemporary surveys for the house of Kinnaird in Angus, which demonstrate very clearly how Bruce planned to remodel both the house and its surroundings. Like Glamis, Kinnaird was an ‘ancient paternal seat’; the lands had been granted to the Carnegie family in 1380, and the Earldom of Southesk had been created in 1618. Charles, 4th Earl of Southesk, who commissioned Bruce, was married to the daughter of Charles Maitland, the Lord Treasurer Depute, and seems to have been well acquainted with life in London. There was a great similarity, therefore, between the provenance of Kinnaird and the houses of the Treasury Commissioners.

Before starting his reforms, Bruce seems to have instructed Alexander Edward to carry out a detailed survey of the house and the park. Edward’s survey provides an excellent impression of how the house was related to the gardens and the other practical elements that lay within the park: the yards, the orchards and the farm buildings. (see fig 36) It seems that some improvements had already been carried out at Kinnaird during the life of the 3rd Earl of Southesk. The park had been encircled by a stone wall, with round towers at each angle. A small pond had been dug on the east side of the house, at the centre of a system of paths, and a bowling green added on the west side. Avenues of fruit trees, cherries, pears and plums, had been planted at an irregular angle to the façade of the house. The main driveway still led from the main Brechin road on the south east, and entered the inner court of the house via a narrow pend. To the north west of the inner court lay the main block of domestic offices with the stables beyond; to the south side of the house, lay a series of farm buildings and fields: a cattle byre, kennels and probably a hay meadow. It was exactly this scene that John Ochterlony of Guyn described in such a fulsome manner:

‘A great house having excellent gardens, parks with fallow deer, orchards, hay meadows, wherein are extraordinary quantities of hay, very much planting, an excellent breed of horse, cattle and sheep, extraordinary good land: without competition the finest place taken altogether in the shire’. 398
The survey gives the immediate impression that everything has been laid out at random; that each element of the landscape has been planned individually. The paths around the pond have been designed in a rough geometrical form, yet the feature seems to have been located where the ground was suitable rather than as part of a greater plan. The avenues of fruit trees are not linked in any way to the axis of the house. The outbuildings have been scattered wherever there was a convenient space within reasonable reach of the house. The whole setting appears to have evolved over a long period of time.

Fig 36: Computer reconstruction of Alexander Edward’s Preliminary Survey of Kinnaird (RCAHMS)
A = Kinnaird Castle  B = Entrance from the main Brechin road  C = Outer court
D = Inner court  E = Domestic offices  F = Kennels  G = Barns  H = Yards
I = Bowling Green or Parterre  J = Avenues of fruit trees  K = Pond  L = Park wall
Having completed his initial survey, Edward then produced radical proposals for relandscaping the house and its setting. (see fig 37) He planned, first of all, to rotate the axis of the house so that the façade was approached directly by a tree-lined avenue from the west. The new approach was to be intersected by avenues on the north east and north west axes. The old driveway from the east, which had led into the inner court at the side of the building, was removed altogether and the imperfect avenues of fruit trees were swept away. The inner and outer courts were aligned to the new entrance on the west and the domestic offices were relocated on either side of the inner court, carefully hidden out of sight behind stone walls. The stables were repositioned in a new block on the north side of the house, but the cattle byre, kennels and all the other farm buildings which had lain on the south side of the house were removed, leaving only ‘the burial place’.

---

**Fig 37: Computer reconstruction of Alexander Edward’s plans for the landscape of Kinnaird (RCAHMS)**

A = Kinnaird Castle  B = new axial avenue  C = new intersecting avenues
D = ‘Points to Farnell’  E = Burial ground

(The landscape is aligned on numerous local topographical features)
In many respects, the proposals for the reformation of Kinnaird were very similar to the setting of Kinross. In both instances, the house was aligned in such a way that its principal prospect overlooked a significant site: Kinross ‘pointed to’ the ‘Castle of Loch Levin’ and Kinnaird faced Famell, the Earl of Southesk’s second house. Both houses lay at the centre of a carefully balanced plan with an axial approach; their facades framed by an outer and inner court, with the domestic offices carefully hidden from view. In neither plan was there any evidence of agricultural buildings: the court on one side of the house was designated as the ‘bleecherie’, and on the other as the kitchen. Although the proposals for Kinnaird were never executed, the plans indicate very clearly that the principles of balance and symmetry, espoused by John Reid in his advice ‘to all ingenious planters in Scotland’, were readily applied to the late seventeenth century Scottish country house and its setting.

The variety of maps by John Adair and the drawings of Johan Slezer and Jacob de Witt suggest that most members of the Treasury Commission, who remodelled their old houses rather than build new ones, took a thoroughly practical approach to the design of the house and its setting. They sought to achieve greater symmetry, but were constrained by the location of the existing house, the topography of the landscape and the vagaries of the local climate. John Reid provided a graphic description of an existing site where the avenue, ‘did not front the house right, by reason of a precipice’:

‘I got on the house top, viewed the ground immediately, saw that I might turn my face towards the East and get stately Avenues with Gardens on each hand at pleasure; and the said precipice turned at my back.’

It was common in Scotland, where so many houses had been constructed on the top of a steep river bank, to find that the options for a new approach were limited. At Thirlestane, for instance, the new façade was oriented towards the south-east because there was a precipice at the north west end of the house. (see fig 38) At Leslie, the façade was located on the west side of the house with a steep bank to the south. (see appendix 2C/3) At Drumlanrig, the new frontispiece faced north with a precipice on the south side. (see appendix 2C/10) In each instance, the main entrance of the house was oriented in such a way that it provided suitable topography for a tree-lined avenue.
The same was not true, however, of the gardens. In a very high proportion of houses, the gardens were located on the south side, in order to take advantage of the limited hours of sunlight, and were surrounded by a high stone wall to provide protection from the wind. This was the arrangement at Brunstane, Pinkie, Yester, Leslie, Auchans, Hatton, Culross, Dunkeld, Drumlanrig, Castle Lyon and Balcaskie. (see appendix 2B & 4B) According to the Earl of Kincardine at Culross, this arrangement produced spectacular results. Writing in mid April 1676, he was able to report upon the progress of his fruit trees:

‘The spring hath been so forward here that the gardens are as much advanced as they use to be in the end of May, wee have abundance of apricots and they are already the bignes of common plums, the cheries upon the walls as big as gins [geans]. There is great appearance of abundance of all sorts of fruit’. 400

It seems from Slezer’s drawings of Culross and Hatton, and de Witt’s painting of Yester, that the relationship between the house and the garden was also carefully contrived. In each instance, the garden was set below the house and, therefore, the house appeared in silhouette against the skyline. What is more, the profile of the garden front at Hatton and Yester accentuated the remains of the original building. (see figs 41 & 42) The same was true of many of the houses that belonged to members of the Treasury
Commission. At Leslie, a new garden was constructed beside the River Leven, requiring a series of terraces and a bridge, with a fine aspect of the original wing of the house. At Drumlanrig and Balcaskie, the garden was relocated below the old section of the house, on the opposite side to the new frontispiece. There can be no doubt, from the contemporary comments of the Earl of Lauderdale that this juxtaposition was intentional. In ‘a new whimsey for enflaming the reckoning of Thirlestane Castle’, he stressed the importance of the appearance of the garden front:

‘I find a great need of two pavilions also in the east end, for without those pavilions the south and north sides of my house will looke pitifull in both the gardens south & north. I meane that the pavilions should joine to the eastern rounds just as they doe to the westeme rounds, and then the house will looke uniforme to both gardens’. 401

Fig 39: Slezer’s view of the Garden Front at Thirlestane (Theatrum Scotiae)

Fig 40: Slezer’s view of the Garden Front at Culross Abbey House (Theatrum Scotiae)
If the aspect of a house was worthy of careful planning, so too was the prospect from the principal rooms. There is strong evidence to suggest that the internal layout of the house was often arranged in order to provide a view of the gardens and the surrounding scenery. In each of the newly built houses, Kinross, Moncreiffe, Dunkeld and Methven, the drawing rooms and principal bedchambers were located on the south side, with a distant prospect of the surrounding hills. (see appendix 2B & 4B)

It seems also, from the frequency with which it occurred, that water played an important part in the prospect. In each of the houses that lay within sight of the Firth of Forth, Brunstane, Culross, Donibristle, Argyll’s Lodging and Balcaskie, the windows of the principal rooms looked across the river. The Earl of
Lauderdale was determined that the layout of Brunstane should be arranged in such a way that he could enjoy a view over the water:

‘I am resolv’d to turn the great chamber to the east-side, where I shall have three fair lights looking upon the sea, & upon Fife, & the fourth light looking upon the Garden’. 402

Locating the principal rooms on the south side of the house served another practical function: it provided more sunlight and greater protection in winter. The recommendations of Roger North in England were even more pertinent in the Scottish climate:

‘Scituation. Let it be due south if possible. I mean so the best rooms, which are usually in the front, have that prospect. The reason is obvious: there is less venom and hurt in those winds than the opposite. And fear not for the sun fall not early in the morning nor is late in the evening in the summer time upon that scituation, and when it comes on it is high, and shines not much into the room, especially when at the warmest pitch, noon … In winter the south rooms hath the low sun at noon, being then comfortable, while east and west hath scarce any, but on the contrary, the east, north and of then-composed-winds, which are not easy’. 403
Having reoriented the approach to display the new façade, relocated the gardens to enhance the roofline and arranged the principal rooms to provide sunlight in winter and a fine prospect; it only remained to place the 'sluttery' out of sight. Like Kinnaird, the domestic offices at Glamis were distributed in piecemeal fashion around the main body of the house: a row of byres and stables, the old hall and the chamber of dais, the womanhouse, the servants’ lodging, the chief stable, the brewhouse and the bakehouse; ‘a strange confused unmodel’d piece of business and was to me a great eyesore’. All of these buildings were swept away by the Earl of Strathmore and the majority relocated in a back court, leaving an uninterrupted view of the new façade. (see figs 44 & 45) The same process took place at Thirlestane: the stables were isolated in their own self-contained court on the north side of the house and the kitchens were confined to a separate court on the south side, leaving a neatly balanced frontispiece. (see fig 53)

Yet, the relocation of the domestic offices was not inspired only by aesthetics. The relationship between the family and guests and the domestic servants seems to have undergone a fundamental change. In England, both Roger Pratt and Roger North expressed their revulsion at the sight of ‘dirty servants passing to and fro’;

‘But this [the entrata] must not be the common passage for all things, in regards your friends and persons of esteem should pass without being annoyed with the sight of foull persons, and things, which must and will be moving in some part of a large and well inhabited dwelling’. 407

Much the same sentiment was voiced in a letter from the Earl of Lauderdale to Sir William Bruce concerning the layout of Brunstane:

‘I do not like my great Chamber to be on the west side as you propose it, for as you say very well, it must not have lights to the west side, because of looking in to the Kitchin-court.’ 408
Fig 44: John Elphinstone’s uninterrupted view of the Frontispiece of Glamis
(RCAHMS)

Fig 45: John Elphinstone’s view of the back court at Glamis with domestic offices in each wing
(RCAHMS)
For whatever reason, menial tasks, and those who performed them, were regarded as unsavoury. They should be kept hidden lest they offend the visitor's approach to the house or detract from the prospect from the principal rooms. The traditional arrangement, whereby the domestic offices had been dispersed at random, was no longer acceptable: fresh standards of privacy required a physical division between the family and their guests, on the one hand, and the servants, on the other.

There is also evidence that this division may have extended beyond the immediate precinct of the house. The first building work undertaken by the Earl of Lauderdale after the Restoration was to construct a stone wall, some two miles long, that enclosed over two hundred acres of the estate at Lethington: a huge and costly undertaking that took almost ten years to complete. The purpose of this wall, according to Slezer's survey, was to create a park: an enclosed area, with the house and garden at the centre, in which Lauderdale could arrange avenues, plantations and agricultural activities as he pleased. Despite its cost, the 'park dike' at Lethington was imitated by a great number of Scottish country house owners in the late seventeenth century. The wall at Kinnaird, surveyed by Alexander Edward, was very similar in appearance with its small round angle towers. There were park walls at Glamis, Culross and Yester, and if John Adair's surveys are to be believed, at many country houses in central Scotland. (see figs 47, 48 & appendix 2C/11)

Fig 46: Slezer's survey of the park at Lethington surrounded by the Great Wall (RCAHMS)
Fig 47: Adair’s map of East Lothian shows details of the great park wall at Yester, with the Deer Park alongside. (National Library of Scotland)

Fig 48: De Witt’s view of Yester from the north-west with the great park wall crossing the new approach and isolating the town of Gifford. (RCAHMS)
John Macky was quick to draw attention to the fact that, ‘the Nobility have of late run into Parking, Planting and Gardening, which are great improvements to their Estates’. 410 Such enclosures would have provided a vermin-free environment in which to establish young plantations, yet contemporary comments suggest that deer were less of a problem than the local population. Writing about his own plantations at Glamis, the Earl of Strathmore placed the responsibility for damage upon the local ‘cuntrie people’:

‘There is a generall humor in commons who have a naturall aversione to all maner of planting and when young timber is sett, be sure they doe not faill in the night time to cutt even att the root the prettiest and straightest trees for staves or plough goads, and many they have destroyed to myself albeit if they stood not in great awe and fear they would have yet done greater harme to my young plantines’. 411

Similar concerns about security were expressed in a letter to Patrick Smyth, requesting his urgent return to Methven:

‘Your affaires here are calling for your presence and there is a necessatie that you come home shortly for putting your affaires in some order than they are now, for what with the people that goes to conventickills and the highlanders coming downe and breaking houses and robbing them, has turned all the country heir very louse, your presence here would do much to quiet them’. 412

Despite the greater social stability of the restoration era, these contemporary comments suggest a sense of unease. They give the impression that the Scottish nobility felt physically threatened by the intrusion of ‘commons’ and ‘highlanders’. Under the circumstances, this nervousness is understandable: the events of the Civil War and Cromwell’s occupation had caused lasting damage, not only to their status and finances, but also to their self-confidence. It seems, therefore, that the great ‘park dike’ may have served two functions. It provided a sheltered microclimate in which to establish new tree plantations and gardens, and it also created a secure and private environment for the family and their guests. It was, in effect, a convenient framework within which members of the Scottish nobility could indulge their architectural aspirations and restore their pride and their status, without the threat of interference.
The Aesthetic Appearance of the Scottish Country House.

