Paisley Abbey And Its Remains

Volume 1

By

Philip Edward Mc Williams

Thesis Submitted For The Degree Of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Scottish History

University of Glasgow

October 1995

© PHILIP EDWARD Mc WILLIAMS

ABSTRACT.

The aim of this thesis is to re-examine the history, architecture, and archaeology of Paisley Abbey. Paisley's history must be looked at anew for modern research, especially into the Vatican Archives, has clarified the sequence of events surrounding the abbey.

Since the *OPUS DEI* was the raison d'etre of the monastic life, I have discussed the architecture of the abbey church in chapter II, while the discussion of its cloistral and out-buildings follows in Chapter III.

My conjectural reconstructions of different aspects of the church, are important to its architectural history; and close observation of the triforium suggests it was the work of the master mason who designed the nave. On account of the lack of actual archaeological evidence, I have had to reconstruct Paisley's cloistral layout from observations made at other British Cluniac houses. Also, an examination of the windows at Paisley's north aisle suggest that they can only be the work of John Morrow.

Church records, and the collections of David Semple, have produced new evidence into the eighteenth and nineteenth century restorations. Also, the collection of papers held at Paisley, together with those of Sir John Stirling Maxwell, explain better the problems emanating from Rowand Anderson's uncompleted restoration.

Professor Charles Gourlay's observations, both as architect and building expert, provide us with a unique understanding of the restoration of the choir, beginning with Chalmers to its completion by Sir Robert Lorimer.

Lastly, the carved and moulded stones in the restored cloister are an important archaeological record of the abbey's architectural history.

CONTENTS
VOLUME 1

Title page	1
Abstract	2
Contents	3-4
Dedications	5
Preface	6
Acknowledgements	7-8
Declaration	9
Abbreviations	10-11
CHAPTER ONE	12
Introduction	13-41
CHAPTER TWO (Part one)	42
The History and Architecture of the Medieval Abbey Church : Its Foundation and Development (1163 - 1371)	43-84
CHAPTER TWO (Part two)	85
The History and Architecture of the Medieval Abbey Church from its Rebuilding to the Reformation (1371 - 1560)	86-145
CHAPTER THREE	146
Introduction	147
Aspects of Planning of the Monastic Buildings in Relation to the Standard Monastic Plan, as seen in Cluniac and Benedictine Sites	148-213
CHAPTER FOUR	214
Restoration and Conservation in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries	215-273
CHAPTER FIVE	274
The Twentieth Century Restorations	275-356
CHAPTER SIX	357
Conclusions	358-374
FOOTNOTES & REFERENCES	375-480
BIBLIOGRAPHY	481-526

VOLUME II

Title Page 1
Declaration 2

APPENDICES 3

Introduction 4
Modern Stained Glass 5-6
Marquis of Bute's Scheme of Stained Glass for the Clerestory 7-13
Dr. Thomas Gentles' Scheme for Stained Glass for the Choir 14-15
Rev. A.R. Howell's scheme for Stained Glass for the Choir 16
Areas of Scottish Cloister Garths 17-18

FIGURES 19

Introduction 20
List of Figures 21-29
Figures 30-96

PLATES 97

Introduction & Index 98
List of Plates 98-116
Plates 117-29

PHOTOGRAPHIC APPENDICES 291

Introduction & Index 292
Collection of Stone Fragments in Restored Cloister 293-297

PHOTOGRAPHS 298-342

Record of Abbey Choir before Restoration 343

PHOTOGRAPHS 344-346

DEDICATION.

I dedicate this thesis to the memory of my mother Mrs Helen McWilliams, who died on 12 April, 1995, aged 90 years.

PREFACE.

Paisley Abbey was first suggested to me as a possible research topic by Eric J Talbot, former lecturer in the Department of Archaeology. Subsequently I researched Paisley for my Honours Dissertation, in the Department of History of Art.

Research for the thesis did begin in History of Art, but owing to the historic implications of the thesis I transferred to Scottish History.

My thesis on Paisley is not just a re-writing of the dissertation, and even though it develops further some of the ground previously covered, on the whole it considers Paisley anew. The monastic ground plan was not investigated, and the restorations from the eighteenth to the nineteenth centuries were only mentioned.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

I am indebted to the support given me by my supervisors Professor E J Cowan, Scottish History, and Dr James Macaulay of the Mackintosh School of Architecture. Also, to Professor Emeritus A A M Duncan, Scottish History, and the late Professor I B Cowan. My thanks also go to Professor A A Tait, Robert Gibbs and Miss Marion Lawson, History of Art. I would also like to record my appreciation of the support given by Dr E Moignard, Post-Graduate Adviser and Dr M K C MacMahon, former Adviser.

The support and assistance of the Rev Alan D Birss, Minister of Paisley Abbey, was crucial in obtaining access to the buildings and searching the abbey records. In this respect, Mrs Irene Burgoyne, the abbey secretary, was also very helpful. Particular mention must be made of the courteous assistance and patience of Bill Lawson, Church Officer, Paisley Abbey, and his staff, during my many visits to the abbey.

I also thank the Carnegie Trust, Major D F O Russell of Markinch, and my brother John McWilliams for financial support.

The Duke of Abercorn, the late Marquis of Bute, the Earl of Dundonald, and Mr Donald Maxwell MacDonald all kindly gave me permission to search their family papers.

I am also indebted to Prof David M Walker, St Andrews University, for his advice and encouraging suggestions.

Thanks are also due Eric J Talbot, formerly of Archaeology, Dr John Durkan, Scottish History, Dr Richard Fawcett, Ancient Monuments, Abbot Mark Dilworth, Fort Augustus, Miss Kitty Cruft and Geoffrey P Stell, RCAHMS, Ian Gow, NMRO, Dr Anthony Malcolmson, PRONI, Eric Cambridge, Durham, Christopher Wilson, Westfield College, and the SRO for their advice and

encouragement. Mr Bill Cameron, of Historic Scotland, for permission to inspect and photograph the triforium and clerestory at Glasgow Cathedral, and the resident staff for their assistance. I also thank James J Dempster, architect Glasgow, who kindly gave me permission to mount the scaffold surrounding the nave of Paisley to inspect and photograph the building, and Willie Fleming, mason in charge of the site, for his help during my visits.

Robert Saunders and John Malden of Paisley Museum also very kindly provided much advice and help; my thanks go to the staff of the Reference Library, Paisley; and also to Miss C MacDonald, c/o Reference Library Paisley.

I am also indebted to Louis de Wet, of Wenlock Abbey, to the abbot and community of Pluscarden Abbey, and to the prior and community of Clare Priory, Suffolk. Miss F Y Maitland kindly provided information on her father, as did Alan MacLean, Jersey. Jim McKechnie, Coatbridge College, kindly offered photographic help and advice. John Danielewksi, of Summerlee Museum, assisted me during my site visits to Paisley; and Prof Susan Tainsh, of Ontario, who kindly offered immediate assistance.

Special mention is owed to Professor Giorgio Palermo, of the University of Rome, W Watson Stewart, Chris Day and Angelo Soave for their support in the past.

Finally, I thank my colleagues and friends in Monklands District Council Planning Department who assisted me in so many ways, especially Kirsten Cairns, Ros Pattison, and Danny Welsh. Extra special thanks for their invaluable support is owed to Brian Cairns, Robert Kinniburgh, Jim Ravey, Rosaleen Toal and Willie Miller, and also to David Miller, Print Room, in the production of the thesis itself.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

THESIS ACCESS DECLARATION

Candidate's Name (BLOCK LETTERS) PHILIP E. M. WILLIAMS

Thesis title PAISLEY ABBEY AND ITS REMAINS

I understand that in the interests of good scholarship, theses of the University are normally made freely available for consultation in the University Library, or within another library, immediately after deposit but that a candidate may stipulate a period of either one or three years after deposit during which his or her written consent must be sought before such access is given. (A candidate is usually advised by the supervisor if commercial or patent reasons make this restriction desirable.)

I therefore agree to grant access and to permit copies to be made for other libraries or individuals without my specific authorisation:

*A. Immediately on deposit OR

*B. One year after deposit OR

*C. Three years after deposit.

I further accept that candidates who stipulate written consent but from whom no reply has been received within three months of a request from the University Library posted to their last known address will be assumed to have ceded this power to the Library Committee, to be exercised in consultation with the Higher Degrees Committee of the Faculty.

Signed

Date 31st October, 1995.

* PLEASE CIRCLE A OR B OR C

Abbreviations.

AANHSC	Ayrshire Archaeological and Natural History Society Collections.
AJ	Architect's Journal.
AGAA	Ayrshire and Galloway Archaeological Association.
Antiq.J.	Antiquaries Journal.
Arch.H.	Architectural History.
Arch.J.	Archaeological Journal.
Arch.R	Architectural Review.
Arch.Scot	Archaeologia Scotica.
AUP	Aberdeen University Press.
BCA	Book Club Associates.
CBA	Council for British Archaeology.
CDRS	Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland.
CUP	Cambridge University Press.
DGNHAS	Dumfries and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society.
EHR	English Historical Review.
Econ.HR	Economic History Review.
EUP	Edinburgh University Press.
ERS	Exchequer Rolls Scotland.
GH	Glasgow Herald.
GUARD	Glasgow University Archaeological Research Division.
GUP	Glasgow University Press.
IR	Innes Review.
JBAA	Journal British Archaeological Association.
JMH	Journal Medieval History.
JSAH	Journal Society Architectural Historians.
JSM	Stirling Maxwell Papers.
JWCI	Journal Warburg and Courtauld Institute.
KS	Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records.
Med.Arch.	Medieval Archaeology.
NAS	National Art Survey.

NMRO	National Monuments Record Office.
OUP	Oxford University Press.
PA	Paisley Abbey Papers.
PDE	Paisley Daily Express.
PH	Paisley Herald and Renfrew Gazette.
PRONI	Public Records Office, Northern Ireland.
PRFG	Paisley Herald and Renfrew Gazette.
PSAS	Proceedings Society Antiquaries, Scotland.
PUP	Princeton University Press.
RCAHMS	Royal Commission Ancient and Historical Monuments, Scotland.
RIAS	Royal Institute of Architects, Scotland.
RIBA	Royal Insitute of British Architects.
RICS	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors.
RPS	Register Privy Seal.
RSCHS	Records Scottish Church History Society.
RSL	Lorimer Papers.
SHR	Scottish Historical Review.
SHS	Scottish History Society.
SRA	Strathclyde Regional Archives.
SRO	Scottish Records office.
STS	Scottish Text Society.
TA	Accounts Lord High Treasurer Scotland.
TAES	Transactions of Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society.
TEAA	Transactions of Edinburgh Architectural Association.
TGES	Transactions of Glasgow Ecclesiological Society.
TRHS	Transactions Royal Historical Society.
TSES	Transactions of Scottish Ecclesiological Society.
TGAS	Transactions Glasgow Archaeological Society.
UCP	University California Press.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The view the observer has of Paisley Abbey today, as he admires it from the north bank of the River Cart, is obviously very different from that which greeted the Cluniac monks on their arrival from Wenlock. The south bank was the preferred site for the new abbey, and one which, in all probability, would have been virgin land before the erection of any monastic buildings. It is likely, that there was forestation on the higher slopes lying to the west and south. Also, the hamlet of Paisley would have been small, unlike modern Paisley, where the abbey, like St Giles, Edinburgh, now forms part of a large and very busy townscape, surrounded by a lawn to the north, and a major roadway to the south. The lawn to the north once formed part of the post-Reformation cemetery, as shown in the extant headstones, which no longer stand upright.

With the demise of the abbey in the sixteenth century, the Burgh of Paisley came into its own, and by the eighteenth century it had grown into a thriving town, such that it had spread northwards across the Cart; and as the land around the abbey was made available for building sites, tenements which followed the line of Abbot George Schaw's famous wall, eventually surrounded it. As a result, the continuous mass of dwelling houses not only boxed the abbey in, as old prints and photographs illustrate [plates A & B], but deprived the observer of the uninterrupted vista he enjoys today.

St. Giles, Edinburgh, suffered similarly before its restoration in 1829 by William Burn.[1] Like Edinburgh and Paisley, some of the great English churches fared no better. Indeed, as early as 1570 the chapter house and cloisters at Winchester Cathedral were pulled down to make way for house

building[2]; in the seventeenth century Bath Abbey was surrounded by shops and houses[3]; by the late eighteenth century, at Lichfield and Worcester Cathedrals, houses had been built close to both east ends. The nave area at Bristol Cathedral was also occupied by houses before its rebuilding by G E Street.[4] The present uncluttered view of Paisley Abbey was not finally realised until the twentieth century, and even though the gradual landscaping of the area surrounding the abbey began with Salmon's restoration in the early 1860s, the actual Committee for the Abbey and George A Clark Town Hall Surroundings Scheme was not inaugurated until 1897.[5]

Ostensibly, from the exterior, Paisley Abbey appears to be no different from most large medieval Gothic churches in design, being a Latin cross, the arms formed by transepts to the north and south of the crossing, surmounted by MacGregor Chalmers' well-balanced central tower. Despite the similarity among large medieval churches each is unique in itself, and like most great churches (depending on the natural light), Paisley Abbey can be either dark and overbearing, or light and airy; and in the sunlight, the usually dull grey ashlar takes on a yellowish hue.