From the contemporary evidence of John Adair’s map of Strathearn in Perthshire, the aesthetic appearance of Scotland’s two earliest compact classical country houses was considered revolutionary. His illustrations of Dunkeld and Moncreiffe depicted a house with a symmetrical façade and a pavilion roof: they were totally different from every other house in the district, all of which were drawn with one or more towers. Yet, these two houses were not built until the late 1670s; nearly twenty years after the Restoration and forty years after the construction of Inigo Jones’s prototype at Chevening in Kent or the Huygenhuis in the Hague.

Fig 49: Adair’s map of Strathearn with the compact house of Moncreiffe. (National Library of Scotland)

Fig 50: Adair’s map of Strathearn with the compact house of Dunkeld. (National Library of Scotland)
The reluctance of the Scottish nobility to adopt the uniformity of the classical villa was in marked contrast to the English or the Dutch, who readily embraced the architectural principles of Palladio and Scamozzi. As a result, English visitors to Scotland in the late seventeenth century surveyed the plethora of castles and concluded that their occupants still lived in the dark ages. Yet the careers of the members of Lauderdale's Treasury Commission provide conclusive evidence that the majority were both cultured and well-travelled. The scarcity of classical houses did not result from ignorance; nor was it caused by a lack of money. With access to the king's revenues, members of the Treasury Commission were well able to afford the cost of new houses. The disparity between the appearance of the Scottish country house and the English country house arose from their different standards of decorum.

A preliminary analysis of the principal houses of the members of the Treasury Commission reveals two clear categories. There were houses whose external appearance remained irregular and others whose external appearance was aesthetically balanced. (see schedule B) The balanced houses were, in the majority of cases, the principal seats of their respective owners; while the irregular houses were secondary homes. This clear distinction confirms the importance of the principal seat as a reflection of the owner's status. There were, however, exceptions to this rule. The appearance of Inveraray and Blair, the paternal seats of the Earls of Argyll and Atholl, remained irregular. (see appendix 2C/7 & 2C/8) These houses were not only geographically remote, but they also served as the recruiting ground for local troops. As such, their traditional appearance may have been retained intentionally.

The appearance of the aesthetically balanced houses can be segregated into three subdivisions according to their uniformity. The first category includes houses whose appearance was approximately balanced. The second category comprises houses that were well balanced, and the third category incorporates those of a uniform appearance. Of these three groups, the houses of an approximate balance significantly outnumber the others. This predominance stemmed directly from the composition of the Treasury Commission, which was administered by a tight nexus of ancient families, linked closely to the Earl of Lauderdale. For this group, the ancestral seat played an important role as the symbol of a family's ancient lineage: to demolish it in favour of a new house was out of the question. It was their duty, as custodians for their generation, to bring the ancient paternal seat up to the architectural standards of the mid
seventeenth century. However, that was easier said than done: a house like Glamis had undergone nearly three hundred years of agglomeration:

'Tho. it be an old house and consequentlie was the more difficult to reduce the place to any uniformity, yet I did covet extremely to order my building so as the frontispiece might have a resemblance on both syds'.

### Schedule B

**The External Appearance of the Principal Houses of the Treasury Commissioners and Executives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Irregular</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Balanced Uniform</th>
<th>Uniform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Lauderdale</td>
<td>Thirlestane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunstane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lethington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Tweeddale</td>
<td>Yester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinkie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neidpath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Rothes</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballenbreich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Dundonald</td>
<td>Place of Paisley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auchans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Kincardine</td>
<td>Culross Abbey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palace of Culross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mainland</td>
<td>Hatton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dudhope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Atholl</td>
<td>Falkland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tullibardine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunkeld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Argyll</td>
<td>Inveraray</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argyll's Lodging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Moray</td>
<td>Darnaway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castle Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donibristle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Queensberry</td>
<td>Drumlanrig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanquhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strathmore</td>
<td>Glamis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castle Lyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Moncreiffe</td>
<td>Moncreiffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Bruce</td>
<td>Balcaskie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Smyth</td>
<td>Methven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There can be little doubt that Strathmore’s yearning for a balanced façade was inspired by the principles of the architectural treatises; yet the illustrations of symmetrical villas and maisons des champs provided by the pattern books were of little practical assistance in reforming an ancient paternal seat. There was, however, in Serlio’s seventh book of architecture, a valuable precedent; ‘on the Remodelling of old Things’:

‘Thirteenth Proposition: take for example a situation where a citizen has a house of great commodity and also with good walls. The face is ornamented, to be sure, but not in the way required by worthy architecture, the clearest error being that the door of this house is not in the centre, as it should be – and also the windows have a certain inequality. Now let us imagine that this citizen, so as not to appear inferior to his neighbours – who however unerringly build with good arrangements and who, as a bare minimum, adhere to symmetry – wants to restore if nothing else the façade of his house with the least disruption and expense possible’. 415
Although Strathmore seems to have shared Serlio's desire for the 'bare minimum' of symmetry, the techniques that they used to obtain aesthetic balance were very different. In remodeling a town house, which was flanked by neighbouring properties, Serlio was interested only in the façade. He demolished the irregular front and replaced it instead with a uniform arrangement. At Glamis, which was visible from all four sides, the balance was obtained by adding matching corner towers or pavilions to either side of the house. A similar formula was adopted by many other members of the Treasury Commission who sought to reform the external appearance of their existing houses. At Thirlestane, where the house was already flanked by massive circular towers, square pavilions were attached to each corner. At Hatton, the old tower was sandwiched between projecting gables and circular corner towers. (see appendix 2C/6) At Balcaskie, square pavilions were added to each corner of the house. (see appendix 4C/2)

Writing to Sir William Bruce about the aesthetic appearance of Brunstane, the Earl of Lauderdale confirmed the advantages that this formula brought to an otherwise irregular building. The addition of pavilions generated an approximate aesthetic balance from whatever side the house was viewed:

‘You know that in the last draught already approved of there are two pavilions on that side of the house wch is toward the Garden, the addition of two more to the other side, in which is the entry, will make the sight of the house much more fine, because on whatever side you come, you will have sight of the pavilions ... If it consist with the Uniformity of the Building, to have this pavilion a little larger than the other pavilions, it will be well; if not I will rest satisfied to have it of the same proportion with the rest’.  

Although the pavilions at Brunstane were intended to generate an air of uniformity, one was in fact taller and narrower than the other. Such inconsistencies were common. At Balcaskie, the windows of the projecting gables did not match. At Hatton, the windows of the garden front were irregularly spaced. At Glamis, the roof of the new west wing was flat while the original east wing was pitched. From the frequency with which they occurred, it seems that these discrepancies may have been intentional: to display too great a uniformity detracted from the aura of the original building.
In addition to providing aesthetic balance, pavilions also projected an appropriate image. In France, du Cerceau had stressed the importance of pavilions as the symbol of a signeurial residence:

‘Les deux pavillons estans sur le derriere excederont en hauteur le grand corps d’un etage pour donner monster et beaute a l’edifice’.  

When Lauderdale visited the building works at Thirlestane for the first time in 1672, he expressed an almost identical sentiment:

‘Without further debate you shall order the present taking down the roofs of those two pavilions, and the raising each of them one story higher ... This, I know, will cost money, but without it I shall never endure the front of my house, and therefore of necessity it must presently be done’.
Fig 53: Slezer’s illustration of the Frontispiece of Thirlestane demonstrates the noble silhouette
(Theatrum Scotiae)

By raising the height of the pavilions on either side of the façade, he created a more spectacular roofline. This formula was repeated on almost every reformed house of the post restoration era in Scotland. The Earl of Strathmore went to great lengths to heighten the ‘great round’ of the east wing at Glamis, before adding a matching tower to the new west wing. Charles Maitland constructed three round corner pavilions at Hatton, which framed both the façade and the garden front, and accentuated the irregularity of the old tower. The Earl of Kincardine raised the height of the garden front at Culross Abbey House by one storey, but extended the corner towers by two storeys. At Leslie, Yester, Balcaskie and Donibristle, the projecting gables on each side of the façade provided the same visual effect. (see appendix 2C/3 & 2C/9) In each instance, the roofline stepped down from the sides to the centre in a noble silhouette.

In silhouette, many of these reformed houses bore a resemblance to the imaginary maisons des champs of du Cerceau. Yet the similarity was little more than an illusion. The pavilions and the projecting gables of the reformed houses provided an architectural framework for what was otherwise an irregular building. In contrast to this approximate balance, the aesthetic appearance of Drumlanrig and Methven was considerably more refined. Each side of the house was aesthetically balanced: the arrangement of the façade and the garden front was different but each was symmetrical and the flanking walls mirrored one another. (see fig 54) Although they possessed a greater uniformity, each displayed the same architectural symbols that were evident in the reformed houses. The building was flanked by corner towers and the
roofline stepped down from the sides to the centre to provide the same distinctive silhouette. Despite the similarity of their appearance, Drumlanrig and Methven differed from the majority of reformed houses in one important respect. In order to obtain the greater uniformity, the original buildings were almost completely emasculated, leaving little or no physical evidence of their history.

Fig 54: The external appearance of Methven and Drumlanrig was balanced on all four sides (from a drawing by Ken Murdoch and a survey by J. Rocque c. 1720)
The greater refinement of Drumlanrig and Methven was not the work of Sir William Bruce: their design has been attributed instead to James Smith. This attribution raises an intriguing question about their architectural inspiration. Unlike William Bruce, Smith had spent his formative years in Italy, rather than in Holland or France, where he had become familiar with the work of Palladio. On his return to Scotland in about 1670, he was quickly employed by Bruce as a mason, first at Holyroodhouse and then at Kinross, and was selected by the Treasury Commission in 1678 to succeed Bruce as King’s Surveyor. If James Smith was so strongly influenced by the Italian interpretation of the architectural treatises, what inspired him to produce designs that were so manifestly French in their appearance? One might have anticipated that the Earl of Queensberry, who was typical of the ancient nobility, would have opted for a house that displayed the noble silhouette of the chateau, but Patrick Smyth was a member of the noblesse de robe whose architectural aspirations were unfettered by the constraints of lineage. His friend and neighbour, Sir Thomas Moncreiffe, had commissioned a classical country house. What inspired Smyth to commission a house that strongly resembled a castle?

From 1664, when he first acquired the estate, until 1681, when the new house was nearing completion, Patrick Smyth consistently referred to Methven as ‘the Castell’. There was a precedent for his claims: there had been a royal castle on the site since the reign of Robert II. In the charter of 1528 granted to Margaret Tudor and her husband Henry Stewart, it was ordained ‘that the foresaid Castle of Methven be the principal house of the Barony’. It was again referred to in similar fashion during the ownership of Ludovick, second Duke of Lennox, as ‘his house, Castle of Methven’. Although Smyth’s origins were relatively humble, his correspondence and his career reveal his social aspirations. By lending money to numerous members of the impoverished nobility, he was able to court their friendship. So successful were his efforts that by 1685 he could count the Earl of Perth as a neighbour, the Earl of Atholl as his patron and Lord Tarbat as a business partner. In adopting the symbols of a seigneurial residence, it seems he intended that Methven should resemble the paternal seat of the Smyth family.

From the outset, Patrick Smyth had a clear idea of the type of house that he would build at Methven. On a visit to Lord Tarbat in 1664, two small drawings were produced of a U-shaped house with a well-proportioned hall and two chambers on the first floor, accessed by narrow spiral stairs in the re-entrant angle. (see fig 55)
In elevation, this design would have closely resembled the early seventeenth-century houses of Pitreavie and Baberton, whose facades were balanced by projecting gables. Yet the eventual design of Methven was considerably more advanced. The two earlier houses were of single-pile construction, with the main entrance and the principal stair in one of the projecting wings: the external stairs led only from the first floor to the storeys above. In contrast, Methven was of double-pile construction, with the main entrance and the principal stair at the centre of the building, sandwiched between the two projecting wings and flanked by circular corner towers. (see fig 56 & 57)
It is conceivable that James Smith was inspired by Palladio and adapted Patrick Smyth’s plans into a more symmetrical and compact arrangement, adding the round corner towers to give the appearance of a castle. Yet, the towers at Methven did not form an integral part of the building as they did in a Palladian villa; they were tacked on to each corner of the house. This distinctive formula was much more likely to have been inspired by the pattern books of du Cerceau. There were already indications of his influence on Scottish domestic architecture in the early seventeenth century. The U-shaped plan of Pitreavie and Baberton bore a close resemblance to many illustrations in the 1582 edition of the *livres d’architecture*, where the façade of the house was flanked by matching pavilions with stair towers in the re-entrant angle. In Scotland, the façade was flanked by projecting gables, rather than pavilions, but the visual effect was the same. This carefully balanced composition accentuated the irregularity, rather than the uniformity, of the roofline.
Although there was a stylistic connection between the imaginary *maisons des champs* of du Cerceau and the U-plan villas of early seventeenth-century Scotland, the resemblance related only to their general aesthetic appearance. At Methven, the links extended to the internal arrangement of the house and its setting. In plate 12 of the 1582 edition, du Cerceau experimented with a compact structure instead of the traditional single-pile arrangement of the French chateau. (see fig 59) The building was constructed in a tripartite form with the principal stair in the central bay and the *salle* and *chambre* disposed on either side. The flanking pavilions were not added to the façade in the normal way; they were tacked on to the corners at the rear of the building. This illustration appears to be linked to a drawing by James Smith of an unidentified Scottish country house in the compact classical style. (see fig 60) Like du Cerceau’s design, this house was also constructed in a tripartite form, but without any corner pavilions.

![Fig 59: The compact arrangement of du Cerceau’s *maison des champs* from *Livre d’Architecture* (1582) Plate XII](http://www.cesr.univ-tours.fr/architectura)

![Fig 60: The compact arrangement of James Smith’s unidentified country house (RIBA Drawings Collection)](http://www.cesr.univ-tours.fr/architectura)
On closer inspection, it is clear that Smith was attempting to compress the requisite rooms and stairs into the confines of a compact building. Although the drawing showed only one elevation, there were three different plans of the first floor. In each one, the principal stair was located in the central bay, but the rooms were disposed in different positions. In the original plans, the dining room was located on one side of the stair, the drawing room in the central bay and two bedchambers with closets on the other side of the stair. This arrangement bore a strong resemblance to the layout of du Cerceau’s compact house. In the third drawing, Smith made a fundamental alteration to the layout; he inserted a vestibule at the head of the stair and relocated the dining room at the rear of the building, but in so doing, he seems to have left insufficient space for a drawing room. This distinctive relationship between the stair, the vestibule and the dining room was adopted in the eventual layout of Methven.

The link between the drawings of du Cerceau and James Smith is further confirmed by the presence of Methven’s circular corner towers. Not only did they provide the appropriate aesthetic appearance, the towers also solved the problem of the restricted floor space. By locating the closet in a tower, Smith was able to create a procession around the central stair: vestibule, dining room, drawing room, bedchamber and closet. A similar formula was also adopted by du Cerceau. In a third of the houses illustrated in the 1582 edition, cabinets and garde robes were incorporated in pavilions, rather than in the main body of the house. There was also a precedent in du Cerceau’s drawings for the singular design of Methven’s forecourt. Plate 5 of the 1582 edition illustrated the same enclosed courtyard, flanked by single-storey offices and entered by an arched gateway in the French tradition. (see figs 61 & 62)

Fig 61: Du Cerceau, Livre d’Architecture (1582), Plate V.
(http://www.cesr.univ-tours.fr/architectura)
Although many of the distinctive features of Methven were to be found in du Cerceau's *livres d'architecture*, the design of the house was not an immediate replica of an imaginary *maison des champs*. James Smith seems to have used the books instead as a source of inspiration; selecting different aspects at random. The same process took place at Drumlanrig, where Smith turned for inspiration to another of du Cerceau's publications; 'les plus excellents Bastiments de France'. The design of the perron stair and the terrace superimposed on an arcade were drawn directly from the entrance front of Fontainebleau. (see fig 63) The characteristic ogee capped towers and the triumphal arch were to be found in plate 11 of the 1582 edition of the *livres d'architecture*. (see fig 64) Like Methven, Drumlanrig was resolutely French in its architectural inspiration; yet both houses lacked the architectural finesse of du Cerceau’s designs. The corner towers at Drumlanrig were flat topped rather than pitched and the façade at Methven was balanced with gables and not pavilions. Whatever the reason for this peculiarity, it created an aesthetic appearance that was characteristically Scottish.

Given the dominance of the Treasury Commissioners, who shared many of the aspirations of the ancient French nobility, it is only to be expected that the majority of Scottish country houses in the post restoration era should have followed the architectural interpretation of du Cerceau, rather than Palladio or Scamozzi. In a society whose standards were dominated by lineage, it was the noble silhouette of the chateau that displayed the appropriate image, rather than the uniformity of the classical villa.
Fig 63:
Palace of Fontainebleau
(Du Cerceau, Les plus excellents Bastiments de France)

Fig 64:
Du Cerceau, Livre d'Architecture (1582), Plate XI.

Fig 65:
Drumlanrig.
(Vitruvius Britannicus)
There were only three houses belonging to members of the Treasury Commission that displayed the uniformity of the classical villa. Two of these, Moncreiffe and Kinross, were commissioned by members of the noblesse de robe whose architectural ambitions were unfettered by their family lineage; the third, Dunkeld, was commissioned by a member of the ancient nobility. (see appendix 2C/7) This apparent anomaly can only be explained by the different functions that each of these houses was intended to serve. As the principal seats of Sir Thomas Moncreiffe and Sir William Bruce, the appearance of Moncreiffe and Kinross was designed to reflect the status of their owners; as the secondary house of the Earl of Atholl, the external appearance of Dunkeld was immaterial.

Moncreiffe was a very compact building, constructed in a tripartite format, with an aesthetic appearance that was austere and unadorned, whose beauty was achieved through the basic form of the house and the rhythm of the window openings, rather than any classical embellishment. The house bore a strong resemblance to the external appearance of Chevening, yet its sobriety suggests a link with the houses of Philips Vingboons in the North Netherlands. Whatever its origins, the design of Moncreiffe was understated. Apart from a discreet pediment over the main entrance, there were no classical details. The walls were rendered, rather than ashlar, to diminish the display of wealth. There was nothing about the aesthetic appearance of Moncreiffe that might have attracted opprobrium.

Fig 66: The austerity of Moncreiffe, Perthshire. (Perth Museum and Art Gallery)
In comparison, Kinross was brazen in its display of ambition. The façade stepped down from the pavilions on either side to a recessed centre in the French tradition; yet the pavilions were accentuated by giant Corinthian pilasters, as if to highlight the uniformity of the building. The ashlar walls underlined the enormous cost of the building works. The internal arrangements replicated the layout of an unexecuted plan for an English country house by William Talman. In almost every respect, Kinross represented the very antithesis of the post-restoration Scottish country house.

Fig 67: Alexander Edward's architectural survey of Kinross
(RCAHMS)
Kinross and its setting were so conspicuous by the standards of the late seventeenth-century Scottish country house that they seem to have attracted the envy of William Bruce’s contemporaries. The Earl of Morton, whose paternal seat formed the focal point of the new house, indulged in ‘malicious and groundless whisperings’ about the price that had been paid to him for the estate of Loch Leven. The Earl of Lauderdale, who suffered from Bruce’s political disloyalty, complained bitterly about his excessive wealth. The Earl of Strathmore, who entered into a protracted and costly legal battle with Bruce, declined to employ him in the reconstruction of Glamis. Such general opprobrium bears a marked similarity to the envy that was incurred by Nicolas Fouquet in France.

Although the scale of Kinross reflected the relative poverty of the Scottish economy, the events that surrounded its construction bore many similarities to the building of Vaux le Vicomte. Like Sir William Bruce, Fouquet was a man of discerning taste who had acquired his prodigious wealth through the manipulation of the king’s revenues. He too commissioned a house that was radical in design and ostentatious in appearance. What is more, he also fell foul of the envy of his contemporaries and lost his official post. In a country like Scotland or France, where lineage was the principal measure of decorum, it was considered inappropriate to display excessive wealth.
The Internal Arrangement of the Scottish Country House

When the Earl of Strathmore first took up residence at Castle Lyon, he complained bitterly about the draughts and the lack of privacy:

"The house itself was extremally cold and the hall was a vault ... No access there was to the upper part of the house without going through the hall, even upon the most undecent occasions of Drudgerie unavoidable to be seen by all who should happen to be in that rowme nor was there any other to reteer to..." 431

According to a household inventory of 1648, the standard of accommodation had evolved very little from the simple medieval arrangement of the hall and chamber. (see appendix 5E/6) The house was constructed in three large vaults, one above the other: a store room on the ground floor, the 'lettermeat hall' on the first floor and the 'great hall' on the second floor.

Fig 68: The layout of Castle Lyon prior to the Earl of Strathmore’s reconstruction (from original drawings of MacGibbon & Ross)
The bedchambers were located above the great hall and in a wing attached to the south side of the house. Access was provided by two turnpike stairs, constructed within the thickness of the massive walls: one leading from the entrance to the great hall and the other from the great hall to the bedrooms above. There was a physical division within the house between the family and guests, who occupied the great hall, and the household servants, who occupied the ‘lettermeat hall’, yet the majority of bedrooms contained two beds: one for the occupant and another ‘by bed’ for a personal servant. There was only one apartment in the house, which consisted of ‘the chamber on the south end of the hall’ and ‘the little house of the chamber on the south end of the hall’. It is easy to understand from the simplicity of Castle Lyon why the Earl of Strathmore should have been so concerned about the lack of privacy.

However, there is evidence that such an arrangement was by no means uncommon in Scotland before the Restoration. An inventory of Cassillis, in 1644, shows a standard of accommodation that was even less advanced. (see appendix 5E/2) The house was divided in the same way into a ‘heiche hall’ and a ‘laich hall’ but there was no apartment in the house; every bedchamber contained a ‘by bed’ for a personal servant. The accommodation at Glamis was a little more advanced. In addition to the ‘gryt hall’ and the ‘lettermeat hall’, there was a ‘tyllit hall’, which seems from the 1648 inventory, to have served as a dining room, but there was still only one apartment: the other eleven bedrooms contained ‘laighe beds’ for the use of servants. (see appendix 5E/7)

By comparison, the standard of accommodation at Donibristle in 1651 was extremely progressive. Although many of the furnishings had been damaged and redistributed during the Civil War, it is evident that the house incorporated two dining rooms, a ‘draying [drawing] rowm’, two ‘parlors’ and two apartments: one for my lady and another for my lord. It also contained a very fine wooden staircase, where thirty six pictures were hung. There is also evidence that the planning of Hamilton Palace was more advanced. According to an inventory of 1648, the principal reception rooms included a great hall, a great dining room and a withdrawing room, and six of the twelve bedchambers were fitted out as apartments. (see appendix 5E/7) In the new wing at Caerlaverock in 1640, there was a ‘long hall’, a ‘dining room’ and a ‘drawing room’. It is clear from the greater number of more specialised rooms that the internal arrangement of these three houses had already undergone significant development prior to the Restoration.
The very marked contrast between the interior of Castle Lyon and Donibristle appears to have been inspired by the court in London. The houses that were more advanced in their planning belonged to owners with close connections to the court. James, 1st Duke of Hamilton, a strong supporter of Charles I, had built a very fine new house at Chelsea in 1639, which contained no fewer than three drawing rooms, overlooking the river Thames, seventeen bedchambers and a gallery where he hung his renowned collection of Italian paintings. James, 4th Earl of Moray, who was responsible for the balanced appearance of Donibristle and Castle Stewart, had married the daughter of the English-born, Countess of Home, whose taste is said to have been cultivated in London. Robert, 5th Earl of Nithsdale, the builder of the new wing at Caerlaverock, was another close confidant of Charles I who remained almost permanently in residence at court. If the more advanced planning of these three houses was influenced by the court, as seems to have been the case, it is likely that their layout would have mirrored the English country house. Yet, the traditional structure of the Scottish country house was very different: it was much closer to the French chateau, with the principal stair at the entrance, the servants’ hall on the ground floor, the great hall on the first floor, and the public ‘chamber of dais’. It is only by comparing the development of an English country house with a Scottish country house that the differences can be assessed.

In 1670, the Earl of Lauderdale and his future wife, the Countess of Dysart, set about the reconstruction of Thirlestane in Berwickshire and Ham in Surrey. Before the building works began, the two houses were totally different in their structure. Ham was a traditional English, H-shaped, house with the great hall on the ground floor, the domestic offices at the low end and the accommodation for family and guests at the high end. The formal and informal functions of the house were divided between the great chamber on the first floor and the parlours on the ground floor. The great stair provided a ceremonial ascent from the high end of the great hall to the great chamber. Although the precise layout of Thirlestane is unknown, it can be conjectured from the traditional arrangement of the Scottish country house that the domestic offices were located on the vaulted ground floor and the great hall on the first floor. The principal stair rose directly from the main entrance on one side of the house to the first floor great hall. Unless significant alterations had been undertaken, there was no physical division between the formal and informal functions of the house: the great hall and the chamber of dais served both purposes. In almost every respect, therefore, the layout of the two houses was representative of the traditional arrangements of their respective countries. (see figs 69 & 70)
Fig: 69

HAM

Conjectural plan of first floor state apartment (top)
Conjectural plan of ground floor private apartment (bottom)
Black = original building
Grey = new building works

(drawn from Thornton & Tomlin, The Furnishing and Decoration of Ham House)
Fig 70:

Black = original building
Grey = new building works
Conjectural plan of first floor state apartment (as built)

Conjectural plan of ground floor private apartment (as built)

THIRLESTANE
(drawn from the plans of Johan Slezer)
Although the scope of the building works at Ham and Thirlestane was different, they appear to have achieved very similar objectives. At Ham, one side of the original H was infilled, providing a suite of private rooms on the ground floor and a suite of formal rooms on the first floor. At Thirlestane, the ground floor vaults were quarried out and the domestic offices relocated, creating the same arrangement of a private suite on the ground floor and a formal apartment on the first floor. In both houses a physical division was created between the formal function on one floor and the informal function on another. This format is evident in a number of other houses belonging to members of the Treasury Commission. At Drumlanrig, for example, the family rooms were located on the ground floor and the state rooms on the first floor. At Glamis, the ‘high dyneing roum’, the ‘withdrawing roum’, the ‘fine bedchamber’ and the ‘closet of the fine bedchamber’ were carefully placed above the ‘dyneing roum’, the ‘withdrawing roum’, ‘my lady’s bedchamber’ and ‘my lady’s closet’. In each instance the rooms of the state apartment were laid out in enfilade.

These new state rooms were decorated in the most lavish fashion. At Thirlestane, the fretwork ceilings above the great stair, the high vestibule, the great chamber, the great drawing room and the great bedchamber were committed to George Dunsterfield, who had travelled from London to work at Holyroodhouse. A Dutchman, Edward Kickius, was employed to decorate the newly plastered rooms with colouring of walnut, tortoiseshell and grained work, in the very latest fashion. Lauderdale even went to the expense of shipping numerous marble chimney pieces from London:

‘I have acquired six already for Thirlestane castle, and 3 of them are finer than any I see in England, and I have a great penniworth; two I have payed for this day much finer than my Lord Chancellor’s [the Earl of Rothes], larger and cheaper above a fourth than his; I lighted on them by chance in an Italian merchant’s hand, who let me have them as he pay’d for them in Italie with the customes and charges … When I see your answer to what I wrote concerning alterations and chimneys at Thirlestane castle, and what marble you can have at home, then I shall fitt marble chimneys for the whole 2 lower stories at Thirlestane castle’.
Fig 71: The lavish fretwork ceiling of the Great Chamber at Thirlestane
(RCAHMS)

Fig 72: The ornate ceiling and door surrounds of the High Vestibule at Thirlestane
(RCAHMS)
The same quality of decoration was repeated at Balcaskie, where the ceilings of the principal reception rooms were plastered by Dunsterfield and the centrepieces were painted by Jacob de Witt. At Leslie, the ceilings of the great dining room, the drawing room and the ‘handsome staitlie bedchamber’ were to be ‘enricht with staitlie & rich freat worke in a beautifull maner’. At Drumlanrig, there were carvings by Grinling Gibbons above the doors of the principal apartment; the window sills and chimney pieces were of white marble. Enormous trouble and expense was incurred to generate the richest visual appearance. Yet, it is surprising to discover from a discussion between the Earl of Lauderdale and Sir William Bruce that the formal state rooms were only seldom used:

“This division will give a faire and handsom passage, betwixt the great stares and the little drawing Rome in the Northwest Round; it will also serve for a Cuburd when we eat upon extraordinary times in the Great Chamber.”