Even though much has been written about Paisley Abbey in the past, no serious systematic historical or archaeological research has been carried out comparable with the larger and richer Glasgow Cathedral, or even Jedburgh Abbey (for example); and because it appears that beyond Paisley, little is known of its former Cluniac monastery, she faces an almost insurmountable task in her quest for acceptance as one of Scotland's major ecclesiastical sites.[6] Also, because Paisley had lost its rural setting (unlike the Border abbeys of Jedburgh,

Dryburgh and Melrose), and lacked any ruined buildings, influential men like Sir Walter Scott could not describe it as a romantic picturesque ruin; nor could Sir Walter compare it with the still complete Glasgow Cathedral.

Since the visitor can explore and investigate the ruined cloistral buildings at the great Border abbeys of Jedburgh, Dryburgh and Melrose, by doing so he can experience a great deal; for example, the enclosed nature of the buildings is counter-balanced by the extensive nature of the sites. However, a visit to the ruined abbey of Crossraguel, Paisley Abbey's daughter house, may be more meaningful, for there is more than enough of the cloistral precinct still extant to provide an excellent picture of what the Cluniac monastery of Paisley may have looked like, though on a much grander scale than her daughter house. At Crossraguel, the sprawling yet definite plan of the site, to the south and east of the church, is common to most monastic sites and provides a considerable contrast to what is extant at Paisley. Also, it gives the visitor an indication of the type of buildings needed by any monastic community to live its life of seclusion and prayer. The buildings to the south-east of the church[7] at Paisley, are certainly not monastic in appearance and are largely inaccessible to the public because they are used mostly as church offices.

At Paisley Abbey only the frater and remnants of the north-east corner of the cloistral area remain, though now unrecognisable as such. The frater was transformed into a dwelling house after 1560, and is now known as The Place. The great drain has been rediscovered and surveyed both by the Royal Commission, and Glasgow University Archaeological

Research Division (GUARD), who produced a report.[8] From comparison with other monastic sites, together with relevant writings, the plan of the main buildings surrounding the cloister can be reconstructed, but problems still remain. There is, for example, no evidence of the site of the Abbot's Lodging, the infirmary, the rere-dorter, and other necessary buildings which are visible, or partly visible at various Scottish monastic sites.

One building about which nothing is known is the Lady Chapel, though it would have existed in some form. We can be certain that the west range (unfortunately demolished in 1873) was part of the monastery, and as such was in all probability the original prior's lodging and guest house, and that the building, whose remains lie to the south of the west range and originally attached to the frater (now The Place), was undoubtedly the monastic kitchen.

The monastic observance exercised at Paisley began at the Abbey of Cluny in AD 994 with the election of Odilo as abbot.[9] Consequently, when Odilo reformed monastic houses he made them subject to Cluny. It was his successor, Hugh of Saumur, who consolidated the Cluniac observance into a monastic Order separate from that of St Benedict, and known as the Order of Cluny.[10] Like most movements seeking a return to fundamental principles, the Cluny reform[11] began as a reaction to what could perhaps be termed the "softer life", supposedly enjoyed by the monks of Benedictine monasteries at that time. Cluny thus sought a more austere form of the monastic life, and as well as organising itself along stricter lines, laid even greater emphasis on the *OPUS DEI*. Even though Cluny wanted to be

different, it still remained in essence part of that great monastic family founded by St Benedict.

The new Order of Cluny spread quickly, and Cluny sent monks out to found many monasteries, most of which were located in France. In 1077, the Cluniacs were invited to found a house at Lewes in Sussex. In the second half of the twelfth century, through the auspices of the Fitzalans (later known as the Stewards), the Cluniacs came from Wenlock in Shropshire to Scotland, first to Renfrew and then to Paisley about 1169. The monks who formed the community of Paisley would have been no different from those at Wenlock, or La Charité-sûr-Loire - the mother house of Wenlock - in dress and daily routine, just as the life of the monks of Pluscarden Abbey today is similar to their brethren at Prinknash. Indeed, by his religious profession, a monk of Paisley was as much a monk of Cluny as the monks of Cluny were themselves, not just because he was expected to go to Cluny to take his solemn vows, but largely on account of the fact that the centralisation of the Cluniac Order meant that unlike their Benedictine brothers, each Cluniac house was either a dependency of Cluny herself, or of a house founded directly from Cluny. Dependency, however, was not seen as a hindrance but rather as a safeguard against secular interference.

Provinces were formed and organized among the Cluniac houses under Hugh V d'Anjou, Abbot of Cluny (1199-1207), who also introduced periodical General Chapters to be held there[12]; and once Paisley was raised to the dignity of an abbey its abbot was tenth in order of precedence at these General Chapters.[13] One of the conditions laid down by Cluny, when Paisley was promoted to the status of an abbey, was that each year it should pay a pension to

Cluny through the Prior of Pontefract; Paisley was still doing this in 1448.[14]

Even though Paisley (and Crossraguel) belonged to the Province of England and Scotland, they did not come directly under the jurisdiction of the Cluniac vicar-general in England for both "were immediately subject to Cluny."[15] The abbot of Paisley may have acted independently (even completely ignoring a citation to attend a General Chapter at Cluny in person[16]), but Paisley Abbey did not escape official visitations by the vicar-general appointed by Cluny.[17] From one such visitation, which took place in the early fifteenth century, we learn that Paisley had twenty-five monks and Crossraguel had ten.[18]

In 1488 Paisley was still an active member of the Order of Cluny for its abbot was asked to explain his non-attendance at a General Chapter for seven years, for he was expected to attend every two years.[19] Though there appears to be no definite record of how regular (or otherwise) was the attendance from Paisley at the General Chapters held at Cluny, it is quite certain that Paisley, as a Cluniac house, did not participate in the General Chapters of the Benedictines, the Black Monks.[20] Even as late as 1546 Paisley was still described as a Cluniac abbey[21], and her last abbot, even when Archbishop of St Andrews, was often referred to as belonging to the community of Paisley, and the Order of Cluny (O.Clun). Therefore, in the sixteenth century Paisley Abbey was, to all intents and purposes, still part of the Cluniac Order.[22]

There were still twenty-five monks in Paisley at the time of Abbot Thomas de Tervas (1445-1459) for he had new choir stalls built for them[23]; and as

late as 1539 there were at least 16 monks at Paisley, for that number witnessed a charter.[24] We also know the names of most of the abbots and priors of Paisley[25], as well as something of the obedientiaries[26] and individual monks. One of them, Andrew Stewart, as the natural son of a Royal Stewart[27], was of royal blood; and Abbot John Hamilton was also related to the Royal House, through the earls of Arran.

From the twelfth century onwards, it was not uncommon for monks to attend university[28], and in the fifteenth century Paisley Abbey had monks who had been educated outwit the cloister. As a young monk, Andrew Stewart (previously mentioned, and later cloistral prior for many years), went on to study theology and canon law at university.[29] Abbot Thomas Morow was also a university graduate[30], and John de Eaglesham, monk of Paisley, sought permission to study arts at any university, as a reward for his services to Abbot Morow.[31] Although there may have been others, John Hamilton's sabbatical leave to study in Paris, testifies that Paisley clerics were still studying abroad in the sixteenth century. Lees also suggests that one Paisley monk did attend classes at Glasgow University, but does not name him.[32] (I have suggested, in chapter 2, that the property the abbey once owned in the High Street, and close to the old university, may have been for housing student monks, just as the Benedictines once sent monks to Oxford, and even today to St Benet's Hall.) When the change of religious practices took place in 1560, there is no evidence of any of the Cluniac monks of Paisley joining the new Reformed Church as ministers, like some of their contemporaries in other religious houses.[33]

By the time the Cluniac monks settled at Paisley, the religious life of Scotland, as in every other European nation, was organised into dioceses. Thus, the Cluniac monks of Paisley found themselves under the umbrella of the Bishop of Glasgow, from whom, as a monastic house, they not only claimed independence but had to struggle to maintain it.[34] Once established there is little doubt that Paisley Abbey became the most important monastic house within the Glasgow diocese.

Also, the twelfth century was the great age of church building throughout Europe, and since Paisley Abbey was founded then, it must not be looked at in isolation from Europe. To do so would be to ignore the fact that monasticism was a Continental movement, not only visible in monastic architecture, but also in monastic planning.[35] Because Scotland was on the fringe of Europe her architectural development was somewhat slower, yet, Scottish masons used the same building methods as did their contemporaries elsewhere.[36]

Paisley must also be viewed within the context of Scottish monasticism. The date of Paisley's formal foundation was 1163, which roughly coincides with the laying of the foundations of St Andrews Cathedral Priory 1163 x 1165.[37] This is important for it indicates that the abbey church of Paisley was contemporary with Scotland's largest medieval church, which in its original form was four hundred feet long, and hence one of the longest in Britain.[38] Even though Paisley and St Andrews were both twelfth century foundations, Paisley's architecture has little in common with St Andrews, apart from the square east end of its late choir, now a modern restoration.

The square east end was customary in Scotland, even in the Romanesque period (as it was in England, from whence it derived).[39] In France the apsed east end was the norm[40], and was certainly very prominent among the Cluniac houses.[41] Scotland also has apsed east ends to some of her churches, those at the parish churches of Dalmeny and Leuchars being very interesting examples, but there are no surviving apsed east ends in any of our great churches. Dunfermline Abbey[42], and the cathedrals of Glasgow, and St Magnus, Kirkwall[43], originally had apsed east ends but these were pulled down in the thirteenth century to be replaced by square ones.

MacGregor Chalmers suggested that Jedburgh may have had an apsed east end[44], but to date no evidence has been found of any such thing. It was also Chalmers' opinion that the east end of Paisley Abbey's first church was apsed too[45], and if it was, then it would have had something in common with many of its sister Cluniac houses.[46] Whether Paisley's first church had an apsed east end or not is still conjectural.

Apart from the east processional doorway, and perhaps parts of the south wall (where, according to Lees, the foundations, consisting of broken stones, are quite different from the rubble foundations of the rest of the church[47]), there is sparse evidence of Paisley's first church. It is likely that the first church or choir would, at least, have been a simple building, perhaps like the original twelfth century nave at Whithorn.[48]

At Whithorn, an earlier Romanesque doorway provided the new thirteenth century church with its west doorway.[49] A similar situation occurred at Culross where an earlier doorway was used as the

entrance to the choir, which eventually became the post-Reformation parish church. At Paisley, a Transitional doorway belonging to the earlier church was preserved, and re-used in the thirteenth century nave, perhaps being moved from its original site to become the processional door into the abbey from the chapter house. There is evidence which suggests this, for the bond stones of the doorway are different from the ashlar of the adjoining walls. Although the Transitional doorway at Paisley is a dignified example of the period, it is rather coarse when compared with contemporary doorways at Dryburgh Abbey, with their finely cut columns and delicately carved waterleaf capitals.

Although the priory at Whithorn expanded to become a typical monastic church and monastery[50], it never quite attained the proportions of Paisley Abbey's thirteenth century church. The Cistercian abbey at Tintern is a better comparison with Paisley. At Tintern an earlier simple twelfth century church was replaced by the great church[51], which, though ruined, still stands today as a wonderful reminder of the achievements of the medieval architect. Prior to the building of the new church, the Tintern monks had, for various reasons, virtually rebuilt the monastic buildings.[52] Even though the monastic church at Paisley was rebuilt in the thirteenth century, there is no evidence to suggest that the cloistral ranges would also have been rebuilt at that time. The rather small cloister begs the question as to whether the nave of the new church was built to suit the cloister of the earlier church, rather than *vice versa*.

Paisley's Early English nave was probably completed in the first half of the thirteenth

century. Although war damage in 1307 is the usual reason given for its replacement in the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries, there is no contemporary evidence which states clearly the extent of the damage to Paisley Abbey. This is one major problem which is still unresolved. Because of the dramatic change in the architecture, in particular the scant extant evidence of the thirteenth century nave, Paisley in its present state has little in common with contemporary churches of the thirteenth century, in particular Glasgow Cathedral.

1272 is seen as the year in which change was coming in England: there was the accession of King Edward I (1272-1307), and in ecclesiastical architecture significant changes were taking place, for the Early English began to be replaced by the Early Decorated.[53] The untimely death of King Alexander III of Scotland (1249-1286) left only a child as his immediate heir. Margaret of Norway's early death led to problems surrounding the succession to the throne. The Scots invited Edward I to adjudicate as to who had the best claim to the kingdom. Nevertheless, they were determined to maintain their own government and remain independent of England, and made their position clear to Edward I. The English king continued to deliberately interfere in the affairs of Scotland, such that by 1296 war had broken out between the two kingdoms. The Wars of Independence lasted until 1371.

The immediate result of the war with England was a virtual halt to major church building, including work on hand at Glasgow and Elgin Cathedrals and Sweetheart Abbey, because the war effort had to take first place. Therefore, during this period of continuous warfare comparatively few major buildings were put up in Scotland, even to

replace those important buildings damaged or destroyed by the English - one of which was Paisley Abbey - so architectural development soon reached crisis point. Also, the lack of contact between Scottish and English masons, at this troubled time, denied the Scots the opportunity to participate in the challenges offered by the tremendous leap forward taking place in English church architecture, namely the beginnings of the Decorated period. Worse still, the generation of Scots masons and building workers immediately following this breakdown in relations between England and Scotland were denied access to this important English development, so as a result, would have lacked the necessary experience to develop Scotland's architecture.[54] Thus, in the thirteenth/fourteenth centuries Scottish masons had to seek their inspiration in the forms and elements used in the architecture of their forefathers. Therefore, due to the political differences with her neighbour, Scotland's architectural growth was stunted.[55]

Sweetheart is a case in point. The abbey was founded in 1273, so the church is largely late thirteenth century, but, the elements used in the church are incongruous if compared with those built earlier in that century, in particular the mother house of Dundrennan. At Sweetheart there is nothing between the arcades and the clerestory but a blank wall[56], a practice which may have begun at Kelso.[57] The blank wall at Sweetheart may have been intended for a painted frieze, a common enough feature in medieval churches of the period. Irrespective of the reasons for the lack of a triforium at thirteenth century Sweetheart, and in Scottish churches of the fourteenth century, one of them has to be a lack of skilled craftsmen. Another possible reason could have been the lack of finance, for the war effort

would have restricted the amount of money in the economy available for building operations. Also, the Black Death may have restricted the movement of masons.