If the ‘great’ rooms were occupied only on ‘extraordinary’ occasions, it seems that their lavish decoration must have been largely symbolic. The splendid state apartments at Ham and Thirlestane were designed to reflect the Earl of Lauderdale’s exalted status as a member of the Cabal in England and as the King’s Commissioner in Scotland. However, the state apartment at Ham was one of the last of its kind in England, while the state apartment at Thirlestane was one of the first to be installed in Scotland. In England, where the compact country house became increasingly popular during the later seventeenth century, the principal reception rooms were often located on the ground floor, on either side of the entrance hall. The first floor state apartment was limited only to the very grandest houses, like Chatsworth and Althorp. In Scotland, the principal reception rooms were almost invariably located on the first floor, where they were laid out in enfilade, creating a distinctive state procession. This arrangement was not only incorporated into the compact houses of Moncreiffe and Kinross (see appendix 4C/1 & 4C/2); it became a hallmark of Scottish country houses during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.
It appears, on the face of it, that the Scottish nobility possessed a grandeur that was equal only to the richest and most influential members of the English nobility; yet, the Scottish economy was on the brink of collapse and landed estates were generating only very small surpluses. There was no comparison between the wealth of the Cavendishes and the Spencers in England, and the relative poverty of the Lyons and the Murrays in Scotland. There must have been an alternative explanation for the adoption of this very stately arrangement.

Since different standards of decorum were responsible for the contrasting external appearance of English and Scottish country houses, it seems that they may also have been the cause of their distinctive internal arrangements. In Scotland, the state procession was not a symbol of wealth and influence, as it was in England, but a measure of history and lineage. However similar their layout, it appears that the state apartments at Ham and Thirlestane may have projected different images. In both houses, the lavish decoration symbolised the Earl of Lauderdale’s status as a senior government official, but at Thirlestane, it displayed the additional message that he was proud of his family’s history.

There is an additional, very pragmatic, explanation for the popularity of the state procession in Scotland. The distinctive enfilade of the state apartments at Ham and Thirlestane originated in France. Since the Scottish nobility acquired their manners and etiquette in France and shared many of the aspirations of the noblesse d’epee, there is good reason to anticipate that the enfilade would have gained ready acceptance in Scotland. It was, after all, ideally suited to the single pile structure of the Scottish country house and the traditional ascent from the main entrance to the first floor. What is more, the ceilings of the first floor were high enough to accommodate the proportions of the state rooms. Above all, the state procession could be incorporated into an existing building without reconstructing the outer walls: a factor of great importance to those who sought to retain elements of the original house.

At Thirlestane, the principal stair was relocated in close proximity to the main entrance and rose directly to the first floor state apartment. The same arrangement was incorporated in the compact layout of Moncreiffe, where the main staircase led from a ground floor lobby to the ‘great dining room’ on the first floor. At Glamis, the state procession was devised in such a way that it included the existing staircase. Strathmore’s plan, which was conceived without the involvement of a ‘publick architector’, was
apparently inspired by his desire to incorporate the original great hall with its splendid plasterwork ceiling. 450

'My great hall wch is a rowme that I ever loved, having no following was also a great inducement to me for reering up that quarter upon the west syde wch now is'. 451

Although he longed to retain this relic of his family's history, Strathmore was faced with the problem of finding a fitting use for it. According to the 1648 inventory of Glamis, the original function of the great hall had already changed: it was no longer used as the principal meeting and eating place in the house. On the face of it, he could have reclaimed the great hall as a 'great dining room': the first element of the state apartment. Instead, he built a completely new wing, which incorporated all four elements of the state apartment, and slapped a doorway in the end of the great hall to provide a convenient access. Strathmore then made another very minor modification to the original layout of the house: he relocated the main entrance so that it opened directly on to the great circular stair. This alteration provided a remarkable procession that combined both tradition and fashion. (see figs 73 & 74) As the visitor climbed the great spiral stair and walked the length of the splendid great hall, he was reminded of the family's history and lineage, but as he entered the 'high dyneing room', he could not fail to have been impressed by its fashionable and lavish decoration. This was an extraordinary combination of symbols, old and new, that were arranged for the maximum theatrical effect.
Fig 73: The Great Hall of Glamis

(Billings, The Baronial and Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland)

Fig 74: Glamis

Conjectural plan of second floor state apartment: route of the state procession

Black = original building  Grey = new building works  Green = Route of the State Procession

(drawn from plans of John Elphinstone)
Before their reconstruction, the respective layouts of Ham and Thirlestane differed in another important respect. The standard of privacy at Ham was very much higher than at Thirlestane. Each of the bedchambers possessed its own closet and the great chamber was followed by a drawing room. At Thirlestane, if it repeated the arrangement of Glamis, there was only one closet, attached to the principal bedchamber, and no drawing room. It was precisely this problem that the Earl of Strathmore sought to overcome in the building works at Castle Lyon. Faced with the prospect of watching the distasteful ‘drudgerie’ of his servants in the old great hall, he converted the traditional chamber of dais and closet into a withdrawing room, a room ‘to reteer to’. He added closets to seven of the bedchambers: he rearranged the stairs so that each room was served directly and he installed a series of ‘outer rooms’ which acted as antechambers. Each of these modifications provided greater privacy for the occupants of the house.

Fig 75: The Layout of Castle Lyon after the Earl of Strathmore’s reconstruction (from drawings of MacGibbon and Ross)
At Glamis, Strathmore took even more drastic steps to avoid his domestic servants. Having added an extension to the original east wing, in which his principal bedchamber was located, he then built a ‘counting room’ at the centre, where he kept a second bedchamber, and finally constructed a new wing on the west side of the house, where his wife was lodged. In order to circulate from one section of the house to another, he was forced to walk through the low hall, which was occupied by the household staff. In order to avoid this unsatisfactory arrangement, he went to the lengths of quarrying out a passage in the thickness of the walls so that he could bypass the servants:

‘I did add to the work before mentioned of a closet in my charterhouse severall things of a considerable trouble as the digging thorow passages from the new work to the old thorow that closet againe so as that now I have access off one flour from the east quarter of the house of Glammis to the west syde of the house thorow the low hall’.

Fig 76: Glamis

Conjectural plan of first floor family apartment: Strathmore’s route from the east to west quarters

Black = original building   Grey = new building works   Green = Route of the State Procession

(drawn from plans of John Elphinstone)
To have undergone such disruption and incurred such expense underlines the intensity of Strathmore's desire for privacy. Yet, it is clear from the evidence of many household inventories that a high proportion of country house owners in Scotland shared the same desire. Before 1650, closets and withdrawing rooms were found only in the houses of those who were closest to the court in London, by the end of the seventeenth century, their presence was almost universal.\textsuperscript{454} At first sight, this pattern suggests that it was the privacy of the English court that infected the Scottish country house. However, the profusion of withdrawing rooms and closets coincided with the construction of many park walls. It seems, therefore, that the desire for greater privacy may have been encouraged as much by the underlying insecurity that resulted from the Civil War and the Cromwellian occupation, as it was by the culture of the English court.

Although the internal arrangement of Thirlestane, Glamis and Drumlanrig was divided between formal and family apartments, the survey of household inventories reveals that the majority of Scottish country houses were arranged in a less formal fashion. Like Castle Lyon, they contained only one dining room.

(see Schedule C)

**Schedule C**

**Survey of Inventories: Internal Arrangements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Houses with Family Apartment only</th>
<th>Houses with Formal &amp; Family Apartments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>House</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Castle Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Cassillis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Balgonie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Lethington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Balloch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>The Binns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Castle Lyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Lochwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Pinkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Broxmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Culross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Sanquhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Kinneil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Cortachy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Dalgety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Floors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This disparity appears to be related either to the function of the house or the relative affluence of its owner. From detailed correspondence between the Earl of Lauderdale and Sir William Bruce, it is clear that the layout of Brunstane, a house that had been recently acquired, was to be arranged in a different way to Thirlestane, the paternal seat. At Thirlestane, the Lauderdales’ private apartment was located on the groundfloor and the state apartment on the first floor. At Brunstane, the private rooms were to be laid out on two floors; those used by Lauderdale during the day were to be located on the ground floor: ‘my little galery’, ‘my low parlour’, an ‘anti roum to the parlour’ and ‘my tobacco roum’; their bedrooms, closets and dressing rooms were to be arranged on the first floor. The principal stair at Brunstane was to lead directly to a vestibule on the first floor, as it did at Thirlestane, followed by the great chamber and a withdrawing room; but this was to be the only dining room in the house and was not accompanied by a state bedchamber.

A similar distinction existed between the arrangement of Castle Lyon and Sanquhar, and Glamis and Drumlanrig. At Glamis and Drumlanrig, the state apartment lay on a different floor from the family apartment: each with their own dining room. At Castle Lyon and Sanquhar, there was only one dining room. Like Thirlestane and Brunstane, it was the paternal seat that provided both formal and family functions and the second house that served only an informal function. This pattern was repeated in the houses of the Earl of Tweeddale. Yester, the paternal seat, served a formal function, while Pinkie and Dalgety did not. This clear distinction between the formality of the ‘house of receite’ and the informality of the ‘convenient lodge’ reflected their different functions. In a summer residence like Castle Lyon, or a suburban villa like Brunstane, there was no requirement for formal entertainment or the display of status. Such houses could be converted to provide convenient and comfortable accommodation, as the reconstruction of Castle Lyon demonstrates, but they would never attain the significance of an ancient paternal seat, which embodied a family’s history.

Given that there was a distinction between the layout of a paternal seat and a lodge, it is significant that certain members of the Scottish nobility possessed houses that did not conform to this pattern. The Earl of Cassillis owned Cassillis and Castle Kennedy, neither of which incorporated a state apartment. The Earl of Wigtown’s paternal seat of Cumbernauld and the Earl of Airlie’s seat of Cortachy had only one dining room and no drawing room. It is evident from the details of their respective inventories that the internal...
arrangement of these houses had not developed at the same rate as their contemporaries; they still retained the original format of a hall and chamber. (see appendix CF/1, 5F/2, 5F/8 & 5F/22) On closer inspection, the finances of each of the owners were in disarray when the inventory was drawn up. The Earl of Cassillis was forced to dispose of his estate of Inch, having failed to obtain repayment of the sums that his father had advanced during the Civil War. The Earl of Wigtown had recently succeeded to the family estates while in his minority. The Earl of Airlie, who was renowned for his lamentable management, had failed to procure a pension from the Treasury. The informal nature of these houses reflected the relative penury of their owners, rather than their specific function. They had not evolved at the same rate as those that belonged to members of the Treasury Commission.
The Furnishing of the Scottish Country House

From the survey of household inventories of the early seventeenth century, it is apparent that the furnishings of the principal bedchamber were visually very striking. In the 'bedchamber of the withdrawing roume' at Hamilton in 1647, the walls were hung with 'rich flanders hingings [hangings]; the 'chapel' bed was decorated with curtains of crimson velvet, fringed with gold and silver lace; the chairs and stools were covered with red damask and a silk fringe. The walls of the 'best chalmer' at Glamis in 1648, were lined with striped hangings; the bedposts were topped with cups of green 'frize' and the curtains were of green cloth edged with a 'willow green' fringe; the chairs and the couch bed were covered in black cloth with a silk fringe. Despite the richness of the materials, the range of furniture was limited in its extent. The 'tyllit hall' at Glamis, contained two large oak tables, two oak forms [benches], a small fir cupboard, twelve red leather chairs and a striking clock in a case.

This stark contrast between the richness of the bedchamber and simplicity of the furniture accords closely with historians' assessments of Scottish furnishings prior to the Restoration.

In order to prepare for his official visit to Edinburgh in 1672, the Earl of Lauderdale sent a shipment of furnishings from London to Leith to decorate his apartments at Holyroodhouse and the house of Lethington. This shipment contained an enormous assortment of different objects: forty one 'great pictures', thirty three lesser pictures in gilt frames, a great sleeping chair with green curtains, two pairs of gilt stands, a little gilt table and a gilt screen, four looking glasses, twelve 'spanish tables', a billiard table, a marble chimney piece, a pair of harpsichords, a pair of virginals, and a 'brass Cupid and a dragon with its pettie stall'. A year later, he had accumulated a whole range of elaborate furnishings, which included the the cloth of state in blue cut velvet with a gold ground, a rich footmantle of black velvet overlaid with gold and silver lace, the state bed which was hung with purple damask curtains and mounted with four 'knops with silver and gold feathers', and a set of chairs covered in the same purple damask. Eighty three pieces of tapestry included a set of 'Adam and Eve' and a set of 'Grotesque hangings, the 'History of Vulcan', the 'History of Jephthah', a set of 'Horse Hangings', and a set of 'Apostle Hangings'. There were three dozen red gilded leather chairs and two armed chairs, eighteen new carpet chairs and sixteen 'wand' chairs, three walnut tables with matching candle stands, three chamber tables with drawers and a 'playing table' with a case.
In 1674, the Lauderdale family took up residence at Lethington, where they entertained the leading members of his administration: the Earls of Atholl and Argyll, Sir William Sharp, the King's Cashkeeper, and Lady Kinord, the wife of Alexander, 2nd Earl of Kincardine. Although the accommodation was relatively confined, the furnishings were lavish. Lady Lauderdale's private apartment was filled with fashionable furniture: her bedchamber was hung with red and white silk hangings, the bed curtains were of white cessnet with silk ties, the bed was topped with four cups with gilded sprigs, the window curtains were of white Indian satin. There were ten cane chairs, an Indian cabinet, an Italian marble table, a little cedar table and a pair of inlaid stands, a fine pendulum clock and a fine Indian screen. In her closet, there was a couch bed hung with curtains of Indian taffeta, four armchairs, a fine japanned cabinet, another Italian marble table and a fine looking glass with a frame of painted flowers. The 'withdrawing room' was lined with gilded leather hangings and contained thirteen cane chairs, each with a silk cushion, an Italian table, six Spanish tables of cedarwood, a large princes wood cabinet and a looking glass in a black ebony frame. The same opulence was evident in the state apartment at Drumlanrig. In the 'great dining room of the Principal Appartment', there were thirty-four cane chairs set around a large cedarwood table, covered with a 'fyne carpet'. The 'fyne arras' hangings depicted the Duke of Newcastle's 'manage'. In the drawing room, the hangings were of the same 'fyne arras', with a 'fyne jeopard [japanned]' cabinet and a japanned looking glass, table and stands. However, the richest and most fashionable furnishings were to be found in the 'principal bedchamber'. The walls were lined with arras hangings of 'fyne forrest work', the window curtains were of white silk damask, there was another fine japanned cabinet, with a looking glass and stands. The large easy chair and six armchairs were covered in blue velvet to match the splendid state bed:

'Ane fyne blew velvet bed lyned with gold colord satten with its roof silo, bolster piece, heid curtein & cornishes all imbroidered with silk of severall colours upon the outer pand a fyne silk freinge of imbroidered gimpt work with twelve loups conform upon the corners of the bed The foot pand also of blew velvet with two rows of mixt fringes upon the bottom with ane fyne imbroidered twilt [quilt] beneath the bed with a canvas bottom The sd twilt being of gold colord satin and ane holland whyt colord twilt All the curteins are of silk ... A fyne tour de lit of gold colord tafety with a mixt silk fringe round the bottom & edge therof with yellow tafety slips upon the four stoups of the bed [bedposts] with ane pedestall for the bed to stand upon covered
with fyne mute and red leatherd strips thrie silk cords for drawing up of the tour de lit with two iron hooks for fastening of them four jeopand folliadges for the top of the bed with four large plumes of feathers with four gilded & jeopand claws for the foot of the bed’.

Such a dramatic increase in the range of furnishings conforms closely to events in England, where the interior of the country house became increasingly influenced by the fashion for French decoration and furniture that swept through the court following the Restoration. However, the most recent analysis of late seventeenth century English interiors suggests that the spread of French fashion was by no means universal. There were marked differences between the interiors of the most ardent courtiers, like Ham, and those of the country gentry, like Belton in Leicestershire. At Ham, the apartments were filled with the richest, most elaborate and expensive furniture; at Belton, the contents were more frugal. This fresh assessment is based upon the presence of certain items of furniture that are characteristic of the period: cabinets and writing desks [scriptors], tables, stands and looking glasses [triads], lacquer and japanned ware and cane chairs. The ‘triad’ was typical of the furniture made popular by the court of Louis XIV, which was subsequently manufactured by English cabinet makers in the late seventeenth century. (see fig 77) Lacquered furniture or ‘japanned’ ware became increasingly popular after 1663, when the East India Company had been permitted to export bullion to India and ship furniture in return. (see fig 79) The ‘cane chair’ was an English innovation that replaced traditional forms of seating because it was lighter than the traditional leather chair and more durable than the covered chair. (see fig 78) If the inventories of contemporary Scottish country houses were scrutinized for the same ‘marker goods’, this would provide a good deal of valuable information. It would indicate the extent to which the Scottish nobility was isolated from the influence of the court in London. It would highlight the factors that were responsible for differences between one household and another: whether they were caused by aspiration or by wealth. It would also provide a clearer picture of the source of furnishings in Scotland: whether they were acquired in London or in Europe.
Fig 77: The Triad (table, glass and candle stands)

Fig 78: The Cane Chair

Fig 79: The Japanned Cabinet

(Thornton & Tomlin, The Furnishing and Decoration of Ham House)
The survey of household inventories reveals a number of distinct patterns. It is immediately evident, from the presence of each of the four ‘marker goods’, that the Scottish nobility was fully aware of the latest developments in London fashion. Of the four items, the increasing popularity of the cane chair is the most evident. In the earlier inventories, the predominant form of seating in the principal reception rooms was either the ‘russia leather chair’ or the ‘carpet chair’. From its first appearance at Lethington, to an inventory of Balloch in 1679, which listed ten ‘ken [cane] stools wt backs’ in the high drawing room, one ‘armed ken chair’ in the ‘Countess’ bedchamber’ a further five chairs and two stools in the ‘yellow room’, the cane chair became almost universal. (see appendix 5F/5) By 1686, when the inventory of Glamis was drawn up, there were six dozen cane chairs spread throughout the house, from the new rooms in the state apartment to the guests’ bedchambers. (see appendix 5F/12)

Much the same pattern emerges for ‘triads’ and cabinets. From its inclusion in the inventory of Balgonie in 1672, the ‘triad’ appeared with increasing frequency in numerous different forms: black, gilded, walnut, olive wood, chestnut, princes wood and even ‘outlandish wood’. (see appendix 5F/3) Cabinets also grew in popularity: at Kinneil, the Earl of Arran’s private apartment contained a walnut cabinet; at Culross, there were four cabinets: two of black ebony, one of walnut and one inlaid. (see appendix 5F/17& 21) The Earl of Strathmore acquired a cabinet for his wife shortly after their wedding:

‘Att the same time also I caused bring home a verie fin cabinet the better was not in the Kingdome in these days which I never told my wyfe of till her coming home, and upon her first comeing into her owne chamber I presented her with the keyes’.467

By the early eighteenth century, ‘japanned ware’ was to be found in many country houses. At Dalgety in 1707, there were eight japanned cane chairs and a fine japanned folding table. (see appendix 5F/24) At Newbattle in 1719, there were two japanned corner cupboards, a japanned indian chest and a black japanned triad. (see appendix 5F/30) The Marquess of Annandale acquired such volumes of japanned ware from London that the drawing room at Craigiehall was filled with lacquer work: there were five black japanned chairs, a black japanned triad and a japanned tea table. (see appendix 5F/23) Despite the increasing number of these fashionable marker goods, there were still houses in Scotland at the end of the seventeenth century in which they were absent. At Cumbernauld in 1682, The Binns in 1685 and
Cortachy in 1699, the principal reception room was furnished with ‘carpet chairs’ or ‘russia leather chairs’. (see appendix 5F/8, 9 & 22) These were the same houses whose internal arrangements had been restrained by the relative penury of their owners. It is evident therefore, that wealth also played an important part in the quality of furnishing of the Scottish country house. Houses that belonged to members of the Treasury Commission were lavishly decorated, while houses that belonged to owners with no extraordinary income remained almost unchanged.

From the inventory of Moncreiffe in 1681, which included at least two of the fashionable marker goods, it appears that there was little distinction between the quality of furnishings acquired by the Treasury Executives and the Treasury Commissioners. (see appendix 5F/6) Although the house was only recently completed, there were eighteen cane chairs in the low dining room. The walls of the principal bedchamber, which contained a ‘flour’d glass, table and stands’, were lined with ‘fine arras’, the bed hangings were of mohair lined with red satin, and the bedposts were topped with gilded cups. In 1682, Sir Thomas Moncreiffe acquired more furnishings for the house, when he commissioned his neighbour, Sir Patrick Murray of Ochtertyre, to buy tapestries while he was in London. 468

Whenever the opportunity arose, members of the Treasury Commission appear to have spent time and money in the pursuit of furnishings in London. In 1670, the Countess of Rothes wrote to Sir William Bruce, while he and the Earl of Rothes were involved in abortive negotiations for an Act of Union, requesting that he accompany her husband to inspect a set of tapestries for Leslie:

“You tell me he was to see that shout [suite] of hangins ye mentioned on an other letar, which I hope for the lenth of them will serve the roum they are designed for, I only wish they be not too deep for if they be more than 2 yeards & a sharp half deep, they will not so hansomly fit that roume”. 469

In 1685, the Earl of Strathmore took advantage of his visit to court, to buy ‘a great dale of furniture, plates and statues’. 470 According to the lengthy correspondence between the Earl and Countess of Tweeddale, London provided a source for numerous different items of furniture and other household effects: silver plate, marble chimney pieces, fireplaces, paintings, looking glasses, beds and tables. It is evident that
Tweeddale was no stranger to the city and its suppliers. He visited Branzkis for beds and hangings, he acquired fireplaces at the ‘the Sign of the Wheel near Haymarket’ and directed his son, Lord Yester, to buy paintings and picture frames from Henry Norris ‘who has the hanging of the king’s pictures’. Although Lady Tweeddale longed for furnishings ‘in the latest fashion’, her husband’s financial misfortunes frequently forced her to make do:

‘Be cause you are there and I know not when we shall have such an occasion againe I wold have something provided for our house which really is bot ill furnished tho good enough for it, yet will serve a better when we get it, bot it is fitter to have some lying by us that upon occasions may be used, and therefore I would have a damask bed & if you could get a second hand on were not soiled and fashionable you might buy it if it be either a blew or crimson…”

For those who did not frequent the court in London, there were two alternative methods for the acquisition of fashionable furniture: they could either purchase direct from a cabinet maker or place an order with a reputable merchant in Edinburgh. The Earl of Lothian ordered two dozen cane chairs and six armed chairs directly from John and James Shewell in London. However, most furnishings were acquired through merchants like Sir John Clerk of Penicuik who imported a consignment of goods from London and Paris in 1676. In England, he acquired clothes, candlesticks, snuffers, an olive wood cabinet and a ‘large glasse table & stands wt a glass of vernish’. In France, he bought a similar range of goods, mostly material for clothes and furnishings, but also a cabinet. He arranged another shipment from Rotterdam, which contained furnishings from Antwerp:

‘Accompt of severall things bought at Antwerp which are to be sent down to Rotterdam by Mr Boels

1 ane old suit of gilt hangings cost 18 gilders being 90 skins
2 ane new suit containing a chamber & ¼ at 72 gil ye chamber
3 and little cabinet & caice
4 ane pair of indented tables indented wt ware about 3 foot long
5 ane picture 22 ane 3 ¼ ane 7 ½ ane 11 ½ ane 7 ane 8 ½ foot long & all of them 6 ½ foot high for all of which I am to pay 100 gilders
6 ane old suit of arras hangings 1 piece 7 ½ ane 4 ane 7 ¼ ane 5 ¾ els long & all of them 4 els deep wt ane arras boord cloth'.

Sir Alexander Brand of Brandsfield, an Edinburgh merchant who was well known to the members of the Treasury Commission as a supplier of munitions, appears to have been the preeminent source of furnishings in Scotland. His name was mentioned in the Drumlanrig inventory and in the Earl of Strathmore’s ‘Book of Record’. According to his correspondence with Sir William Bruce, Brand acted as an interior decorator. Not only did he supply gilded leather hangings, for which he had been awarded the local monopoly in 1692, but he also provided striped material for wall hangings, window curtains, table cloths and pictures:

'It 2 picktors of fruits cost 3 gldrs ... £6:10:00
It 1 ps of architectorie wt a frame ... £1:15:00
It 2 ps of flowr potts wt firames ...... £4:00:00'.

It is clear that Bruce was not purchasing works of art by celebrated Dutch painters. He was buying pictures for purely decorative purposes. What is more, Brand held a stock of such works that could be readily cut to size to suit a particular application:

'The two pictors I have gott & I belive will please you ye one being freutts as you desyred & a blakemore serving, its exact ye deepnesse but a little too longe wch you may cause fold in; ye other is a prettie fancie of a woman & it is exact ye tenth but a little too broad but it may fould in & noething ye worse, they are both in verrie prettie cutt & gildet frames else I had sent ym wt your servant'.

Although the demand for fashionable furnishing originated in France, it is apparent that the principal influence upon the decoration of the Scottish country house stemmed from London. The Scottish nobility may have been isolated from court, yet many members of the Treasury Commission visited London from
time to time. Whether it was on official business to negotiate terms for a trading union with England or to gain a personal hearing with the king, each visit provided an opportunity to experience the opulent lifestyle of the court and acquire those items that were deemed to be fashionable. In 1673, the Earl of Atholl was invited to dine with the king’s mistress, the Duchess of Portsmouth:

‘Wednesday last the Duchess of Portsmouth inueted me to dener, wee hed it all in the freanche fasion; it was uarie well & she was dresed uarie praitilie in her night cloth. The nixt day I hed the honor to dyne with his Majestie at home, & the same Ladie was ther. Things was in uarie goud order … the Douke & Duchess [of Lauderdale] has forsed me to sit to my pictor to Mr Lelle [Lely].’

It is difficult to envisage how the furnishing of the Scottish country house would have evolved in the late seventeenth century without the influence of the Earl of Lauderdale and the Treasury Commission. The survey of household inventories demonstrates very clearly that standards of decoration were directly linked to levels of wealth. The houses of those with limited resources were less advanced in their planning and contained fewer items of fashionable furniture. The members of the Treasury Commission not only experienced the lifestyle of the court at first hand; but they could afford to furnish their houses accordingly. By adopting the latest fashions, they provided an example for others to follow. They were, as the Earl of Strathmore so aptly described, the ‘leaders’ of fashion in Scotland.
Conclusion

For many years the Restoration of the monarchy has been heralded as a pivotal moment in the development of Scottish domestic architecture. It was in this period of greater social and economic stability that the 'Scottish Classical House' was born. In one respect, this theory of a sudden watershed is correct. There was a 'great rebuilding' in the post restoration era: but this was far from being the cultural awakening that historians have claimed. It arose instead from the determination of the post war generation to restore the status and self esteem of the Scottish nobility that had been so badly damaged during the twenty years of the Civil War and the Interregnum. This study has revealed that the development of Scottish classicism in the seventeenth century involved a far more complex and protracted process than has been portrayed hitherto. Scottish country houses were designed in accordance with the principles of the architectural treatises: there was a difference between the function of a paternal seat and a convenient lodge. Their external appearance was dictated by the rules of decorum: they did reflect the status of their occupants. It was the way in which the treatises were interpreted to meet the particular characteristics of the local nobility that distinguished the development of Scottish domestic architecture from other countries in Europe.

The watershed theory has arisen because historians have consistently treated seventeenth-century Scottish country houses either in isolation or have compared them only with the Italian, rather than the French, interpretation of the architectural treatises. Using the pattern books of Palladio and Scamozzi as a yardstick, only four compact classical houses were built in Scotland between 1660 and 1690: Moncreiffe, Dunkeld, Kinross and Whitehill. If the pattern books of du Cerceau are used as a benchmark, the picture changes dramatically. The process of development was already well under way before the outbreak of the Civil War, in the balanced design of Baberton, Pitreavie and Fyvie. The compact classical houses did not represent a cultural awakening; they reflected the different aspirations of their owners. There were those who preferred the noble silhouette of the chateau and there were others who opted for the uniformity of the villa.
In comparing the members of the Earl of Lauderdale’s Treasury Commission, the thesis has revealed that there were different aspirations and ambitions within the ranks of the Scottish nobility. The majority of Treasury Commissioners, who were drawn from the ancient nobility, opted for a style of architecture that closely resembled the French adaptation of the treatises. What is more, they did not construct new houses; they concentrated their building works on the reconstruction of their ancestral homes, retaining large parts of the original building. The Treasury Executives were the only members of the Commission who built principal residences de novo, and it was they who adopted the Italian interpretation of the treatises. There was a clear distinction between the aspirations of the noblesse d’epee, who measured their status in terms of lineage, and the noblesse de robe, who sought to display their status in their newly-acquired wealth.

In England, where the economy was strong, it was relatively easy to acquire sufficient wealth to join the ranks of the noblesse de robe. As a result, status was determined by individual wealth rather than lineage, and the uniformity of the classical villa prevailed over the noble silhouette of the chateau. In Scotland, the position was reversed. Because the economy was so weak and the king’s revenues were closely guarded by a tight nexus of ancient families, it was very difficult for an outsider to join the ranks of the noblesse de robe. As a result, there were very few individuals who possessed both the wealth and the freedom to build in the classical manner. The great majority of the nobility, whose families were of ancient origin, chose the noble silhouette because they shared the same aspirations as the nobility in France and many other countries in Northern Europe. Like the traditional ritterschaft of Utrecht, they shunned the uniformity of the classical villa, not from a lack of culture, but because it portrayed an inappropriate and undesirable image.