Because of the lack of artistic contact between Scottish and English masons, if Scottish architecture was to develop, Scotland's masons had no alternative but to look abroad to France and the Low Countries for new architectural models. However, such European architectural influences are not really discernible in Scotland until the fourteenth century, and into this period falls the rebuilding of Paisley Abbey. Yet at this point in time, Scottish masons were building small collegiate churches, as well as rebuilding parochial ones, in preference to larger churches like Paisley Abbey. Similarly, the Establishment had no alternative but to forge and maintain diplomatic and commercial outlets with north European countries - especially the Low Countries.[58] In both cases, this inevitably resulted in closer links with the Low Countries - over and above that special relationship Scotland had already "*enjoyed*" with France for generations. Of course, this special relationship was not always beneficial to Scotland; the débâcle of Flodden in 1513 is a prime example.

In France and the Low Countries, from the 1350s onwards, Flowing tracery (which had gone out of fashion in England at that time), was enjoying a revival. In France, in the late fourteenth century, it developed into the Flamboyant Style.

England's architectural progress was distinct from that of France and Europe, and indeed the birth and development of the Decorated period in England eventually rivalled the Rayonnant in France.[59] Under

normal conditions Scotland would have shared in this great architectural movement, for the Decorated period lasted from the accession of king Alexander III in 1249, until well into the reign of king David II c.1350.[60]

Despite the problems Scotland was having with England, English architectural models were still being used in Scottish ecclesiastical architecture of the fourteenth century, especially at Dunfermline Abbey, where in the rebuilding of its frater (perhaps about 1329) curvilinear tracery was used in the south flank, and reticulated tracery with lozenge-shaped quatrefoils was used in the large west window.[61] The use of these elements of tracery was probably a reworking of earlier English forms. Reticulated tracery was also used at Maybole collegiate church about 1382, but by then it would have been more of a revival. Moreover, around 1337, Dunkeld choir was heavily restored using English forms, and other earlier elements, like cylindrical piers and early Decorated tracery, may have been used in the rebuilding of the south transept at St Andrews in 1378. Early Decorated tracery was also used in the west gable at Sweetheart around 1381, at Jedburgh in the south choir chapel; and in the east window of St Mirren's Aisle at Paisley in the fifteenth century.

Yet, in the rebuilding of Melrose after its destruction by English troops in 1385, we see the current fashionable English Perpendicular forms being used in the Presbytery, the east flanks of the north and south transepts, and in the clerestory above. The Perpendicular was again used, notably at Carnwath in the north transept[62], at Linlithgow[63] and Stirling[64] in apsed east ends.[65]

The rebuilding work at Melrose was probably carried out by Yorkshire masons[66], at the behest of Richard II. The Perpendicular tracery, without a doubt, is of a very high quality, as can be seen in the great east window with its blind arcading to the gable, decorated buttresses and attendant sculpture. Were this Perpendicular tracery still intact today, it might have been the finest example of late medieval architecture in Scotland, but unfortunately most of it is missing. The architecture of Melrose is perhaps an example of a lost opportunity, for it is indicative of what might have been accomplished in church building in late medieval Scotland had this example been developed further.

Unfortunately, no attempt appears to have been made to emulate the spectacular east end at Melrose Abbey elsewhere, and subsequently the Perpendicular was abandoned in Scotland for no apparent reason. Flamboyant tracery appears to have had a much greater influence in Scotland, being found not only in the south transept, and south aisle chapels at Melrose, in the north aisle and triforium at Paisley and in the choir at Lincluden, but in other churches throughout Scotland. All of this late fourteenth early fifteenth century work is of a very high quality, and shows influence of northern Europe.

It could be suggested that the master mason at Paisley, instead of using the Perpendicular in a manner befitting the nave of a great abbey church, as at Melrose's choir, preferred to use the current north European Flamboyant forms probably because he had been schooled in France, or northern Europe. Furthermore, the use of the clustered pier, the mouldings of the capitals and of the arcading, although resembling the English Decorated of the late thirteenth to fourteenth century, probably owes

more to France than to England because of its use of elements similar to those used in the revived Flamboyant tracery.

Besides, Flamboyant best describes the form of the tracery in the two eastmost windows of the north aisle at Paisley, and at Melrose in the south aisle chapels. Similar tracery can also be found in the choir of Lincluden Collegiate Church after 1389.[67] The work at the two eastmost bays of the north aisle at Paisley Abbey is seen as being part of the rebuilding programme of Abbot John de Lithgow I (1384-1412).[68]

Despite sharing a common building period with Melrose Abbey, not only is the architecture of Paisley Abbey different from Melrose, but it is three storeys, whereas Melrose is not, strictly speaking, three storeys high, for the triforium and clerestory are merged to form a glazed triforium. Paisley thus follows the building traditions of the earlier Middle Ages when great churches of the Romanesque, and later Gothic period, were usually built three storeys, and sometimes four storeys in height, as in the towers of Kelso. Moreover, these storeys were all distinct from each other, being separated by string courses and vaulting shafts. Therefore, it could be said that Paisley Abbey was the last major Scottish medieval church to be built in the traditional three storey fashion. Even though Paisley, like Melrose, had suffered damage due to the conflict between Scotland and England, and so was in need of refurbishment, the mason in charge of the new work at Paisley had to take cognisance of the existing remnants of the previous thirteenth century three storey church.

Other developments in fifteenth century Scotland can be studied at Dunkeld Cathedral and the large collegiate and burgh churches. Dunkeld's nave was begun in 1406 and consecrated in 1464, its upper storeys being supported by stout cylindrical piers, last used in important Scottish churches of the twelfth century; but their use at Dunkeld is perhaps derived from the Low Countries[69], or more simply a re-use of older forms.

In the fifteenth century the building of large two storey burgh and collegiate churches, like Linlithgow, Stirling and Haddington, took precedence. The lack of a triforium meant that these churches have an expanse of blank wall between the nave arcades and the clerestory, as was noted earlier at Sweetheart's late thirteenth century nave. More importantly, within the context of Paisley Abbey nave, the elements used in the piers, the arcading, and especially the capitals, can also be found in the arcading of the chancel of St. Michael's Linlithgow (1450 x 1500), where the mouldings of the piers are straight like those at Paisley. Similar mouldings exist in the chancel of the Holy Rude, Stirling (1529 x 1555).[70] Other examples are extant in the Moray Aisle, the south aisle, the Chapman Aisle, all in St Giles, Edinburgh, and all of which were built between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Similar mouldings can be seen in the crossings at Dunglass, Seton, and elsewhere. All of these examples come after Paisley, apart from the remaining south aisle respond at Lincluden, where the form and style of the capital and base owe more to Paisley than those other examples. Indeed, the similarity between the responds at Paisley and Lincluden may well be more than coincidence. The use of such elements may have been the beginnings of a National Style of

architecture in Scotland, and which was still to the fore immediately prior to the Reformation in 1560.[71]

Because of the manner in which these earlier elements are used in the nave at Paisley, it can perhaps be described as the best example of the national style of architecture developed by Scotland in isolation during the Wars. Also, if Paisley's nave is compared with the thirteenth century nave at Glasgow (perhaps completed in the early fourteenth century), Glasgow's nave has a unity which is lacking at Paisley, because at Glasgow the bays of the choir and nave are divided by vaulting shafts unlike Paisley.

This is most unfortunate, for the lack of unity in Paisley's nave is certainly not helped by the contrasting elements from different architectural periods used (for example) in the triforium and clerestory. These belong to two different building campaigns, those of Abbots Lithgow I and Tervas. However, these need not necessarily be seen as separate building periods, as such, for it is likely that work would have continued on the nave after Lithgow I's death in 1312. This may explain the obvious connection between the arcading and the triforium which contrast with the clerestory above. Such contradictions in design have produced a building where too many contrasting styles are struggling to co-exist with each other: hence its apparent "*heaviness*". A heaviness which is also emphasised by the unusually projecting corbelled platforms of the clerestory walk.

A comparison between Paisley's nave and the presbytery at Melrose, which is light and elegant, (or even the nave at Jedburgh), will explain what is suggested by the use of the word "*heaviness*".

Moreover, although it is not uncommon for large medieval churches to display different architectural forms they are rarely if ever seen, as at Paisley, where the claustrophobic use, or accumulation of such forms in the nave is problematical, not only for any understanding of Paisley's architectural development, but for an understanding of developments in Scottish ecclesiastical architecture of the fourteenth century and later.

The late fourteenth century also witnessed the rebuilding of the nave of St Giles with its octagonal piers; the rebuilding at Elgin, after 1390, of the presbytery and choir aisle in a fashion which harmonised with the earlier nave; repair work carried out at Arbroath after 1390, and at Sweetheart where the clerestory was probably remodelled using elements from earlier periods of architecture in both cases. The nave at Crossraguel was largely rebuilt at this time, as was the "modernising" of the cloistral area.

The fourteenth century also saw the building of smaller Scottish churches like the incomplete St. Monan's, Fife c.1362, with its ribbed and groined vaults; and the new chancel built at Bothwell Collegiate Church c.1398. These are both interesting examples of middle to late fourteenth century church building in Scotland, and in their own way are precursors of the larger collegiate churches built in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, most of which have barrel or groined vaults. Though on the whole it could be said that, apart from the building of smaller churches like St, Monan's and additions to Bothwell Collegiate Church, it is obvious that church building work in Scotland in the fourteenth century, including the major

rebuilding of Melrose and Paisley, was largely repair work, resulting from the Wars of Independence.

Another major problem affecting any understanding of Paisley is the choir. Little if anything is known about the form of the choir before the fall of the central tower in the sixteenth century, nor is anything known of the damage resulting from this. Questions have been raised about the choir being extant (because of the presentation of a new missal to the Lady Altar) in 1551.[72] Certainly, in the present restored choir there is evidence of what would have been the doorway in the south wall into a planned sacristy/chapel, which was common in later medieval churches; and, in any case, it was not unusual for sacristies to have altars in them. However, such evidence does not necessarily signify the existence of a choir. McGibbon and Ross suggested[73] that the building of a new choir was in hand because of the fact that the existing walls were of an equal height all round, in which case it is logical to assume that the doorway into the choir was for the sacristy/chapel, as the evidence suggests. Alternatively, the nine feet walls may well signify that a demolition[74] had taken place, and that for some strange reason the walls were left standing at this height.

A thorough excavation of the choir site would answer several questions: [i] whether the original choir of Paisley was built in a Romanesque/Transitional Style, and [ii] whether the long choir was either contemporary with the thirteenth century nave, or, was a third rebuilding as suggested by McGibbon and Ross.

During the time of religious change, culminating in 1560, the nave of Paisley Abbey survived relatively unscathed, probably because its proportions were ideal for transforming it into a parish kirk. After the Reformation Scottish ecclesiastical architecture developed in many different ways, none of which really affected the abbey, though this new kirk architecture continued into the late eighteenth century. Indeed, by the eighteenth century (apart from the installation of pews, and the blocking up of windows), the nave of Paisley Abbey had changed little. Nevertheless, despite its historical importance, in 1788 the nave was at risk of being pulled down.

The Heritors suggested pulling down the nave and using the stone to build a commodious new kirk, because of the rather poor state of the fabric. In the late eighteenth century in Scotland medieval parish churches were often pulled down and replaced with parish kirks. This did happen at Old Monkland and Eaglesham, and elsewhere, but fortunately not at Paisley Abbey, the nave still being essentially a medieval building. It could be said that the cry for a restoration of Paisley Abbey came at the right time, for by then, British architects, Robert Adam among them, were turning to the medieval period for inspiration, as part of the Picturesque Movement. (The Picturesque Movement became fashionable in England in the second half of the eighteenth century, and lasted into the nineteenth). The influences of Gothic architecture became so fashionable that it led to a rebirth of Gothic forms and elements in what became known as the "*Gothick Style.*"

At Alnwick Castle in the early 1770s, Robert Adam designed a banqueting hall, a saloon and later

a Chapel, in the new Gothick Style for the duke of Northumberland. He also designed a bridge for the duke over the River Aln. (Yet, Adam's castellated exteriors at Mellerstain and Culzean Castle, contrast with his elaborate Neo-classical interiors.)[75] The design of new *Gothick* buildings was also accompanied by much restoration of the great English churches, many of which, like Paisley Abbey, had been grossly neglected. One architect who was prominent in restoration work was James Wyatt [1747-1813].

Unfortunately, architects like Wyatt failed to appreciate the Gothic ideal of their medieval predecessors, who had built these great churches. Wyatt and his contemporaries, in striving for the Picturesque, wantonly pulled down rood screens, pulpitum, chapels, chantries, and much stained glass at Salisbury Cathedral, and elsewhere.[76] It was this same misguided search for a "pure Gothic" which resulted in Glasgow Cathedral losing its two western towers. It is also interesting to consider that when Wyatt was working at Salisbury, Boog's restoration of Paisley was taking place.

It is unlikely that the work eventually carried out at Paisley can really be attributed to the *Gothick Style*, for there is no doubt that the restoration was carried out in a manner sympathetic to the original Gothic architecture of the nave. More importantly, Paisley Abbey still had most of its medieval window tracery, though there is evidence to suggest that the tracery in the eastmost window of the north aisle was removed to form a doorway to Lord Ross of Hawkshead's pew [see plate 59].When the eastmost window was eventually restored (though there is no evidence when) it appears to have been done so in the form of its original,

unlike in some of the great English churches. A good example of such interference with the authentic fabric was at Worcester Cathedral, where the medieval tracery in the north transept, west front and cloisters, was replaced by stylised tracery.[77] Similar "*improvements*" were made to the cloisters at Durham. By the time Boog's restoration was completed in 1791 the first post-Reformation church in this new *Gothick Style* had been built at Farnell, Angus, by James Playfair.[78]

The successful restoration of Paisley Abbey was largely due to the efforts of the minister of the First Charge, the Rev Robert Boog, but it was almost marred by the addition of the ugly Session House over the north porch. The Session House was built in the *Gothick Style*. It was replaced in the early 1860s by one designed by James Salmon, in a fashion was more sensitive to the medieval architecture of the nave.

Between the restoration of Paisley Abbey in Boog's time and its restoration by James Salmon, in the time of the Rev Andrew Wilson (1852-1865), much had been achieved in Scotland's architectural history. Indeed, many Gothic churches were built in Scotland at this time, each in its own way playing its part in the history of the Style, now known as the Gothic Revival.[79] Many of these Scottish churches exemplify the writings of A C Pugin (1762-1832), and others[80], whose influence was such that by the middle years of the nineteenth century, the *Gothick* influence had developed into a search for the "*true GOTHIC STYLE*", based on authentic archaeological forms. There is no doubt that some of these churches are not only substantial buildings, but also buildings of architectural importance. Both Gillespie Graham's St Andrews RC Cathedral, Glasgow

(1813), and William Burn's St John's Episcopal Church, Edinburgh (1816) come into this category, and as such are certainly excellent examples of this early period of the Gothic Revival in Scotland and elsewhere.

Pugin's son, A W N Pugin (1812-1852), was very influential in this search for the "*true Gothic Style.*" The crowning glory of this later Gothic Revival period was perhaps the rebuilding of the Houses of Parliament in the Tudor Style (1840-1860), designed by Sir Charles Barry, with the assistance of A W N Pugin in the interior decoration. This later Gothic Revival also led many administrators of medieval cathedrals to engage architects to undertake restoration work in an effort to recapture the former glory of the great churches under their care. G G Scott (1811-1878), and others, continued the work of restoration, though his work was not always as sympathetic as it might have been.[81] Eventually, the Gothic Revival, like the Gothic period itself, became an International Movement.

Some important examples are the notable restorations of Viollet-le-Duc in France, in particular his work at Notre Dame de Paris and Mont San Michel; the completion of the unfinished Gothic Cathedral at Cologne (1824 x 1840), according to the medieval plan; and even in America the building of St Patrick's Cathedral, New York, and St John the Divine in the Gothic Style.

The restoration of Paisley Abbey must also be seen in the context of this Gothic Revival. The destruction of medieval churches in the name of Revivalism happened in Scotland (as well as in England), but fortunately not at Paisley. St Giles, Edinburgh, was "*clothed*" in stone and "*remodelled*"

by William Burn (1829-1833); and at Glasgow the piers in the choir were covered with dark brown paint in an attempt to cover up the many repairs and achieve a cosmetic uniformity. Even though the piers in Paisley's nave appear to have seen many repairs, fortunately no attempt was made to paint them.

Many of England's great churches were restored, and the restoration work at the cathedrals of Lichfield and Worcester coincides roughly with that carried out at Paisley in the 1860s. Lichfield was begun by G G Scott in 1856, continued by his son Oldrid until 1908, and finally completed by others at a cost of £98,000.[82] Perkins began the restoration of Worcester in 1855[83]; and G G Scott continued the work after 1864, completing it in 1874.[84]

The restoration of Paisley Abbey in the 1860s was carried out by James Salmon (1805-1888), a Glasgow architect. Without a doubt James Salmon's restoration at Paisley was an outstanding success, but more than anything else, it was his conjectural drawing of a restored abbey, complete with tall elegant spire, which inspired the great resolution by important Paisley "*worthies*" to strive for a complete restoration of the choir, central tower, transepts and cloister of the abbey.

Fortunately for Paisley Abbey, James Salmon did not attempt to alter the medieval window tracery, or the fabric of the nave. Instead he opened up the windows blocked up in earlier times. The immediate benefit of a well lit church encouraged benefactors to fill the tracery with stained glass. Some of these benefactors were Heritors who were actively involved in Paisley's restoration, so were obviously

aware of what was happening elsewhere in Britain, in particular the work of Edward Burne-Jones, the foremost glass designer of his age.[85] The nave of Paisley Abbey is fortunate to have several windows designed by Burne-Jones.

Unlike some architects, when Salmon came to restore the tracery of the north transept windows (especially that great north window), instead of designing his own tracery he preferred to use the extant remnants of the original as springers for his new tracery. In doing so, Salmon rebuilt not just the great north transept window at Paisley, but one of the finest traceried windows in Scotland. Furthermore, James Salmon's sympathetic restoration of the ancient fabric of Paisley Abbey was later enhanced by Robert Rowand Anderson (1834-1921). He restored the crossing, transepts and part of the central tower.

Anderson's approach to the restoration was typical of the man, whose reputation as a restorer was first seen at St Vigean's, Arbroath. Anderson had worked with G G Scott early on in his career, as did William Forrest Salmon, son of James Salmon. Anderson preferred to draw up his designs for the church he was commissioned to restore based on research from genuine Gothic churches. Thus he knew exactly what he was about. Anderson was later to restore Dunblane Cathedral in a most careful as well as a tasteful manner. His work at Paisley was completed by 1907.

In 1913 it was Peter MacGregor Chalmers, and not Rowand Anderson, who began the final chapter of the restoration of Paisley Abbey, namely the cloister, choir and tower. Peter MacGregor Chalmers (1859-1922) was also a skilled restorer and

ecclesiastical architect, but only lived to see his choir walls rise up to their full height with the springers in place ready to take the vault. The restoration of Paisley Abbey would undoubtedly have been his greatest work. The honour of completing the restoration fell to Sir Robert Lorimer (1864-1929), Chalmers' great rival for the commission, whose reputation as a restorer of great houses was second to none, although it was his Thistle Chapel of 1911 which showed that he had other talents. Lorimer completed the restoration of the choir and central tower of Paisley Abbey in 1926. The renewed abbey choir and tower were very much in the spirit of the medieval Gothic, and as such certainly complement the medieval nave.

Of course, Paisley Abbey is not the only medieval Scottish church to undergo restoration work. Coldingham, Culross, Fearn, Iona, Monymusk and Pluscarden have all been restored in some way, but none as fully as Paisley's choir.[86] Although the choir at Paisley is essentially a restoration, it also played an important part in the development, though rather late, of the Gothic Revival in Scotland.

However, the building of churches in the Gothic Revival Style was still taking place. In 1894 as Anderson was working on the tower and crossing at Paisley, Hyppolite Blanc was completing his magnificent cathedral-like Coats Memorial Baptist Church, on Paisley High Street.[87] The tall tower of Coats Memorial, surmounted by a Crown Spire, dominates the sky-line of the town. Blanc's wonderful interior, embellished with fine wood panelling and stone vaulted crossing and chancel, is an excellent example of late nineteenth century Gothic Revival; and before Lorimer completed

Paisley, J J Burnet in 1923 had built the new chapel for Glasgow University, assisted by James Napier. This essay in the Gothic Revival is very much in the spirit of Burnet's earlier Barony Church, in the Early English Style. The Barony Church is famed for its spaciousness, which feature the University Chapel could be said to share. At the University, Burnet was faced with a narrow site. To achieve the required sense of space he rather cleverly accentuated the height of the chapel, balancing it with a clerestory, similar to that at Dunblane Cathedral, and then filling the nave with three tiers of stalls.[88]

Although Paisley's restoration came late, even during Chalmers' time restoration work was continuing in England. The restoration of Winchester Cathedral by T G Jackson (1905 x 1912)[89] was the last of three major restorations carried out on the cathedral; and Selby Abbey was rebuilt after being completely gutted by fire in 1906.[90] It was Oldrid Scott who was the architect-in-charge of the restoration, which meant that he had to repeat his father's work of 1871 - 1873, and his own of 1889 - 1890.[91] The restoration work at Selby continued until 1935, culminating in the heightening of the western towers.[92]

Although Selby was also a major rebuild it was the result of an almost catastrophic fire. Yet, there were other cathedrals whose rebuilds were, like Paisley, dependant on other causes. The nave of Bristol, for example, was rebuilt by G E Street (1868 x 1877)[93], although the central tower was not completed until 1893. G Gwilt rebuilt the nave of Southwark (1838 x 1841)[94], but between 1890 and 1897 Sir Arthur Blomfield rebuilt the nave, saving a building which might have been lost.[95]

The Place of Paisley, incorporating the buildings to the south east of the abbey church, were also restored, at different times. Although MacGregor Chalmers drew up plans, little if anything was done. It was much restored by Lorimer, and latterly in the late 1950s by James Steel Maitland (1887-1982). Steel Maitland was a Paisley architect of considerable skill and ingenuity, who had formed a partnership with T G Abercrombie in 1923, becoming sole partner in 1925. Steel Maitland was more than qualified for the task, and not surprisingly, the quality of Steel Maitland's work at The Place is very high indeed; and, like his predecessors, he completed its restoration in a style which also kept its antiquity in mind though at the same time not just attempting to replicate it.

Indeed, all of us should be thankful that those who were responsible for the various periods of the restoration of the abbey, namely the Restoration Committees and their architects, were aware of what should be achieved, for the immediate result was a complete and sympathetic restoration of the building. Unfortunately, this was not always the case in England, where the architects were often carrying out the directions of the deans and chapters of the cathedrals in which they found themselves working.[96] Yet, in England there are also many examples of major restoration work which were sympathetic to the fabric of the buildings, so could be compared with that at Paisley.

Had the nave of Paisley not been saved, the evidence of it as a significant element of the north European Renaissance in church building in the later Middle Ages, would have been lost. The aim of this thesis is to set it in that context.

CHAPTER 11
(part 1)

The History & Architecture Of The Medieval Abbey Church Its Foundation And Development 1163 - 1371

The history of Paisley Abbey is very much a history of the Stewards, or the royal house of Stewart. Its founder Walter Fitzalan was the third son of Alan, a knight of Anglo-Norman descent, who had founded the dynasty in Shropshire.[1] Walter is said to have entered the service of David I (1124-1153) in or about 1136.[2] Subsequently, King David rewarded him with the office of Steward or Dapifer[3], as well as granting him the lands of Strathgryfe in Renfrewshire. He served as Steward 1136 x 1177 to David I, Malcolm IV and William I. Walter I married Eschina de Londres, Lady of Mow, but it was their grandson, Walter II, who adopted the more dignified title of Senescallus rather than Dapifer.[4] In 1157 Malcolm IV (1153-1165), David's successor, not only confirmed Walter I in his lands, but also made the office of Steward Hereditary[5] in the Fitzalan family. Not content with that, Malcolm made Walter I gifts of more land.[6]

Some time later, following the example of his former liege-lord King David I, who was himself an enthusiastic founder of monastic houses, Walter I resolved to found a monastery on his estate. Although there is doubt about the exact date of the founding of the abbey, 1163 is the most likely. At this time King Malcolm IV, as Earl of Huntingdon, was visiting Fotheringay, where he was the Lord of the Manor, to do homage to Henry II [1164-1189] his liege-lord.[7] Walter was attending King Malcolm in his capacity as Steward, and took the opportunity to make an agreement with Humbold, Prior of the Cluniac house of St Milburga at Wenlock, in Shropshire. Humbold was to send thirteen monks to found a house of his Order at Paisley, where the monastery was to be built, and from their number, one was to be elected prior.[8] The founding charter for Paisley was sealed at Fotheringay[9], and the

witnesses included Engelram, Chancellor and Chaplain to King Malcolm, and Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx. So with this foundation charter, Walter I Fitzalan began the history of the monastery of Paisley.