By examining the relative influence of the French and English courts and analysing the evidence of many household inventories, the thesis has brought a greater understanding of the internal arrangement of the seventeenth-century Scottish country house. Until the Union of the Crowns, there had been a close affinity between the informal lifestyle of the Scottish and French courts, which was reflected in the traditional structure and the pattern of life of their respective houses. This informality was in sharp contrast to the formality and privacy of the Tudor court, which had been replicated in the structure of the English country house. When the Scottish nobility was subjected to the culture of the English court, they
were faced with the prospect of adapting their houses from a pattern of life that had existed for generations.

Although the privacy of the English court was reflected in the inclusion of drawing rooms and closets, the cultural importance of London lay in its role as a conduit for the fashions of the French court. When the Treasury Commissioners sought to replicate the state apartment at Ham, they found that this was relatively easy to achieve because the structure and traditions of the Scottish country house were so similar to those of the chateau. In Scotland and in France, the *escalier d'honneur* had always led from the main entrance to the principal reception rooms on the first floor; therefore, the state procession could be incorporated without altering the traditional pattern of circulation within the house. The layout of the Scottish country house did not replicate the arrangement of the English country house. It evolved in its own distinctive way, as a fusion of different cultures: English, French and Scottish.

This thesis has also clarified the way in which culture and fashion were disseminated in Scotland in the absence of a royal court. The Earl of Lauderdale's Treasury Commission played a crucial role in the development of Scottish architecture in the post restoration period. The Treasury not only provided the financial resources with which to build, but it also encouraged architectural discussion through its responsibility for the King's palaces in Scotland. It was the Treasury Commission that appointed the King's Surveyor, who in turn acted as 'consultant architect' to the commissioners and executives. However, this relationship was not confined to the post restoration era. The same form of tight-knit group controlled the development of Scottish domestic architecture throughout the seventeenth century. Until the appointment of James Smith in 1672, almost every architect who held the post of King's Master of Works or King's Surveyor enjoyed a close, often blood, relationship with one or more of the senior Treasury officials. It was this small group of well educated, cosmopolitan individuals that acted as the cultural leaders of Scotland.

Following the Glorious Revolution in 1688, the external appearance of the Scottish country house seems to have undergone a perceptible change, which coincided with the appointment of a fresh group of cultural leaders. Many of the most senior government offices in the new administration were awarded to members of the Scottish nobility who had participated in the Rye House plot in 1683, and had been forced
into exile at the Orange court in Holland. George, 1st Earl of Melville, was appointed Secretary of State in 1689, and his son, Alexander, Lord Raith, assumed the office of Lord Treasurer Depute in 1690. Like their predecessors in the Earl of Lauderdale’s Treasury Commission, Melville and Raith soon embarked upon major house building projects; employing James Smith as consultant architect. In external appearance, their houses represented a marked shift from Smith’s earlier works at Methven and Drumlanrig. At Melville, the façade was balanced by matching pavilions; but the side elevations were adorned with pediments. At Raith, the façade itself was embellished with a tympanum, bearing Lord Raith’s coat of arms. The same formula was adopted at Hamilton and Dalkeith, where Smith remodelled the old house. A new frontispiece was constructed that was embellished with a portico and a pediment. On the face of it, the noble silhouette of the post restoration era had given way to the uniformity of the pediment.

Despite the growing popularity of the classical façade, there is evidence to suggest that lineage and history still remained the primary measure of status in Scotland at the end of the seventeenth century. Behind the new portico at Hamilton, the rear elevation remained almost unchanged. (see fig 81) The new pedimented facades of Brechin and Nairne were carefully balanced with corner towers. (see fig 82) Perhaps the most telling evidence, however, was contained in a letter written by the Duchess of
Buccleuch to the Earl of Melville, concerning the redecoration of Dalkeith: ‘you will think me extravagant in marble but it is to show you I do not dispise my old Castle’. 183

Fig 81: The north elevation of Hamilton remained almost wholly unchanged following the completion of the new frontispiece. (RCAHMS)

Fig 82: The new frontispiece of Brechin with the central pediment balanced by circular corner towers. (RCAHMS)

It was only after the Act of Union in 1707, following another change in the country’s cultural leadership that the image of the portico and the pediment finally prevailed. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, there had been a substantial increase in the number of Scots who had matriculated as law students at the universities of Leiden, Gronigen and Utrecht, in anticipation of a profitable career at
home. As the volume of litigation increased, many of these lawyers generated sufficient wealth to indulge in building works: Robert Dundas, Lord Arniston, President of the Court of Session; George Dalrymple, Lord Dalmahoy, Baron of the Exchequer; Andrew Fletcher, Lord Milton, Lord of the Court of Session; David Erskine, Lord Dun, Lord of the Court of Session; Charles Erskine, Lord Tinwald, Lord Advocate; Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, Baron of the Exchequer. Each of these eminent advocates was educated in Holland; all of them were patrons of William Adam and each of them commissioned uniform classical country houses; but none of them were members of the traditional nobility of Scotland. While they sought to portray an image of wealth and enlightenment, members of the ancient nobility, like the Duke of Argyll and the Earls of Mar and Breadalbane continued, as they always had, to opt for the noble silhouette of the chateau. They did so, not from a lack of culture as Sir Gilbert Elliot surmised, but because the noble silhouette represented an indivisible link between a family and its ancient paternal seat.

Fig 83: Arniston, the classical country house of Robert Dundas, Lord President of the Court of Session.
(Vitruvius Scoticus)

Fig 84: Inveraray Castle, the new paternal seat of John Campbell, 2nd Duke of Argyll.
(Vitruvius Scoticus)
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Attention was drawn to the similarity with Du Cerceau’s works by Prof. Ian Campbell at the annual conference of the Architectural History Society of Scotland, 2006.


The illustrations of Floors and Fasque bear little resemblance either in their scale or their external appearance, but both contain significant remains of earlier bldings.


Brown, Noble Society, p.226.


C. Whitely, *The Scots and the Union*, (Edinburgh, 2006), pp.139-175.


Fouquet began the design and construction of Vaux le Vicomte shortly after his appointment to the office of surintendent des finances in 1653 and was arrested and imprisoned on the orders of Louis XIV following the celebrated inauguration of the house in August 1661. F. Robichon, *Le Chateau de Vaux-le-Vicomte, Beaux Arts Magazines*, 1/1, (Paris, 1997).


Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet, *The Staggering State of the Scots Statesmen for one hundred years from 1550 to 1650*, (Edinburgh, 1754).


According to a dormer stone at Traquair, a new wing was added to the house c.1642, one year after the Earl of Traquair had been demitted from the office of Lord Treasurer. D. McGibbon & T. Ross, *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland*, vol. 2, pp.440-444.


Winton was commissioned by George, 3rd Earl of Winton, a Treasury Commissioner: ‘The Lords [of Exchequer] grant full power and commission to Sir Antonie Alexander, Master of his Majesties Works, with
the concurrence of George, Earl of Wintoune ... to pass to the said bridge of Linetoune', 5th May 1636. Masson, Register of the Privy Council, vol. 6, p.237.
The reformation of Keith Hall was commissioned by John, 1st Earl of Kintore, who was appointed Lord Treasurer Depute in 1694. Raith was commissioned by Alexander, Lord Raith, who was appointed Lord Treasurer Depute in 1694. For the attribution of Pitreavie: McKean, Scottish Chateau, p.204. For the attribution of Winton: McGibbon & Ross, Castellated and Domestic Architecture, vol. 2, p.524. For the attribution of Keith Hall and Raith. Glendinning, MacInnes & MacKechnie, History of Scottish Architecture, p.85 & 103.
Attention was first drawn to the similarity between Scottish country houses and the drawings of Jacques Androuet du Cerceau by Prof. I. Campbell at the annual conference of the Architectural History Society of Scotland, 2006.
Sir Anthony Weldon accompanied James I to Scotland in 1617 with the alleged task of denigrating the king’s country of birth: quoted in Hume Brown, Early Travellers, p.102.
Scot of Scotstarvet, The Staggering State, p.16.
Quoted in McKean, Scottish Chateau, p.185.
Recorded on a plaque of the garden wall at Pinkie is the following inscription; ‘For his own pleasure, and that of his noble descendants and all men of cultivation and urbanity, Alexander Seton, who above all loves every kind of culture and urbanity, has planted raised and decorated a country house, gardens and suburban buildings’. Quoted in McKean, Scottish Chateau, p.187.
For the history of the English ‘conceit’: Cooper, Houses of the Gentry, pp.29-34.
Lee, Inevitable Union, p.13-140.
The Days of Duchess Anne’ was originally published in 1973.
Vincenzo Scamozzi, Ottenheym, Scheepmaker, Garvin & Vroom, p.40.
This common refrain was last repeated in T. M. Devine, The Scottish Nation, (London, 1999), p.xxi.
The original building contract for Leslie was drawn up between the Earl of Rothes and John Mylne in 1667, shortly before Mylne's death: the building work was executed by his nephew, Robert Mylne.


Amongst the most widely available treatises were:

M. Vitruvius: Numerous editions of 'De Architectura libri decem' were available, for instance, 1552 edition printed in Lyon, and 1556 edition printed in Venice.

L. B. Alberti: 'Libri de re aedificatoria decem' were published in Florence in 1485, and Paris in 1512. S. Serlio: 'Tutte l'opere d'Architettura' (books 1-5, book 7, the ‘extraordinario book’ and 'on accidents') were published in Venice, Paris, Lyons and Frankfurt between 1537 and 1575.

A. Palladio: 'I Quattro Libri dell'Architettura' was published in Venice in 1570.

P. de l'Orme: 'Le Premier Tome de l'Architecture' was published in Paris in 1567.

J. Androut du Cerceau: Two volumes of 'Les plus Excellents Batiments de France' were published in Paris in 1576 and 1577, and three 'Livres d'Architecture' between 1559 and 1582.

H. Vredeman de Vries: 'Architectura' was available in Antwerp from 1577.

V. Scamozzi: 'L'Idea della Architettura Universale' was first printed in Venice in 1615; books 1 & 2 were translated into Dutch between 1640 and 1648.

P. P. Rubens: 'Palazzi di Genova' was published in Antwerp in 1622.

P. le Muet: 'Maniere de bastir pour toutes sortes de personnes' was printed in Paris in 1623.

P. Vingboons: 'Afbeelsels der voornaernste gebouwen uyt alle die Philips Vingboons' was published in Amsterdam in 1648.
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Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, p.137

For the understanding of architectural theory in England: Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*, pp.25-29


Serlio on Domestic Architecture, Rosenfeld, p.41.


Serlio himself was fully aware of the distinction between French and Italian architecture; 'Although the French articulate their buildings in a way which is different from ours, nonetheless they have the same comfort ... they plan a series of rooms in a row the width of which does not pass twenty-four feet between the walls'.

Two manuscripts for Serlio's book VI have survived: both were executed between 1541 and 1550.


'Two types of building are needed on the estate; one for the owner and his family to live in, and the other in which to organize and look after the produce and the animals of the farm. The site, however, must be arranged in such a way that neither the former nor the latter interferes with one another'. A. Palladio, *The Four Books on Architecture*, R. Tavernor & R. Schofield, tr., (Massachusetts, 1998), p.123.

'In all the buildings for farms and also for some of those in the city I have built a tympanum on the front façade where the principal doors are, because tympanums accentuate the entrance of the house and contribute greatly to the grandeur and magnificence of the building'. Palladio, *Four Books*, p.147
‘But, just as our blessed God has arranged our own members so that the most beautiful are in positions most exposed to view and the more unpleasant are hidden, we too when building should place the most important and prestigious parts in full view and the less beautiful in locations concealed as far from our eyes as possible’. Palladio, Four Books, p.78.


Palladio described the Villa Cornaro; ‘the hall is placed at the very center of the house so that it would be far from the heat and cold’. Palladio, Four Books, p.131.


Chatenet, ‘Les Maisons de Papier’, Maisons des Champs, pp.75-78.


A succinct comparison has been made between the architects of France and Italy in the sixteenth century: ‘les Demeures qu’ils dessinent ou realisent, restent ‘des chateaux’ et ne ressemblent en rien, exterieurement, a des villas’. J. Guillaume, ‘Du Cerceau et Palladio: Fortune de la villa dans la France du XVIe siecle’, Annali di Architettura 12, 2000, p.102.
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Sir Roger Pratt, Gunther, p.57.

Sir Roger Pratt, Gunther, p.28.

Sir Roger Pratt, Gunther, p.27.

Sir Roger Pratt, Gunther, p.28.


The layout of Kinross is alleged to draw inspiration from Coleshill: Dunbar, Sir William Bruce, p.2.

Smith, ‘Plain English or Anglo-Palladian’ in The Renaissance Villa, p.106.


Cuddy, ‘The Revival of the Entourage’ in The English Court, p.177.


Girouard, Life in the French Country House, p.78.

Smith, ‘Plain English or Anglo-Palladian’ in The Renaissance Villa, p.90.

Girouard, Life in the French Country House, p.79.

Girouard, Life in the French Country House, p.78.


Smith, ‘Plain English or Anglo-Palladian’ in *The Renaissance Villa*, p.89.


Smith, ‘Plain English or Anglo-Palladian’ in *The Renaissance Villa*, p.96.


Cuddy, ‘The Revival of the Entourage’ in *The English Court*, p.179.


The concluding remarks of Prof. Chatenet at the AHSS Annual Conference, 2006, regarding the similarities of Scottish country houses and the works of du Cerceau, are highly significant: ‘The principal area of future discoveries, however, is more likely to relate to du Cerceau’s house plans than to decoration, and for great aristocratic houses rather than those for the ‘new men’ – the noblesse d’epee rather than the noblesse de robe’. M. Chatenet, *The Paper Houses, Architectural Heritage*, p.97.

I am grateful to Prof. Chatenet for her confirmation of the dissimilarity between the distribution of the Scottish country house and the maison des champs of du Cerceau.


James Browne, quoted in Hume Brown, *Early Travellers*, p.244.

Other notable building projects included: Holyroodhouse, Wemyss, Panmure and Leslie,


‘The Book of Record – A Diary by Patrick 1st Earl of Strathmore and other documents relating to Glamis Castle 1684-1689’, A.H. Miller, ed., *Scottish History Society* 1890, p.16.