The Cluniac priory of Wenlock was chosen to form the community at Paisley specifically because of Walter Fitzalan's family connections with Shropshire, where the family had settled after coming from Normandy, and in particular with the priory of Wenlock itself.[10] Because of the centralisation of the Order of Cluny, Humbold had first to acquire the approval of Étienne I de Boulogne, abbot of Cluny[11]. This was granted sometime after 1163.[12] Since Wenlock had been founded by the earl of Shrewsbury in 1077 from La Charité-sûr-Loire, Suaricius, its prior, had also to approve of the new foundation of Paisley, which he also did sometime after 1163.[13] Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) approved the founding of the new monastery at Paisley in 1209.[14]

Walter confirmed the foundation of his Cluniac priory of Paisley 1165 x 1173[15], as well as the many endowments he had bestowed on it. He reaffirmed the dedication of the abbey to the Virgin Mary, a favourite patron of the Cluniacs[16] (as with the Cistercians and other Benedictines); to his patron saint, St James the Greater of Compostella, (also a favourite dedication of the Cluniacs[17], as well as King Malcolm.[18]) It has been suggested that Cluniac devotion to St James of Compostella was derived from the hospitality given to the many pilgrims as they journeyed to his famous shrine.[19] Paisley was also dedicated to St Mirren, the local saint, and finally to St Milburga of Wenlock, which was a common practice amongst dependant religious houses.[20] Although the principal dedication of Paisley Priory was St James, it was St Mirren who eventually came to the fore.[21]

The choice of St Mirren was significant, for it recognised the need to acknowledge the important cult of the local saint, that of Walter's adopted lands of Paisley.[22] There was a considerable practice of the cult of local saints in the area, as seen in the building of Glasgow Cathedral over the tomb of St Mungo or Kentigern. Paisley, as well as Kilwinning, Kilmarnock and Lesmahagow, enjoyed the cults of native saints which survived and flourished.[23] Unfortunately, little if anything is now known of the cults of these saints.[24]

The altar and tomb of St Mirren were reputed to have been in the abbey church.[25] Indeed, it has been argued that the Cluniac monastery was built on the site of Mirren's earlier church, which would have contained his tomb.[26] However, there is no evidence for this.

The list of benefactions Walter gave to Paisley included many churches with their revenues; together with many other endowments of land and benefices.[27] By this charter he generously endowed the monks of Paisley, for not only was theirs the only monastic foundation in Renfrewshire, it ultimately became one of the most important monastic foundations in Scotland, and the richest abbey in the mid-west.[28] Although Paisley was not among the first of Scotland's monastic foundations, in terms of date of foundation, it was certainly not the last, for this was the great age of church building not only in Scotland, but also across Europe. Dunfermline c.1070-90, Kelso c.1128, Melrose 1136, Jedburgh c.1138, Dundrennan 1142, and Dryburgh 1150 are some of the twenty-eight religious houses founded in Scotland before Paisley, and some of Scotland's most important.

The chosen site for the new monastery was beautifully situated [fig 1], but as noted above, there is no

evidence to suggest that it had any previous connection with an earlier chapel of St Mirren. The site was part of a fertile and perfectly level piece of ground on the left bank of the Cart, on its course to the Clyde. Without a doubt the site would have provided for all the needs of the community of the new Cluniac priory, as laid down by St Benedict in his Rule.[29]

A typical Cluniac practice was for a small company of monks to take possession of new estates and build (or occupy if already built) a small church and various offices to house them. The members of the group, if all went well, were increased by new drafts till enough were gathered together to carry out the full regular and liturgical life.[30] It has been suggested that there would have been monks at the priory of Sts Mary and James of the Inch founded by Walter I, near to his castle at Renfrew, in 1163 x 1165.[31] In a later charter given to Paisley 1165 x 1173 Walter specifically mentioned the island near his castle (at Renfrew) on which the monks first lived.[32] A charter of Malcolm IV to Paisley c.1165 mentions the priory of Sts Mary and James of the Inch to which the Cluniac monks had come from Wenlock.[33] In a Bull of Pope Alexander III (1159-1181), of 25 March 1173, the monks are said to have lived beside the mill at Renfrew before they occupied the priory at Paisley.[34] Thus, there appears to be little doubt that the Cluniac monks from Wenlock lived for some time on the Inch at Renfrew.

If this was the case, when the monks arrived from Wenlock, it is more than likely that their companions would have transferred from the Inch to Paisley.[35] But, whether the monks were actually in residence at Paisley during this period (for the express purpose of observing the building of the priory church and cloistral

buildings), is uncertain. Yet, it has been suggested that some monks were living there before the death of King Malcolm in 1165.[36]

In any case, the formal transfer from the priory of Sts Mary and James to the new monastery at Paisley would only have taken place on the arrival of Humbold, of his representative from Wenlock in 1169.[37] If Humbold had come north for the dedication ceremony it is most unlikely that as a prior he would have returned home alone[38], so the thirteen monks who were to form the new Paisley community would probably have been chosen from among those who also journeyed north, and those who had previously occupied the Inch at Renfrew. Thus by 1169, the year in which the Cluniac monks travelled north from Wenlock to Paisley[39], it is more than likely that some kind of monastic buildings would have awaited them. Humbold had confirmed the founding of the new priory by a charter signed between 1163 x 1169.[40]

Humbold or his reperesentative would have supervised the election of the first prior, Osbert (1169-1180), of the new foundation at Paisley. Nothing is known of Osbert, yet it has been suggested that he came north with Humbold, even though there is no evidence for this.[41] Osbert, who may have died c.1180, was succeeded as prior by Roger. Under these first two priors, work on the monastery would have progressed though nothing for certain is known of the scale of their achievements.

The monastic church of Sts James, Mirren and Milburga of Paisley is mentioned in a charter of 1172[42], but there is no evidence of its architecture. Yet, by then the work of building the church and monastery would have been progressing for about nine years. The church and cloistral buildings were certainly under construction

before 1177, for the burial of Walter's daughter Margaret in the chapter house is mentioned in a charter which, though undated, is seen as having been drawn up before then.[43] If this is the case, there is no doubt that the choir would have been in use, for monastic churches were normally built from east to west. Thus, the buildings of the east range, with the chapter house, the second most important place in the monastery after the choir, were probably either under construction or completed. The monks' dorter, as an integral part of the east range would also have been under construction, but what the situation in the other cloistral ranges was, is unknown.

We do know that the founding of the Cluniac priory at Paisley coincided with the period of architecture known in England as Transitional.[44] Considering the geographical ties with England, there is no doubt that the situation in Scotland was similar.

In Scotland at that time there certainly were fine examples of churches in the Romanesque and Transitional styles. Dunfermline and Kelso Abbeys, and St Magnus Cathedral, are probably the most famous Romanesque churches in Scotland. The nave of Jedburgh, completed about 1192, is an excellent example of the early Gothic, while Dundrennan and Dryburgh are good examples of Early English. The existence of these churches illustrates the fact that Scotland was not an architectural backwater, and that the masons who would have built the first church at Paisley, were not without excellent models for inspiration. Therefore, given the period of its building, the earliest church at Paisley would certainly have had a Transitional choir.

Indeed, there is evidence which supports this statement. This evidence consists of a fine processional

doorway in the south aisle.[fig 2] The south aisle, with perhaps parts of the south transept, is the oldest part of the abbey church, and the Transitional doorway is toothed into the adjoining walls on each side. The twelfth century doorway, with its rounded archway and stepped moulding springing from foliated capitals on free standing shafts, is indeed a fine example of the Transitional, and has been dated around 1190[45] so may have been built during Roger's time as prior. The arch moulding of these orders is deep and filleted like Early English work, as is the moulding in the jambs, which give the illusion of further shafts, a practice which can also be seen in the great west doorway. The dripstones are foliated, the larger at the east corner being a full-petalled flower.

Apart from the Transitional doorway, there is further evidence in the form of a large carved and moulded waterleaf capital [plate 1] lying in the reconstructed north cloister walk. There is no doubt that this capital was a nook-shaft so would probably have belonged to either another larger Transitional doorway, or even a large archway (the chancel arch perhaps), or the entrance to the earlier chapter house (which more or less amounts to the same). Nearby is a round moulded base [plate 2], obviously belonging to a nook-shaft, and probably the base of the large waterleaf capital.[plate 1] Also, there is evidence of a change of ashlar in the south aisle, which suggests that the lower ashlar levels could belong to the first stage of the nave, which was certainly the situation at Glasgow's nave, prior to its completion in the late thirteenth century.[46] Another important factor indicating the probable design of the earliest church at Paisley, is the fact that the monks who formed the original community at Wenlock Priory had

inherited a former nunnery in 1089 dedicated to St Milburga.

It was a Romanesque church built c.1050 with a triple-apsed east end [fig 3].[47] The new monks of Wenlock, true to Cluniac custom, made use of this Romanesque church. They probably extended the monastery around the existing buildings, as can be seen in the extant remains of perhaps the finest Romanesque chapter house in Britain. Indeed, the Transitional door in Paisley's south-east cloister is more in keeping with the style of the Romanesque priory at Wenlock, and is reminiscent of the doorway into the former infirmary there [plate 163].

The present ruined church at Wenlock is Early English, and because it was completed before the middle of the thirteenth century[48], stylistically it has more in common with the thirteenth century aisle and west end at Paisley. Yet, Paisley does not appear to share the West Country influences of its mother church of Wenlock, as seen in the mouldings of the piers and vaulting-shafts of the south transept.[49] This suggests that at Paisley any possible architectural influences brought north from Wenlock had been superseded by then. Also, important Cluniac priories like Lewes, Castle Acre and Thetford originally had apsed east ends. Dudley Priory, a dependancy of Wenlock founded c.1149-1160[50] had a triple apsed east end too [fig 4], like the mother church; and may be a model for Paisley's earliest church.

Or, as has also been suggested, the original choir and presbytery at Paisley may have resembled those of the Cluniac abbey of Cérisey-la-Fôret, so would have had five apses, consisting of twin chapels to the north and south flanking the central apse [fig 5]. Professor Gourlay[51]

suggested that MacGregor Chalmers reached the conclusion that Cérisey's abbey church was the model for Paisley Abbey from reading Bond's *GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE*.[52] Gourlay appears to have agreed with Chalmers, for he wrote that there was every reason to believe that the corona of chapels would have been planned to accommodate chapels to Saints Milburga, James, Mary and Mirren.[53]

Unfortunately, there is no archaeological evidence to date of any apsidal endings to an eastern chapel, or chapels, of the first priory church of Paisley.[54] Of course, this is not conclusive proof since the earlier foundations may yet to be discovered by excavation[55], even though those of the south aisle are quite different.[56]

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, Paisley was still a priory, with Roger probably still prior. Nevertheless, its wealth was on the increase, its chief benefactors being mainly the Stewards. In 1178 Alan (1178-1204) succeeded his father Walter I, who had become a monk at Melrose in his last hours. Although Walter died there in 1178, his body was brought back to Paisley for burial before the High Altar. About the year 1202 Alan provided the abbey with the Mill of Paisley[57], and when he died, his son Walter II (1204-1246) succeeded him as Steward. Walter II, following the precedents of his father and grandfather, became a benefactor by bestowing on the priory all the land between the Altpatrick and the Espedair.[58]

Despite Paisley's importance as one of the four major pilgrimage sites in Scotland[59], and its considerable wealth[60], Paisley, as a priory, was regarded as being a minor Scottish religious house, and as such was unable to fulfil the important role its founder Walter had

anticipated. Walter I expected that it would have enjoyed the same abbatial status as its contemporaries, and as such would have played an important part in the religious life of the country. He would have taken for granted that its monks would have been able to take solemn vows, as did the monks in other Scottish monasteries, and so live the full religious life. Also, besides expecting the many prayers for him and his family, as benefactors of the monks of Paisley, there is every likelihood that any increase in the abbey's influence would have reflected on his family. It is more than likely, therefore, that Walter I's wish would have been that the cloistral buildings of his abbey of Paisley would have been the equal [say] of Jedburgh and Arbroath.

Had it been an English Cluniac house (all of which were priories) there would have been no problem, since in England many of the largest and most important religious houses were priories. Cluny was the real problem, for it was jealous of sharing its abbatial rank with dependencies. Because of this, great administrative problems were experienced by Paisley which was the farthest away of all the dependent houses of Cluny, and any journey to Cluny would have proven difficult.[61]

The greatest problem was that the Paisley monks were not able to make regular profession of the three vows of Poverty, Chastity and Obedience[62], which was contrary to the wishes and intentions of the founder, Walter I, and the religious life itself. An undated letter of c.1220[63] was sent to Cluny from the abbot and convent of Paisley, probably close in time to its promotion to abbatial status, on the very subject of the non-attendance of novices from Paisley at Cluny for profession. The reasons given are those which ventually led to its

promotion; it was King Alexander II (1214-1249), perhaps at the behest of the Steward, who petitioned Pope Honorius III (1217-1227) that he bestow on the monks of Paisley the privilege of electing their own abbot.

In 1219 a Bull was issued at Reate[64] setting up a Commission to investigate this problem. The Commission inquired of all interested parties, and concluded that Paisley should be allowed to elect an abbot. The Bull was sealed at Reate in July 1219[65], permission being given for the prior and convent to proceed towards the election of an abbot.[66] Waiter II, the Steward and grandson of the founder Waiter I agreed, and an abbot was elected, as a charter of c. 1220 verifies.[67] The outcome was that any connection which still existed between Paisley and Wenlock ended[68], though Paisley still maintained its connections with Cluny. Unfortunately, because the abbot of Cluny would not approve the promotion of Paisley to abbatial status, Honorius would only grant it conditionally.[69] Paisley had to wait another twenty-eight years before it received final approval from the abbot of Cluny.[70]

The first abbot of Paisley is mentioned in a charter of 1220 but not by name[71]; and even though William, who is often regarded as the first abbot, is mentioned in charters between 1225 and 1248, there is no indication of the date of his election. On the other hand Roger, who is mentioned in a charter of 1207-1214 as prior[72] could have been the abbot mentioned in a charter of 1220.[73]

Professor Gourlay suggested that it was Abbot William who would have completed the second, or Early English church between 1225-1248[74], during the prosperous reign of King Alexander II (1214-1249). Even though William's abbacy corresponds roughly with the probable

building dates of the Early English church, there is no evidence to prove that he was responsible. If Gourlay is correct, then it is Abbot William we are indebted to for the great west doorway, and it was his church which the English would have burnt in 1307. All that remains of what may have been the second abbey church of Paisley are the west front, including the westmost bays of the interior, the south aisle, and the south transept. Despite this lack of evidence at Paisley, there are enough clues to make a feasible conjectural reconstruction of the layout of the west front and two bays of the thirteenth century nave.