All three had committed significant sums to the royalist cause in the Civil War.

Strenuous efforts were made both in England and Scotland to protect inheritance through the entailment of estates. The ‘Strict Settlement’ that was devised in England ensured that the outright possession of an estate would never fall into the hands of an individual. Instead, one life tenant would pass his interest to a second life tenant with the estates entailed to a third generation. In Scotland, where simple contract debts could be secured against heritable lands in addition to a debtor’s personal estate, the Act of Entail of 1685 was even more extensive in the protection that it offered the landowner. Estates could be entailed in perpetuity with a series of conditions that would prevent their alienation. Provisions could be imposed which forbade an heir from contracting debt or doing anything that might cause the estates to be apprised, adjudged or evicted. For details of the Strict Settlement: J. Habakkuk, *Marriage, Debt and the Estates System–English Landownership 1650-1950*, (Oxford, 1994), p.10. For details of entailment in Scotland: *The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland. 1424-1707*, (2nd edition, London, 1966), pp.106-107.

The Earl of Middleton was appointed King’s Commissioner to the Scottish Parliament in 1660.


Miller, *The Book of Record*, p.23.

Miller, *The Book of Record*, p.27.

Using Miller’s notes it is possible to calculate a monetary value for those rents that were paid in kind: Miller, *The Book of Record*, pp.xxxvii-xxxviii.


Lee, *Heiresses of Buccleuch*, p.94.
According to the contemporary description of Gilbert Burnet; 'She was violent in everything she set about, a violent friend, but a much more violent enemy. She had a restless ambition, lived at vast expense, and was ravenously covetous; and would have stuck at nothing by which she might encompass her ends'. G. Burnet, *History of my own Times*, O. Airy & H. Foxcroft, eds., (Oxford, 1900), vol.1, p.437.

Letter from the Countess of Tweeddale to the Earl of Tweeddale dated 1st June 1669. MS14402/30. National library of Scotland.


Murray, *Chronicles*, vol. 1, p.164.

‘1677 Martinmas: Note of rents and incumbrances on Atholl estates’. Blair Castle Muniments. Box 29/1/3/60.


Lauderdale’s role was similar to that of court favorites in other European countries, like the Duke of Lerma in Spain or the Baron d’Arques in France, who exploited the power and resources of the state for their own interests and those of their families: Asch, *Nobilities in Transition*, pp91-92.


The factional nature of Scottish politics was described by Sir John Lauder of Fountainhall; ‘our statesmen being att that tyme under great animosities and prejudices against one another, Lauderdale, Hamilton and Rothes drawing three several factions, Abbotshall [Sir Andrew Ramsay, Provost of Edinburgh] did strike in with Lauderdale, and upon his buttome reared up the fabrick of his enshuing greatness’. Journals of Sir John Lauder, Lord Fountainhall, 1665-1676, D. Crawford ed., *Scottish History Society* (Edinburgh, 1900), p.306.


Lauderdale’s pre-eminent position as ‘favorite’ seems to have been mirrored in the royal courts of Spain and France. Asch, *Nobilities in Transition*, pp.89-92.


By replacing the Lord Treasurer with a Committee, it was hoped that the conflicting interests of individuals would be balanced: A. Murray, ‘The Scottish Treasury’, *Scottish Historical Review*, vol. 45, 1966, p.90.


Wemyss Castle Muniments. The Minute Book of David, 2nd Earl of Wemyss.

The office of Cashkeeper replaced the three receivers who operated under the Lord Treasurer. Murray, The Scottish Treasury, *Scottish Historical Review*, p.98.

Treasury Sederunt Book 1, E6/1. National Archive of Scotland.

Letter dated April 1667 from Lt. Gen. Drummond to the Earl of Lauderdale; ‘The forces standing in great necessitie of money, had been in a sad condition even neer to disorder, if My Lo. Commissioner, Gen Dalyell and Sr William Bruce had not upon their particular credits and sureties advanced a considerable supply for present releef’. Airy, Lauderdale Papers, *Camden Society*, p.279.

Treasury Sederunt Book 1, E6/1. National Archive of Scotland.

Airy, Lauderdale Papers, *Camden Society*, p.161


Whatley, *Scottish Salt*, p.41.
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[211] Like Sir William Bruce and the Earl of Kincardine, Sir George Downing, Secretary of the English Treasury, had learned his financial skills in Holland, while acting as ambassador to the Hague. Roseveare, The Treasury, p.59.

[212] A ‘grassum’ was the original down-payment for a feu and the sum paid for the periodic renewal of a feudal charter. Brown, Noble Society, p.ix.


[215] Despite the size of his salary Lauderdale still complained that he was short of money: ‘You are much in the right my money will not hold out, indeed I must at least make use here of above fifteen hundred pounds more... Earl Middleton had 6000 lib, sure I may have the half, & Earl Rothes had 2000 lib & yet boght nothing, I think I ought not to be a loser’. Letter dated 3rd August 1669 from the Earl of Lauderdale to the Earl of Tweeddale. Airy, Lauderdale Papers, Camden Society, p.219.


[218] A ‘wardship’ granted to the holder the right to decide upon the marriage partner of a minor and to negotiate the terms of his/her marriage contract. The payment made to the Earl of Rothes gives an idea of the huge sums that might be obtained. Brown, Noble Society, p.x.


[221] Letter dated 30th January 1669 from the Earl of Lauderdale to the Earl of Tweeddale; ‘In your examinations concerning the West India prize you will find good use of the papers I sent to Earl Kincardin, especially great stress laid upon Col Sinclare for abstracting that pocket book of the pilots which should have told all the loading, which it seems T Moncrief first conceal’d & now confesses’. Paton, Lauderdale Letters, p.197.


[225] Sir William Sharp was granted a new commission for the office of cashkeeper on 17th June 1674. On this occasion, his guarantors were named as Lords Newbyth, Niddrie and Cockburn, and bailie Cheislie. Treasury Sederunt Book 2, E6/2. National Archive of Scotland.


[227] The Scottish Treasury Commission had not made the same important transition as their English counterpart: the English customs revenue was collected by Treasury officials, the Scots customs revenue by tax farmers. Roseveare, The Treasury, p.65.


[234] For the most recent transcription of the correspondence: Letters of Sir Robert Moray, Stevenson, pp.61-288.


237 Sir Robert Moray and the Earl of Kincardine were both present at the foundation meeting on 28th November 1660. The Earl of Argyll was proposed by Sir Robert Moray and elected on 4th November 1663 and the Earl of Tweeddale on 3rd February 1664. http://royalsoc.ac.uk.


242 'I cannot but command your care to furnish your gardens with what they want whensoever you have the opportunity. But for the most part of fruit and seeds you can have full as great variety if not more at London than in Holland'. Letter dated 29th March 1658 from Sir Robert Moray to the Earl of Kincardine. Royal Society. Kincardine Papers. M146.

243 Moray first wrote about the pendulum watch, 'an exceeding pretty invention', designed by Christian Huygens, 'a young Gentleman of 22, second son of Zulicomp, the Prince of Orage's Secretary, a rare Mathematician' in a letter dated 29th April 1658. Royal Society. Kincardine Papers. M146.

244 'For as well as Will: and I both love Musick I suspect we shall not often practise it as long as we are all three together, I have had 3 fiddles hanging in my Chamber these 5 or 6 moneths lyke St Katherine's sword'. Letter dated 18th April 1658 from Sir Robert Moray to the Earl of Kincardine. Royal Society. Kincardine Papers. M146.

245 'There is a renowned Alchemist called Glaubenis that hath found out of Antimony, that is one of the soverainest remedies in the world if it be true he writes of it, pray enquire at your physicians if they know him & his powder, it is quite another way of preparation than ever anybody lighted on, unless it were Paracelsus'. Letter dated 29th October 1657 from Sir Robert Moray to the Earl of Kincardine. Royal Society. Kincardine Papers. M146.


247 Letters of Sir Robert Moray, Stevenson, p.18.


249 The Earl of Kincardine obtained a monopoly for ‘carrying stone’ in July 1662, giving him the sole right to export Scottish freestone, blue whinstone, grindstones, milnstones and paving syones for 21 years. Letters of Sir Robert Moray, Stevenson, p.226.


254 Original notes from the sea trials of the pendulum watch. MS13500/35- National Library of Scotland.


258 E.S.de Beer, Evelyn’s Diary, vol.3, p.552.

259 ‘His [Sir William Moray’s] condition is very hard at present & without a speedie supply he will be quickly ruined. There is resting to him four years & a half of his fie before the treasury was in commission; & the debt being of that date, we cannot without a warrant from the King pay it’. Letter dated 13th March 1669 from the Earl of Kincardine to the Earl of Lauderdale. Tollemache Papers. NRA17204/2077.
According to the same letter from the Earl of Kincardine to the Earl of Lauderdale, Sir William Moray received only the salary of the Master of Work: ‘There is that singular in his case wch I thinke may take off the prejudice of the preparative, that it is the fee of a place wch required his attendance, & hade no other profits following it: & for any thing I know there is non who hath that to pretend…’ Tollemache Papers. NRA 17204/2007.

The Lords ordained a letter to be drawn to be signed by their Lops and sent to ye Professor of ye Mathematics at St Andrews that he may come to Edr and attend their Lops next week concerning a Plane of ye Castle of Sterling’. 9th June 1671. Treasury Sederunt Book 1, E6/1. National Archive of Scotland.


Moray’s cousin was married to Frederick Magnus, Rijngraf van Salm, the Military Governor of Maastricht. K. Ottenheym, ‘Het stadhuis te Maastricht van Pieter Post,’ in Een seer magnifick Stadhuys, (Delft, 1985), p.53.


Charles Maitland assumed the office of Treasurer Depute on the death of his predecessor, Sir William Bellenden: an appointment that had been planned as early as 1668; ‘What you said of Lord Bellenden’s condition maid me to secure the place for my brother when ever it vakes by death or dimission’. Letter dated 17th November 1668 from the Earl of Lauderdale to the Earl of Tweeddale. Paton, Lauderdale Letters, p.168.


Letter dated 16th July 1667 from Charles Maitland to the Earl of Lauderdale. Tollemache Papers. NRA 17204/1813.

‘The truth is the work is greater then was imagined however both Sr Wm & I have rated Ro: Milne exceedingly & he yet says he shall have all his undertaking done’. Letter 1st August 1671 from Charles Maitland to the Earl of Lauderdale. Tollemache Papers. NRA 17204/2302

Letter dated 8th March 1673 from Charles Maitland to the Earl of Lauderdale. Tollemache Papers. NRA 17204/2380

The design of Thirlestane was greatly assisted by the plans and elevations drawn by Johan Slezer, the Chief Engineer to the Artillery, which Lauderdale was able to peruse at leisure and issue instructions accordingly. Slezer was lured to Scotland with the help of Kincardine’s mother-in-law, Lucia van Walta. Letter dated 26th August 1671 from the Earl of Kincardine to the Earl of Lauderdale. Tollemache Papers. NRAA17204/2309.

Although nothing remains of the house, it does seem to have been rebuilt by Sir Andrew Ramsay: ‘Abbotshall, a large and fine new house with gardens and inclosures’. R. Sibbald, The History, Ancient & Modern, of the Sheriffdoms of Fife and Kinross, (London, 1803), p.315. There is also evidence from a contemporary household inventory that the house was richly furnished. RH13/11/34. National Archive of Scotland.

There is no reliable evidence for the design of Barnton. However, the 1694 Hearth Tax Returns suggest that it was a house comparable in size to Pinkie, with 35 hearths. E69/16/1. National Archive of Scotland.
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280 Miller, The Book of Record, p.33.
281 The first meeting of the Treasury Commission attended by Strathmore was held on 4th September 1680. Treasury Sederunt Book 3, E6/3. National Archive of Scotland.
284 Macky alluded to the antiquity of many of the Commissioners' families:
Lauderdale: 'I find this Family Lord of Lethington by a Charter from King David II in 1346'.
Rothes: 'This Family is of great Antiquity in this Kingdom; for I saw a Charter granted by Robert Bruce, confirming the Barones of Rothes and Banbrich, to Sir Andrew Lesly'
Atholl: 'This Family of the Murray are ancient Lords of Tullibarn, as appears by a Charter dated in 1282'.
Moray: 'The present Earl of Murray lives up to the Splendor of the ancient Nobility'.
Queensberry: 'The first of this noble Branch of the Douglasses was William Douglas, son of James Earl of Douglas, who by a deed given to him in Portion the Barony of Drumlengrig about the Year 1400'.
Macky, Journey through Scotland, p.34, 168, 151, 178, 13
285 Miller, The Book of Record, p.18, 33.
287 In addition to the estate of Scone, David, 4th Viscount Stormont inherited Comlongan and Falkland from his cousin James, 2nd Earl of Annandale. In order to alleviate his financial situation, Comlongan and Falkland were sold to the Earl of Atholl. Viscount Stormont was another member of the Scottish nobility who became a fellow of the Royal Society on the recommendation of Sir Robert Moray.
288 Robert, 2nd Earl of Elgin, grandson of Edward 1st Lord Kinloss, was created Earl of Ailesbury in 1664 and remained in permanent residence in England.
289 The Palace of Culross was constructed by Sir George Bruce, the successful entrepreneur, around 1597. The house lay at the centre of the town of Culross, in close proximity to Bruce's coal mines and salt pans.
290 Charles Mailland's elder brother, Richard, also married an heiress, Margaret Lundin of Lundin. Their daughter, Sophia, married John Drummond, 1st Earl of Melfort, Charles Mailland's successor as Lord Treasurer Depute.
292 John Macky praised the comfort of the Place of Paisley: 'the Abbey and Lands were purchas'd by the Earls of Dundonald, who now keep their Residence there; which is so pleasant, that the Dutchess of Beaufort, after the Death of both her Husbands, altho' an English Woman, chose it for her Residence, and dy'd there'.
Macky, Journey through Scotland, p.316.
293 Sir William Bruce was created a baronet in 1668, Sir Thomas Moncreiffe in 1685.
Sinclair of Mey: Smyth Papers. GD190/305/Sec 1/Bundle 39.
Lindsay of Edzell: Smyth Papers. GD190/3/179/52.


302 Murray, Chronicles, vol. 1, p. 177.


307 Macfarlane's Genealogical Collections, Clark, vol. 1, p. 46.


310 Miller, The Book of Record, p. 28.


313 'Sir William Bruce of Kinross being informed that James Hay writer to the Signet, one of the Earl of Morton's creditors as formerly, has of late again endeavoured to influence the present Earl of Morton and some of his noble relations, to entertain sinisterous opinions of ye purchase of the Estate of Loch Leven acquired by the said Sir Wm particularly that he purchased ye same for less than five years purchase'. GD29/1171. National Archive of Scotland.

314 Based upon a survey of 60 earldoms in 1660: 11 earls were married to English wives, 2 remained unmarried, 5 married the daughters of lairds and 42 married the daughters of other Scottish earls. Data source: J. Balfour Paul, The Scots Peerage, (Edinburgh, 1905).

316 Brown, Noble Society, p. 113.


318 Wormald, Lords and Men in Scotland, p. 76.

319 Quoted in Wormald, Lords and Men in Scotland, p. 83.


321 'Billie David and I have grieved with my Lord Matherdie'. Letter dated 13th August 1678 from Anne Keith to Patrick Smyth, Perth Museum and Art Gallery. Box 449.


326 D. Malcolm, A Genealogical Memoir of the most noble and ancient house of Drummond, (Edinburgh, 1808).


329 Letter dated 23rd May 1678 from the Earl of Lauderdale to Sir Andrew Forrester. Tollemache Papers. NRAI7204/2741.


331 Quoted in Paterson, King Lauderdale, p. 190.


'I shall only say this in general; that by the way he hath used it [the gift of seizures], it hath been worth upwards of 2000 lib ster: to him & by restricting it as we ought in duty to have done without a clear & positive warrant from the King it will not amount to 300 lib. But he hath abused the King in other things than in that, wch will take more time to follow to the botomme, but in due time may be met with'. Letter dated 26th March 1674 from the Earl of Kincardine to the Earl of Lauderdale. Tollemache Papers. NRA 17204/2474.

The construction of Kinross began eight years after Bruce had acquired the estate and was never completed.


Wright painted a similar portrait of Thomas Sydserf, the Scottish playwright, who is also dressed in a striped smock.

The idea of William Bruce as a 'gentleman architect' has been encouraged by English historians who have applied the same term to architects like Sir Roger Pratt and Hugh May. Colvin, Dictionary of British Architects, p. 176.

According to many household inventories there was a considerable disparity between houses that contained many pictures and others that held very few. Where a house was full of pictures, like Craigiehall, Newbattle, and Hatton, a high proportion were hung on the Great Stairs. At Leslie and Pinkie, the majority were hung in the Gallery.


She is Bess[Countess of Dysart] of my heart, she was Bess of Old Noll [Oliver Cromwell] - She was once Fleetwood's [Cromwell's son-in-law] Besse, now she's Besse of Atholl'.

Quoted in 'Ham House', National Trust Guide Book, p. 68.
abroad will not be long, for it was to improve you in useful breeding you was sent there, and not to follow

360 Letter dated 26th July 1675 from the Earl of Kincardine to Lord Bruce. Beinecke Rare Book and
361 Letter dated 24th December from the Earl of Kincardine to Lord Bruce. Beinecke Rare Book and
362 Letter dated 17th November 1676 from the Earl of Kincardine to Lord Bruce. Beinecke Rare Book and
365 James Browne, quoted in Hume Brown, Early Travellers, p.246.
366 Sir Roger Pratt, Gunther, p.23.
369 Letter dated 15th February 1672 from Lord Yester to the Earl of Tweeddale. MS14403/66. National
Library of Scotland.
370 Writing about the town houses at Richelieu, Lauder of Fountainhall was obviously impressed by their scale
and regularity: ‘they are all raised also to the same height, that ye shall not see one chimly hier then another:
for they are all 3 story high and built after that same mode of window answering to the window; so that ye
shall see a rank of about a hundred windows in a straight line’. ‘Lauder of Fountainhall’s Journals. 1665-
1676’, Scottish History Society, p.25.
372 The gardens of Enghien were illustrated in a series of seventeen prints entitled ‘Villa Angiana vulgo het
XVIIe Siecle’, in Revue da la Maison d’Hier et d’Aujourdhui, 1976, p.5. A set of these prints were hung in
the drawing room at Brechin in 1712, ‘seventeen prints of Angvien in black frames’. GD45/18/1678.
375 Letter dated 27th November 1674 from Lord Yester in Livorno to the Earl of Tweeddale. MS14403/92. National
Library of Scotland.
376 Smith claimed to have had a ‘liberall education at schools and Colledges at home and abroad and occasion
to know the world by travelling abroad’. Colvin, Dictionary of British Architects, p.949
377 Smith’s drawings are filed in the RIBA Drawings Collection. H.Colvin, ‘A Scottish Origin for English
378 Lethington: ‘Nor was I in this place since my last gave yr Lop: an accompt of ye house draught laying at
the E Tweddaill & Sr R Murray’s door who are to utter some of their thoughts to gid ye about’. Letter dated
16th July 1667 from Charles Maitland to the Earl of Lauderdale. Tollemache Papers. NRA 17204/1813.
379 Kinneil: ‘I have sent you a draught off the Tower of Kinneil, with the two new pavillions I have builded to
itt, and ther is a scale will lett you know the measures’. Letter dated 10th November 1677 from the Duke of
Hamilton to the Earl of Queensberry, quoted in R.Marshall, ‘Scarce a Finer Seat in Scotland: Kinneil Castle
and the 4th Duke of Hamilton’ in I.Gow & A.Rowan, eds., Scottish Country Houses 1600-1914, (Edinburgh,
381 Dunkeld: ‘I received a line from you wherein I think strong that you should reprove me or challenge me
for the Marquess of Atholl his balusters for the house of Dunkeld’. Letter dated May 1680 from John Smyth,
382 Moncreiffe: ‘However when it please god we meet at Edinburgh this winter (as I hope we shall) we shall
know exactly what sort [of wainscot panelling] will be best for lining for I hear Robert Milne has some come
from Holland for lining of some rooms in his new house’. Letter dated 14th October from Sir Thomas
383 Asch, Nobilities in Transition, p.3.
384 McKean, Scottish Chateau, p.10.
385 Andrea Palladio, The Four Books of Architecture, R.Tavernor & R.Schofield, trans., (Massachusetts,
1998), Book 2, p.77.


When Strathmore and his family returned to Glamis in 1670, they were able to take up residence in rooms above the Great Hall. Miller, Book of Record, p.37.


It is estimated that over 1000 country houses underwent building works between 1500 and 1680. McKean, Scottish Chateau, p.17.

A number of houses did undergo reconstruction during the Civil War, like Auchans, but the rate of building slowed to a trickle. McKean, Scottish Chateau, p.238.


The setting of the Scottish country house has been discussed without reference to the original layout of the landscape and ancillary buildings in C. McKean, 'The Scottish Renaissance Country Seat in its Setting', Garden History, vol. 31, 2, 2003, pp.141-162.


According to the Memoirs of the Count de Grammont, ‘a story was set about, and generally believed, that the Earl of Southesk [Robert, 3rd Earl] that had married a daughter of the Duke of Hamilton, suspecting some familiarities between the duke [Duke of York] and his wife, had taken a sure method to procure a disease to himself, which he communicated to his wife and was, for some years, not ill pleased to have this believed. It looked like a peculiar strain of revenge, with which he seemed much delighted. But I know he has, to some of his friends, denied the whole story very solemnly’.


Reid, The Scots Gard’ner, ch.1, para.6.


North, Of Building, p.89.

The term ‘sluttery’ was used by Sir Robert Ker to describe the outbuildings and domestic offices. Laing, Correspondence of the Earls of Ancrum and Lothian, p.67.

Miller, Book of Record, p.39.

Pratt recommended the convenient arrangement of the kitchens, ‘in that no dirty servants may be seen passing to and fro by those who are above, no noises heard, nor ill scents smelt’. Sir Roger Pratt, Gunther, p.27.


Dunbar, Building Activities, p.218.

Macky, Journey through Scotland, p.276.

Miller, Book of Record, p.41.


Miller, *Book of Record*, p. 41.


The same theory is proposed by Prof. McKean for Baberton House. McKean, *Scottish Chateau*, pp. 194-195.


The reader’s notes attached to plate 26 of du Cerceau’s 1582 ‘livre d’architecture’.


From a letter written by Anne Keith to Patrick Smyth dated 8th July 1678, it is not only evident that James Smith was involved in the design of Methven but he was also employed at Kinross from the outset: ‘That Mr James Smyth that hath thy draught I have sent to the work at Lochleven, seeking him yet no accounts of him nor it’. Perth Museum and Art Gallery. Box 449. Despite this conclusive evidence, English historians remain reluctant to accept Smith’s involvement in the design of Methven. Colvin, *Dictionary of British Architects*, p. 952.


In an undated letter of 1680 from Anne Keith to Patrick Smyth, Methven was described in endearing terms as, ‘my Love’s bonie strong house’. Perth Museum and Art Gallery. Box 449.

From a copy of the original charter in the possession of Mr and Mrs Ken Murdoch.


It is conceivable that this discussion may have revolved around New Tarbat House in Rossshire, which is purported to have been designed by Lord Tarbat himself. Clough, *Two Houses*, p. 73.

Such details could not have been inspired by Smith’s travels in Italy. Whenever towers were added to a Palladian villa, they were square in shape and formed an integral part of the building: the corps de logis was linked to the farm buildings by long colonnades. For examples of the Palladian villa with towers see the Villa Pisani at Bagnolo and the Villa Thiene at Cicogna.


For the similarities between the floor plan of Kinross and Talman’s unexecuted plan and the origins of the giant corinthian pilasters at Kinross. K. Ottenheym, ‘Dutch Influences in William Bruce’s Architecture’, *Architectural Heritage XVIII*, 2007, p. 140.

The careers of Fouquet and Bruce were very alike in many respects. Both men prospered under the patronage of the king’s favourite: Fouquet from Cardinal Mazarin, Bruce from the Earl of Lauderdale. Both men worked closely with members of their immediate family: Fouquet with his brother, Basile, L’Abbe Fouquet, Bruce with his cousin, Alexander, Earl of Kincardine. Both men acquired posts that administered supplies to the armed forces: Fouquet as ‘procureur general’ and ‘surintendant des finances’, Bruce as Collector of the Cess and Fines. Like Bruce, Fouquet was a notable patron of the arts, encouraging the literary careers of Corneille, Moliere and la Fontaine, and employing Le Vau and Le Brun to devise the design of Vaux-le-Vicomte and its gardens. Both men eventually fell prey to the envy of powerful adversaries: Fouquet to Colbert and Bruce to the Countess of Dysart. Describing Fouquet’s malpractice, Louis XIV used terminology very similar to that employed by Lauderdale about Bruce; ‘Ce qui le rendait plus coupable envers moi etait que, bien loin de profiter a la bonte que je lu avais temoignee en le retenant dans mes conseils, il en avait pris une nouvelle esperance de me tromper... Il ne pouvait s’empecher de continuer ses depenses excessives, de fortifier des places, d’orner des palais, de former des cabales... dans l’espoir de se rendre bientot l’arbitre souverain de l’Etat’. For a full account of Fouquet’s career: P. A. Cheruel, *Memoires sur la vie
187


Miller, Book of Record, p.36.

Without accurate drawings of Donibristle, it is impossible to define the internal layout of the house. See appendix 5C for reference.

Miller, Book of Record, p.36.

Describing the interior of Moray House in Edinburgh, R.W. Billings noted; 'it is at once evident that the person for whom the house was built had a taste cultivated in England'.


The Countess of Dysart had inherited Ham on her father's death in 1654.

A similar arrangement for Thirlestane is proposed in Dunbar, Building Activities, p.203.

In the most elaborate plan for Thirlestane, it was proposed that the Lauderdalees would each have their own apartment, with bedchamber, closet and dressing room. In the event, this layout was abandoned, leaving only one bedroom with a closet and dressing room.

Dunbar, Building Activities, pp.208-209.


National Archive of Scotland.

Dunbar, Sir William Bruce, p.11.


See appendix 5B for reference.

Undated note by the Earl of Lauderdale headed: 'Considerations concerning Thirleston Castle'. Tollemache Papers. NRA 17204/642.


In the enfilade, each room was confined within the width of a single range and led directly from one to another.

It appears that the prolonged legal battle with William Bruce over the value of Kinross debarred him from involvement in Glamis. Miller, Book of Record, p.42.

Miller, Book of Record, p.41.

Miller, Book of Record, p.36.

Miller, Book of Record, p.68.

Of all the inventories listed in appendix 5/F, only Cortachy, the Bins and Cumbernauld contained no withdrawing rooms and closets.


This pattern was repeated by the Campbells of Glenorchy, who left their principal house of Balloch in Perthshire at the end of March, to spend two and a half months at Finlarig in Argyllshire. 'Houshold Book of the Honourabile John Campbell, Laird of Glenorchy yr and Ladie Marie Rich, dochter of the Erle of Holland, his wife', p.58. GD50/30. National Archive of Scotland.

See appendix 5B for reference.

See appendix 5B for reference.


'Goods sent from Ham & Highgate to Scotland by Alexr Smart 10th Decr 1672'. Lauderdale Papers. NRAS 832 Bundle 63/65.

'Inventarie of the goods belonging to his Grace John Duke of Lauderdale within the Palace of Holyroodhouse and at Brunstane & Ledingtoun'. Lauderdale Papers. NRAS 832 Bundle 63/65.

See appendix 5B for reference.

See appendix 5B for reference.

Bowett, English Furniture, p.12.

For full details of the furnishing of Ham: Thornton & Tomlin, Ham House.


Miller, *Book of Record*, p.89.


Clerk of Penicuik Papers. GD18/2567. National Archive of Scotland.

Sir Thomas Kennedy, Sir William Binning and Alexander Brand were found guilty of defrauding the Treasury in 1697 and were heavily fined. Treasury Sederunt Book 6. E/6/6. National Archive of Scotland.

'I have also bought from Bailzie Brand in Edinr. A Cabinet for my fyne bed chamber'. Miller, *Book of Record*, p.95. 'Thrie piece of arras hangings from Bayllie Brand'. Buccleuch Papers (Drumlanrig). NRAS 1 Bundle 1335.


Murray, *Atholl Chronicles*, vol.1, add.xxxvi.

William Schaw was renowned as 'the true hearted friend' of the Earl of Dunfermline, Chairman of the Treasury Commission. Sir Anthony Alexander was the son of the Earl of Stirling, originator of the Nova Scotia scheme. Sir Daniel Carmichael was the son of Sir James Carmichael, Lord Treasurer Depute. Sir William Moray was the brother of Sir Robert Moray and Sir William Bruce was the first cousin of the Earl of Kincardine.
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