Despite later changes, the elevation of the west front of the Early English church, as seen today, is still essentially Early English in character [fig 6], and as such, has always been one of much dignity as befits an important abbey church of the thirteenth century, and can easily be compared with the west front at Jedburgh.

The conjectural restoration of the west front of the church [fig 7a] is composed of a grand central and two lateral compartments, separated and flanked by four plain buttresses. The central compartment itself is divided into three storeys consisting of the great west doorway at ground level, and twin windows above divided into three lights. Tabernacle work separates the first and second floor levels. The second floor would have been filled with either a rose window [fig 7a], or a group of lancets [fig 7b]. The four west front buttresses are typical of the thirteenth century, as is the division of the west front into three storeys by using string-courses. Thus the overall design of the west front has changed little since the thirteenth century.

Paisley has the customary spiral stairs at each corner of the west front. Spiral staircases afforded access to the upper storeys, and were usually surmounted by polygonal turrets, like those at the north transept of Glasgow Cathedral, the tower of Cambuskenneth Abbey, and the east end of Elgin Cathedral [fig 7c], as well as the Whitby Abbey north transept. The conjectural drawing of Paisley west front [fig 7a] has polygonal turrets over the stair wells, similar to the thirteenth century turrets on the tower of Cambuskenneth Abbey.

The dignified west doorway [plate 3] consists of a receding arch of ten orders, the arch mouldings planned squarely, the outer one enriched with dogtooth ornament. On either side of the door jambs are four free standing shafts, alternating with roll and fillet mouldings which give the impression of engaged shafts. Thus, this doorway with its *fifteen* shafts to each jamb is certainly very impressive. The deep moulding springs from bell-shaped capitals, which also decorate the blind arcading flanking either side of the door. These are also decorated with dogtooth ornament and two roll and fillet shafts to the outside, the fillet mouldings being continued into the archivolts. Unfortunately, the shafts and moulded bases are at present in a rather poor state of repair. The hoodmould above the west door is carried over the plain solid buttresses to join with the dripstones of the lancet windows at the north and south aisles. These two lancet windows, which differ from each other slightly in character[75] [plate 4a & b], have nook-shafts and shaftrings.

The very fine west doorway bears a remarkable resemblance to other contemporary west doorways of the thirteenth century in Scotland, especially in the form and elements used. West doorways displaying similar

archaeological evidence as that at Paisley are to be found at Dunblane Cathedral [plate 5], Inchmahome Priory [plate 6] and Cambuskenneth Abbey [plate 7]. The similarity of these doorways, together with other archaeological evidence, suggests that the same masons worked on all of them, for they all appear to have been built in the same manner, being narrower at the spring of their arches than at ground level.

Also, the same method of building appears to have been used at the north [plate 8a] and south porch [plate 8b] doors of Dunblane Cathedral; and perhaps at the north entrance to the lower church at Glasgow with stiff leaf capitals [plate 9a]. Indeed, Gourlay has suggested that the south entrance of Glasgow's lower church is similar to the north porch door at Paisley [plate 9b][76], but close observation suggests that this is not the case. In Ireland at the church of St Sorrey, Drumacoo, Co. Galway, there is a doorway which appears to have been built in the same fashion as Paisley's west doorway [77][plate 10].

The great west doorway of Dunblane with its deeply moulded doorway and blind arcading to each side, is the closest analogue in terms of style and craftsmanship. Dunblane Cathedral was perhaps begun after 1237 by Bishop Clement, but the church was probably not finished until the late thirteenth century.[78] The doorway has unfortunately lost its shafts (and their accompanying mouldings) to the weather. Billings' print [plate 11] gives the observer a wonderful impression of this doorway as it might have looked, complete with flanking shafts with their caps and bases, as at Paisley.

The west door of Inchmahome is also similar in style to Dunblane, but it is a more homely example of the

achievements to be seen there. At Inchmahome the west doorway, again similar in style to Paisley, but flanked by double blind arcading, has also suffered serious damage from weathering over the centuries [plate 6]. At Cambuskenneth, despite the obvious similarities, the absence of any real evidence of the blind arcading [plates 7 and fig 8] makes its comparison with Paisley very difficult.

To allow for the recession in the archivolts, the wall at the great west doorway at Paisley is very thick, a practice which enabled the building of deeply recessed doorways (Dunblane and Inchmahome being built likewise). At Paisley the thickness of the wall is undisguised, and where the wall protrudes from the facade, each angle of the projection is occupied by a filleted nook-shaft, whose caps and bases are in the same style as those at the west door. It is to France (where the building of deeply recessed doorways became a fine art) that we must look for models. The Cathedral of Eu [plate 12] has a west front and doorway comparable with that at Paisley, but at Eu the thickness of the wall reaches up to the height of the buttresses. At Paisley, the nook thus formed by the projecting doorway and the building line is filled by a tall single shaft. So, Paisley's west door may well be an early thirteenth century sign of French influence in the design of recessed doorways in Scottish churches.[79]

During the High Gothic period in France, the idea was to carry the western doorways right out to the line of the front of the buttresses, and to cover the portals with gables; a system brought to perfection at Amiens, Bourges, Rheims and the striking south transept of Chartres.[80] But alas, not in Scotland, or England, where nothing touches the unsurpassable grandeur of those great

French doorways. Yet despite the stately English west fronts, Scottish builders appear to have achieved a better relationship between the doorway and the entire front than was the usual practice in England.[81]

Coltart makes a valid point here, for a simple examination of some of England's greatest abbey churches and cathedrals will show that very often what would normally be regarded as the great west doorway is minuscule in comparison with the west front itself, York Minster and Wells Cathedral [plate 13] illustrate this point. At Wells it is important to note that even though the sculpture is seen as an essential part of the architecture of the building, it is preferred as a means of emphasising the facade rather than a more prominent west doorway. This is certainly not the case in France, for the later great west doorways usually dominate the facade of the cathedrals, and if an examination was made of the Scottish cathedrals and abbeys their great west doorways would be found to be proportionately larger than their English counterparts.

Experts agree that the general treatment of the twin windows (25ft x 10ft) rising above the great west doorway of Paisley, each one divided into three lights, is original to the Early English design[82] [plate 14a]. Indeed, the method of building the thirteenth century south aisle windows does resemble that at the west front windows, and is quite obvious from photographs [plate 14b], The four lancet windows at Glasgow's thirteenth century east end also have thick mullions, and are of a similar building period to those at Paisley's west front.

Although it cannot be said with certainty that the tracery extant today replaced the original, there is no indication whatsoever of the earlier style. Glasgow's

north transept window [plate 15] is similar in proportion, and considering its division into two windows of three lights each, could well represent the original tracery at Paisley's west front. In the conjectural drawing [fig 7a] Lithgow I's tracery has been replaced with tracery loosely based on that at Glasgow, which appears to be a sensible archaeological "*fit*".

Also, the fact that the dripstones in the interior of Paisley's west end [fig 9a] are at the same level as those on the exterior supports the argument that the mullions and the hoodmoulds are of the thirteenth century. The fact that the interiors of the windows have nook-shafts and divided central mullions - moulded as though a cluster of shafts, and undoubtedly a thirteenth century form - shows that the interior of Paisley's thirteenth century window was still intact at that time [fig 9b] (as it is today).

Moreover, given the fact that the aisle lancets have flanking nook-shafts with shaftrings in the same style as the shafts flanking the west door, there is every possibility that the twin west windows originally had nook-shafts as part of an overall symmetrical design. Thus, the overall symmetry of the exterior would have been maintained, as seen at the west fronts of important churches in the Early English period.

The west fronts of Elgin Cathedral [fig 10] and Holyrood Abbey are Scottish examples of the obvious symmetry of Early English frontages, and so compare with similar west fronts in England. The magnificent west front of Peterborough Cathedral (1201-1222) [plate 16] is an excellent example of the symmetry of the Early English period, as is the east end of Elgin Cathedral (after Billings) [plate 17]. With these examples in mind, nook-

shafts at the twin west windows at Paisley would definitely have balanced the design, which is what the evidence of uniformity suggests.

Above the twin windows at Paisley are three niches of tabernacle work [plate 18] seven feet high, one occupying each of the spandrels formed by the twin windows. The tabernacle work itself comprises three trefoiled arches which spring from mini shafts with caps and bases in the style of the west door. The arches are moulded, as though forming orders in an archway, the hoodmoulds decorated with chevrons. Each of the hoodmoulds is finished with a moulded dripstone like those at the west door. The niches rest on the dripstones of the twin windows, as was customary in churches of the Early English period, as at Glasgow Cathedral and the west fronts of Elgin Cathedral and Holyrood Abbey.

The tabernacle work over the west windows is flanked by encircled quatrefoils, which are shown in Billings' print [plate 19] alternating between a Greek cross and a saltire. A modern restoration, obviously influenced by Billings, has built them in this fashion. It is more than likely that the quatrefoiled circlets at Paisley would have been set symetrically. For if Paisley is compared with the west front of Peterborough, or Elgin, the uniformity to be found there, would also have been found at Paisley. Also, considering that the *NATIONAL ART SURVEY* drawings have recorded this 3:1 ratio [fig 6], then there is little doubt whatsoever that the four encircled quatrefoils at Paisley's west front ought to be encircled Greek crosses[83] [fig 7a].

Above the tabernacle work, the master mason would probably have placed appropriate fenestration in the west

gable, perhaps a group of lancets as at the south aisle. In the reconstruction [fig 7b] a group of five lancet windows, based on examples at Elgin's west front, has been placed (as an alternative) in the west gable. Had these been flanked with nook-shafts, as reconstructed, then they would have helped balance up the design of the twin west front and aisle windows below [figs 7a & b].

A more interesting alternative to a group of lancets in the west gable would be a rose window, even though it is a form seldom used in these islands during the Early English period.[84] Without a doubt, had the west gable been filled with a rose window, it would certainly have complemented Paisley's west front, as the conjectural reconstruction shows [fig 7a], making it as dramatic as that at Arbroath Abbey [plate 20], or Pluscarden Abbey's north transept [plate 21]. Therefore, I am inclined to the view that a rose or wheel window in a style similar to that at (say) Beverley Minster c.1250, could have filled the west gable at Paisley, and hence it has been introduced into the conjectural reconstruction of the west front [fig 7a].

In the apex of the west gable at Paisley, and surmounting the rose window would have been a bullseye, perhaps similar to the thirteenth century example at Dunblane, decorated with dogtooth moulding. The apex of the west gable at Paisley would have been surmounted by a finial cross, and indeed the stump of the late medieval finial cross is still extant. A bullseye and a finial cross, similar to those at Glasgow's east end, have been added to the conjectural reconstruction of the west front [fig 7a].

The bays flanking the west front, one each at the north and south, belong to the thirteenth century church.

The west bay in the north aisle, with its two small windows is original, but the spiral stair would probably have been surmounted by an Early English turret, as at the west front [fig 7a]. There is no evidence that there ever was one at the south aisle, perhaps because the west cloistral range met the church at that point.

Both of these bays at the west end were intended to support twin towers[85] as seen in the heavy buttresses on the exterior of the west front and the rather squat buttress next to the north porch. In the interior, the westmost responds and the huge piers, occupying most of the bays, also support this argument. Despite claims by J J Waddell, Chalmers's assistant, that the towers were built[86], it is quite obvious from the evidence that they never were.

The evidence of these westmost bays - as part of the bay system of the nave - suggests that the intended method of building the towers at Paisley would have been similar to those at the west front of the English Cluniac house of Castle Acre in Norfolk [plate 22a], or those at Arbroath Abbey [plate 22b]; but unlike those at Elgin [plate 22c] and Holyrood where the extant western towers are independent of the bay system of both naves.

At the west front, the great doorway leads directly into the nave of the abbey church. The dignity of the exterior of the west end is not reflected in its rather austere interior [fig 9b]. The simple moulding and hood-mould inside the west doorway contrasts with the exterior. The two aisle windows are deep-set to accommodate the passageway built into the west front, which in the thirteenth century would have originally

provided access to the first floor window level, with the turret stairs at the north and south aisles.

Although the form of the interior of the twin west windows has already been noted, the mouldings of the capitals are continued into the jambs of the windows [plates 23a & c], a practice noticeable in the eastern chapels of the lower church at Glasgow Cathedral [plate 23b]. Simple arch moulds spring from the capitals of the nook-shafts to decorate the window arches, whilst the hoodmoulds terminate between the windows and at the extremities, with foliated dripstones. Between the west windows is a large decorative roundel, which is neither flush with the wall surface, nor is it on the square, but slightly askew. The reason for this is that it was taken down during Salmon's restoration, but later re-inserted after protest.[87] However, photographic evidence [plate 24] shows there were two smaller examples in the spandrels to the north and south. It it is probable that all three were originally part of the Early English interior.

On the interior of the west front, and in the spandrels between the main arcading of the nave, there is evidence of whitewash as decoration which is said to have been applied in Boog's time (1788-1789). The application of whitewash may well have been much earlier, for an investigation on the evidence of colour in the interior of Westminster Abbey has demonstrated that the stonework (as opposed to the marble) of the building, must have been lime-washed all over by a resident white-washer and his assistant who were employed throughout the later stages of the construction.[88] If this was done at Westminster, it is likely to have been common practice.

So any references to painting may refer to a fairly regular, rather than a new process.

Once inside the church today the observer is presented with a still complete late medieval nave which is 90 ft long x 60 ft wide divided by five piers into six bays [fig 11], and which ranks with those in the cathedrals of Glasgow, and Saint Magnus in Orkney. The Early English nave would also have been three storeys high, which is customary in most of the great medieval churches of western Europe. The three storeys consisted of the nave arcades, supporting the triforium above, with the clerestory, or third storey, with a wooden waggon roof, perhaps in the style of that rebuilt in the choir at Glasgow [plate 25].

In attempting a conjectural reconstruction of the bays of the lost nave at Paisley [fig 12], Glasgow's choir [fig 13] is undoubtedly a very important source. There is also Lincoln, whose influence, particularly in the relationship between the arcading and the triforium, was far-reaching.[89] So bearing these in mind, together with the evidence at Paisley, the triforium and clerestory have been reconstructed and based on elements of the choir at Glasgow. There is certainly evidence of the thirteenth century nave arcading in the large western piers, with their respective responds at the west door, and in the north and south aisles. The west end piers have the Early English contrasts of rolled moulding and deeply cut hollows, which are similar in style to the clustered piers in the choir of Glasgow Cathedral [fig 13]. Also, the thirteenth century westmost piers at Paisley would probably have been lozenge-shaped like those in the choir at Glasgow. The nave arches would have been more acutely pointed, like their contemporaries

at Paisley's west end [fig 11], which are similar to the arcading at Glasgow Cathedral east end.

In the thirteenth century nave at Paisley, as indicated by the extant piers at the west end, the crowns of the arcading would have risen to meet the string-course at the gallery [fig 12], as in Glasgow Cathedral's nave. The moulding of the nave arches would have been identical with those at the west end, as reproduced in the reconstruction. Since both the west end at Paisley and Glasgow Cathedral choir are of a similar date, it cannot be ruled out that they were built by the same masons' shop.

There is archaeological evidence of the Early English triforium at the north and south bays at the west end of the triforium at Paisley, but it is ambiguous. In the north-west bay of Paisley [plate 26], for example, despite a cluster of mini-shafts which do not follow the present building line, the arcading springs directly from the wall itself. Also, instead of one vaulting-shaft, as appears to be the situation at the south-west corner of the triforium, there are two vaulting-shafts, the second supported by a corbelled head [plates 27, 28 & fig 14b]. Also, these remnants of the vaulting-shafts at Paisley are similar to those at Glasgow's choir and the nave of Holyrood Abbey, where they are in threes.

The situation at the south-west corner of the present triforium [plate 29] is slightly different from the north. Here the arcading springs from a cluster of three shafts, with a fourth one thicker, and of the same height, yet situated slightly behind the cluster, and projecting beyond the line of the present arcading. To the west of this fourth shaft, springs a vaulting-shaft on a corbelled head, as at the north side [fig 14a]. The

vaulting-shaft is decorated with fillet moulding. The moulded bases of these shafts contrast with the caps and bases of the later work in the triforium. Therefore, what the ambiguity of the evidence between the south-west and the north-west bays suggests is that the north-west bay is the more authentic; and that at the south-west, one of the two vaulting-shafts has obviously been truncated and used to form the present fourth shaft of the gallery arcade [fig 14b]. Had it been otherwise, Paisley would have had an asymmetrical Early English triforium, with one vaulting-shaft to the south and two to the north.

Thus, in the north-west bay we can see the remnants of the arcading of Paisley's thirteenth century triforium. This probably consisted of (from the west - fig 15 - conjectural restoration) two vaulting-shafts which would have risen to the roof, followed by three clustered shafts from which would have sprung arcading, but more pointed than that which we see at present. The arcading would have reached up to meet the string-course at clerestory level. Secondly, the triforium would be divided, as at present, into twin arcading in each bay.[90] And, thirdly, the twin arcading would have sprung from a cluster of shafts in the centre of the each bay, whilst the clustered shafts at the west would have been matched up by, and joined to, the vaulting-shafts of the next bay. There are two bases for a cluster of four shafts among the moulded stones in the cloister [see photo appendix i, photos 48 & 49], which may have come from the thirteenth century triforium.

As part of my reconstruction of the Early English bays at Paisley I have divided each bay into four which is the situation in the choir at Glasgow [plate 30a & fig 13], and in the tower at Arbroath. Also, considering that

Glasgow's choir was still being built in the 1240s, as Paisley's nave was being completed, it is more than likely that the form of the arcading in the triforium there would have been similar to that at Glasgow. True to the Early English period, the bays of Paisley's nave would have been defined vertically by triple vaulting-shafts, and horizontally by string-courses. The triple vaulting-shafts would have risen from above the piers in the nave to roof level, as at Glasgow and Holyrood. The extant evidence at the west end proves this point [figs 14a-b & 15].

Indeed, if a direct comparison is made between these two westmost bays in Paisley's triforium with that in Glasgow's choir, or Holyrood's nave, it will be seen that at Glasgow there is a similar, but, completed campaign where the vaulting-shafts of the clerestories reach down to the galleries and finish with moulded corbels (rather than corbelled heads), which join with the string-courses [plate 30a & fig 13]. Also, at Glasgow, the abaci at triforium level are joined to the string-course; the remains at Paisley's south-west gallery appear to indicate that this would also have been the case there, just as the vaulting-shafts would have merged with the string-course at clerestory level. Also, there is no evidence at the west end to suggest that the vaulting-shafts would have reached down to the caps of the piers.

Therefore, in the reconstruction of the triforium and clerestory at Paisley the vaulting-shafts have been shown not to rise from the caps of the piers, as at Glasgow and Holyrood, but rather from the triforium level as at Hexham, and Glasgow's nave [plate 31]. Also, in reconstructing the upper storeys of the nave at Paisley, full use has been made of what evidence is extant in the

westmost bays, such that the form of the vaulting-shafts and string-courses have been copied from the originals as drawn on the *NATIONAL ART SURVEY* measured drawings.

Peter MacGregor Chalmers, restorer of the choir, argued that the triforium in Paisley's Early English nave would have been triple arcaded, perhaps like that at Elgin or the south transept at Pluscarden[92] [plate 32]. Although a triple arcaded triforium at Paisley cannot be ruled out, it is unlikely, since the archaeological evidence suggests a connection between Paisley's nave, completed around the 1240s, with Glasgow's choir[92], completed around the early 1270s.[93] So there cannot be a connection with either the triple arcading in Pluscarden's south transept, which is not earlier than the late thirteenth century, or the choir at Elgin, rebuilt after a disastrous fire in 1270.[94]

Above the triforium at Paisley would have been the clerestory [fig 15]. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to suggest the style of the previous clerestory. Perhaps, like the triforium, it could have been similar in style to that in the choir at Glasgow [fig 16] where the triple lancets are separated by jambs, moulded to suggest clustered shafts, and flanked by a narrow blind arcade, the hood-moulds joined over the triple windows. As noted earlier, similar arcading, moulded as though clustered shafts, is extant at Paisley's west end. In view of the fact that all of the forms used in Glasgow's clerestory can be found at Paisley, it is possible that Paisley's Early English clerestory may have resembled that at Glasgow. Thus it can be said that any comparison between Paisley's earlier nave and Glasgow's choir or Holyrood's nave, where the situation is similar, is not unrealistic.

Another aspect of the thirteenth century church, still extant, is the south aisle [plate 23a]. The mouldings of the capital and base of the eastmost respond, at the crossing, is also of this period, though differing in style slightly from those at the west end. The interiors of both south aisle doorways are plain segmental arched, the jambs decorated with simple concave chamfering, and quite typical of early thirteenth century work.[95] Unlike the three central bays of the aisle with deeply splayed window sills, to allow for the cloister, the splay of the windows above the doors is less marked. The aisle walls are raised high, so that the windows clear the cloister roof[96], and thus increase the light entering the church. This style of window was common in monastic churches.[97] All four bays were originally lit by triple lancets of thirteenth century date, similar to the three eastmost bays.

Between the aisle windows, triple Early English vaulting-shafts [fig 17], with moulded caps, bases and shaftrings, spring from stone benches.[98] The shaftrings merge with the string-course at the window splay, and like the west end the moulding of the capitals is carried on into the window reveals [plate 23c]. So it appears that the practice at Paisley, of continuing the mouldings of capitals into window jambs in a decorative manner, is a particular feature of the thirteenth century work in the nave. The concave chamfering is carried round the windows of the south aisle at Paisley as arch moulds. The fifth and sixth bays at Paisley south aisle were originally occupied by the west cloistral range.

On the exterior, four plain squared buttresses flank the triple windows of the south aisle, sloping gently upwards at window level towards the plain parapet, each buttress decorated with a gargoyle [plate 34] (similar to

those on the parapets of Glasgow's nave) [plate 35]. The plain undecorated parapet over the south aisle is supported by a simple Early English corbel table. Even though the south aisle parapet was restored in the time of Boog it follows the form of the original [99] [fig 17].

The cloister would have occupied the same position as the partly restored one does today, supported by the same type of corbelling. The Early English west cloister door [plate 36] contrasts with the Transitional east processional door. Instead of having free standing shafts, the jambs of the west cloister door are filled with dogtooth decoration, but the caps and bases, and the hoodmould with dripstones, are moulded as at the west front. The arch mouldings of two orders, of four and five roll mouldings, are also similar in style to those on the great western doorway. (The trefoil arch is a modern restoration.)

In the interior, the south aisle leads into the south transept. The form the south transept takes is unusual in a thirteenth century church, for it owes more to the Romanesque as at Cérisey-la-Fôret, Winchester and Ely, than the thirteenth century transepts at Dundrennan and Dryburgh [plate 37] where they are divided to accommodate chapels, As noted above, the form of the transepts at Cérisey [plate 38] has been suggested as a model for Paisley's first church, whose south transept [plate 39 resembles Cérisey plate 38], but not the abbey church of Bernay, which is considered the original source.[100] The buttress at Cérisey is semicircular, whereas at Paisley it is square and typical of Early English work. If the arcading at Paisley's south transept owes its existence to French sources, that does not explain the fact that the arcading is decidedly English in form.

The bases of the south transept arcading [plate 40a] are very similar to those in the Blackadder Aisle [plate 40b], the Lower Church [plate 40c] and in the piers of the ambulatory chapels [plate 40d] at Glasgow Cathedral, all executed in the thirteenth century. A comparison of the caps [fig 18a 1-2] and bases at Paisley, and those already noted at Glasgow [fig 18b 1-3], shows that even though they are not identical, the similarity is enough to suggest the same masons' shop, as well as showing that the arcading at Paisley is undoubtedly of the thirteenth century.[101] A similar base was extant at Lindores Abbey, Fife, in 1871.[102] Also, the barrel vaulted ribbed roof is problematical, for St Mirren's Aisle is often seen as being of the fifteenth century [103] [plates 41a & b].

Despite its Early English character, it is assumed that St Mirren's Aisle, and vault, were built in 1498, but there is evidence which suggests that the ribbing may have been added later.[104] There are precedents. The ribbed vault in the Blackadder Aisle of Glasgow Cathedral is a late addition[105], so perhaps the same could be said for Paisley. Also, the tracery in the east window of St Mirren's Aisle is very similar to that in the twin lights of the clerestory. The similarity in character between the wall shafts in St Mirren's Aisle and the mouldings in the clerestory at Paisley, also suggest being part of Abbot Tervas's building campaign. Therefore, this would explain the insertion of the vaulting-shafts and ribbing in the already existing St Mirren's Aisle.

In Paisley, the most likely explanation for an aisled south transept is a practical one, the need for a sacristy/library. The need for a sacristy near the High Altar was realised as early as the sixth century, at St John the Evangelist and San Vitale Ravenna [106]; and where the transepts had western aisles, as at Paisley, these

were very often utilised as sacristies. This was the situation at Peterborough, Ely, Winchester, and Cérisey.[107] The Cluniac houses of Wenlock, Castle Acre, Thetford and Crossraguel all had sacristies, at one time or another, in or near their south transepts. Also, at Worcester Cathedral [fig 19] there is an extension to the south transept for use as a sacristy, and divided like Paisley's.

The most likely explanation for the aisled south transept at Paisley is that it was built for use as a sacristy[108], firstly, it was near the High Altar, and secondly, because of the fact that the quantity of vestments, altar furniture and furnishings required for the medieval liturgy was considerable. If the number of vestments and other liturgical vessels and furnishings once held at Glasgow Cathedral[109], and the College chapel of St Salvator, St Andrews[110], are a fair indication of what was required to accommodate the needs of several priests, much storage space would have been necessary. Paisley Abbey, with most of its monastic community ordained priests, would probably have needed similar storage space for its altar vestments, missals and furnishings.(The measurements of extant Medieval cope chests certainly illustrate the need for much storage space in the more important medieval churches.)

With the possible building of a new sacristy in the fourteenth-fifteenth century, as part of the new choir, the old sacristy in the south transept could have been re-dedicated for use as a chapel. The re-use of the earlier sacristy as a chapel would have provided James Crawfurd of Kilwynet, a Burgess of Paisley, and his wife Elizabeth Galbraith, with the opportunity to have it refounded in 1499 as a chantry chapel, dedicated to Sts Mirren and Columba. Indeed, the charter states that the

new chapel was erected in the south side of the parochial church of Paisley at the altar of Saints Mirren and Columba. This suggests that the new chapel was founded at an already existing altar dedicated to the two saints, and that "*erected*" here means "*constituted*" rather than built.[111]

There is on the east wall of the Aisle a sculpted frieze depicting scenes from the life of St Mirren.[112] In one particular scene is to be found the west front of a church, but whether this represents the chapel of St Mirren, or even the abbey (which it vaguely resembles) is conjectural. Perhaps the evidence of this frieze encouraged past commentators on the abbey to claim that the reason for the building of St Mirren's Aisle was the founding of the new chapel.[113]

The building of an extra bay on to the east front of the south transept, and beyond the building line, was quite contrary to early medieval building practice[114], for it upset the symmetry of the original thirteenth century ground plan [fig B]. Also, the extant remnants of an earlier one illustrate that the present east window, with early Decorated tracery, forms part of a second building campaign. There is no evidence to suggest what form the earlier window took, or when it was built. In any case, as suggested, there would have been an altar in the sacristy, which was a common practice.[115]

The north aisle of the Early English church, apart from the two westmost bays, was replaced in the time of Abbot Lithgow, but the earlier interior would no doubt have been similar to the south aisle, even to the triple vaulting-shaft with shaftring which still rises between the second and third bays. The windows could have been filled with tall lancets similar to those in the aisles

at Dunblane Cathedral (which Rowand Anderson reconstructed 1892 x 1895). The exterior of the thirteenth century north aisle at Paisley would have been similar to the south aisle.

The north aisle door occupies the second bay from the west, but its interior is more enriched than those in the south aisle, for here the plain jambs are stepped to accommodate free standing nook-shafts (restored) with moulded caps and bases, in the style of the west front; above is a hoodmould, its prominent dripstones decorated with stars. The likely explanation for these decorative elements being added to the north porch door is simply because it was the "*public*" entrance to the abbey church, and so is in keeping with its importance.

The exterior of the north aisle entrance[116] [plate 42a], is Early English like the great west doorway, but it is grander than its neighbour to the south-east. The mouldings of the archway are stepped, and comprise five orders of deeply cut roll moulding. Unlike the great west doorway and the south-west cloister door, the capitals of the north porch door are decorated with fine stiff-leaf carving [plates 42b & c], and the roll and fillet mouldings of the jambs are cut deep to create the impression of shafts, the extremities decorated with dogtooth moulding. Similar excellent examples of stiff-leaf carving can be found at Lincoln Cathedral [plate 42d]. Although stiff-leaf is an undoubted English form[117], Scotland's Early English architecture differs little from that of its neighbours, so that much of the architecture of that period has English antecedents. Nevertheless, the stiff-leaf carving at Paisley was certainly of a very high quality.

But what is important about Paisley's stiff-leaf is that Glasgow has similar examples in the capitals of the piers of the choir [plates 43a & b]; and in the ambulatory chapels where the window jambs are decorated with dog-tooth, making them almost a model for the north aisle doorway at Paisley. Moreover, in the choir at Glasgow and also in the Lower Church, particularly in the capitals of the piers surrounding the site of Saint Kentigern's tomb, there is stiff-leaf carving, which is also similar in style to that of Paisley [plates 43c & d]. It is more than likely that the stiff-leaf work at both Paisley, and Glasgow Cathedral, is the work of the same masons' shop, and that the north aisle doorway at Paisley was probably built about the time of Glasgow's choir. In other words, a likely period for the Early English work at Paisley is the mid-thirteenth century, the period already suggested for the work at Glasgow.[118]

Unfortunately, due to some misfortune, the achievement at Paisley has been marred, for the foliage is severely damaged. Despite this, the stiff-leaf still adds more than a touch of grandeur to the north aisle doorway. Also, the fact that the stiff-leaf work can be compared favourably with that on the north choir aisle doorway of Lincoln Cathedral [plate 42d] shows the nature of the achievement, and it definitely suggests that masons (Scots or English) working in Scotland at that time, were more than capable of creating work of as high a quality as that found at Lincoln.

The north aisle would have led into the north transept. All that can be said about the north transept of the thirteenth century church is that it would have resembled that to the south, with two or even three chapels facing east, a typical English usage. There is

nothing to suggest that it would have been divided by arcading, as has been argued[119], like the south transept.

The evidence of remnants of what could be thirteenth century buttresses were photographed on the south wall of the medieval choir [see plate 72c], but it is hardly enough to conclude that an Early English choir was built to replace the Transitional one, though the suggestion is certainly there. However, it is not impossible to have had the Early English nave built on to the Transitional choir. Like most of its contemporaries, had Paisley had a thirteenth century choir, its east end would have been square, a typical English development[120], which allowed the use of large windows to let the maximum light into the presbytery. Arbroath exemplifies this concept at its east end [plate 44]. Like any choir and presbytery of the period, Paisley would have been furnished with choir stalls, funereal monuments, shrines, and a High Altar.

Nothing is known of the exact date of the building of the Early English church, though there is certain evidence which can help. The mouldings of the west front (and in particular the great west doorway), would indicate that it was probably completed in the mid, rather than the late 1200s. Indeed, as mentioned above, the arcading of the St Mirren's Aisle is very similar to that in the Blackadder Aisle of Glasgow Cathedral, which has been given a date of around the 1240s [121]; and the stiff-leaf carving on the north aisle doorway at Paisley, already discussed, is very similar to work at Glasgow which has been given a similar date.[122]

Any suggested date for the stiff-leaf carving at Paisley must also give us an approximate one for the completion of the abbey church. The north aisle entrance being near to the west end, and true to the medieval

tradition, it would have formed part of the final stages in the building of the abbey church, so this suggests that its completion must have been near. Also, there is a striking resemblance between the form of the exterior base courses at the west end of Paisley [plate 45a]. and those at the choir of Glasgow [plate 45b and fig 20], which also suggest a similar date. Indeed, if the date of the thirteenth century church can be shown to coincide with that of the completion of Glasgow's choir, Paisley Abbey would have been completed before Glasgow, for in accordance with the medieval building programmes the presbytery of larger churches was usually built first.[123] Indeed, Gourlay noted that it was Chalmers' opinion that the naves of Paisley and Glasgow were being built simultaneously, though he gave no reasons for this conjecture.[124] This is unlikely, considering that Glasgow's nave was not completed until the late thirteenth century.

Although the Early English nave at Paisley was completed, or nearing completion, by the 1240s, it has already been noted that the promotion of the monastery to an abbey had not yet been verified by Cluny. Cluny's intransigence had created many difficulties for the Paisley monks, and because these difficulties could only be resolved by Paisley's promotion to an abbacy, the Cistercians offered to take over the monastery and raise it to an abbey. Walter II, the Steward and protector of the monastery, was the major protagonist in the drama.[125] He was determined that Paisley should become an abbey according to the wishes of his grandfather. As a devotee of the Cistercians he would have been quite content for Paisley to break away from Cluny and become a Cistercian house. However, the monks of Paisley were not too happy about the prospect. In a letter to Cluny (undated)

Walter II is mentioned together with his desire to take Paisley out of the Cluniac family.[126]

Paisley's plight was also taken up by William, bishop of Glasgow. It has been argued that in 1245[127] while at the Council of Lyons, Bishop William, and other Scottish bishops, took up the matter of Paisley with Hugh VI de Courtenay, abbot of Cluny. In 1244 William III de Pontoise (1244-1257) was elected abbot, so it appears that the more likely date was 1241 when Hugh was still abbot.[128] The Scottish bishops expressed great dissatisfaction to Hugh with the fact that Humbold had not been completely honest, because he had failed to explain that he was not canonically empowered to accept the solemn vows of the Paisley monks on behalf of the Order of Cluny. Only Hugh, as abbot of Cluny, could do so, and this meant going to Cluny; so in effect up till then it is likely that the Paisley monks would have died without taking full solemn vows, unless they had undertaken the long journey to France.[129]

The Scottish bishops insisted that this was contrary to the intentions of the founder, who, rather than choose another Order had specifically chosen Cluny. The bishops' case was argued so well that Hugh consented to Paisley's promotion to abbatial status; but for the privilege of electing an abbot, Paisley had to pay two merks every year to the Cluniac house at Pontefract, in Yorkshire, on the feast of St Peter-in-Chains. Paisley was later to be accused of not having paid the two merks to Pontefract and Yves I de Poisson (1257-1275), William III's successor as abbot of Cluny, withdrew the privilege.[130] Once more the bishop of Glasgow came to the assistance of Paisley, and had the privilege restored. At last, Paisley had obtained abbatial status. Indeed, it was Walter Fitzalan's intention that the

important abbey he had founded should enjoy such status, not just in terms of income or in the style of its monastic buildings, but more importantly within the context of the Church in Scotland.

In 1238, Walter II gave further important gifts to Paisley Abbey, in particular the lands of the former house of the Gilbertine Canons at Dalmulin[131], which Walter II had founded.[132] When Walter II died in 1246 he was probably buried in the choir of the new Abbey of Paisley. He was succeeded by his son Alexander (1246-1282), who before going on pilgrimage in 1252 to the famous shrine of St James of Compostella, confirmed all the bequests that the Stewards had bestowed on Paisley up to that time.[133] In 1275 Paisley Abbey was valued at £2666[134], so there is little doubt as to the abbey's prosperity: Alexander the High Steward died in 1282 and was succeeded by his son James (1282-1309), who had been named after the family saint, St James of Compostella.

The untimely death of King Alexander III (1249-1286) on 12 March 1286, at Kinghorn in Fife resulted in probably the most calamitous period in Scottish history. Paisley suffered during the period immediately following the king's death in that there is hardly a gift recorded in the chartulary, apart from James the Steward's confirming of the gifts of his ancestors and adding a few of his own. This was a common occurrence in the thirteenth century, when there was a general falling off in all gifts to monasteries.[135] Indeed, the abbey received no land apart from what it bought or received as collateral for a loan of money during the period between the death of Alexander and the reign of Robert I.[136]

The abbot and monks of Paisley were loyal to the struggle for Independence, and it was at this time that

the dedication of Paisley Abbey to St Milburga was discreetly dropped from the abbey's charters.[137] Also, it is hardly surprising that Paisley supported the cause of Scottish Independence, when its protector James, the fifth High Steward, was great great grandson of the founder Walter. James was also a strong supporter of, and probable adviser to the king.

In 1300 the abbot, Walter perhaps, appealed to Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303) for protection against any form of attack during those troubled times. Boniface duly issued a Bull of Protection in 1301.[138] Despite this the abbey is said to have been completely destroyed by the English, who set fire to it in 1307. The chartulary is quite factual about the event: "Hoc in anno scilicet 1307, Anglici combusserunt monasterium de Pasleto"[139]. This statement does not clarify the extent of the damage, or if the choir was included in the damage, or who ordered the burning. There is no doubt that other monasteries, besides Paisley, suffered at this time from England's interference in Scottish affairs.[140]

Despite the lack of evidence, the destruction resulting from the fire of 1307 is seen as having been complete; an assumption still being made as recently as 1986[141], probably because, comparatively speaking, so little of the Early English church is still extant, and the fact that the present nave belongs to a later period. "Nothing but the blackened walls were left standing, and the monks had to carry on their services amid the ruins, if they attempted service in the church at all."[142] This is guess-work on the part of Lees, for there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that the church was totally destroyed, with nothing being left but blackened walls.[143] There does appear to be evidence of burning on the west walls of both transepts, but this does not

explain either the extent of the burning, or the damage to the abbey in 1307.

If the church, and monastic buildings were destroyed completely, then the Cluniac monks of Paisley would have had great difficulty in continuing to exist as a religious community, even though the unlikely argument has been made that the monks moved to Glasgow where they owned property.[144] Although Prior Roger may have bought a property in Glasgow's Rotten Row, it was hardly a suitable substitute for the monastery of Paisley. However, if enough of the church had survived for the monks to continue the *OPUS DEI*, the church could have been used until such times as rebuilding work for the abbot and community could take place. Indeed, the continued existence of the west front, south aisle and south transept suggests that the cloister and some of the monastic buildings surrounding it had not been totally destroyed.

In any case, the survival of the south aisle and west front, more or less dictated that when the eventual reconstruction of the abbey church was begun by Abbot John de Lithgow I (1384-1412)[145] it had to follow the interior plan of the Early English nave, with the piers occupying the position of the earlier ones [fig B].

This has also been the case at great churches like Chartres, where a fire about 1194 destroyed much of the structure of the building, but left the west front largely intact. There, the great west doorway, with attendant sculpture, is of the Romanesque period whereas the rebuilding at Chartres was subsequently carried out in the "new Gothic architecture." The remainder of this jewel of medieval ecclesiastical architecture illustrates the gradual development into what became the High Gothic

period in France. Of course, if the alternative view is correct, that Paisley was virtually destroyed[146], there is nothing to suggest that the west gable would not have stood by itself. The standing east gable of St Andrews and that of the south transept of Kilwinning are excellent examples. However, it is not possible to reach a judgement on whether the abbey suffered total destruction; a complete rebuilding ensuing, solely on the basis of a change in style, without substantiating documentary evidence. In this respect the case of Canterbury provides a documented example where the building programmes followed the basic ground plan of the earlier sections of the church, which for one reason or another, were replaced.[147]

Bishop Wishart of Glasgow had already absolved Robert I on 12 February 1306, for his part in the murder of the Red Comyn in the church of the Greyfriars at Dumfries.[148] Yet, in about 1311, in accordance with the terms of a deed issued by the Papal Penitentiary, Cardinal Berengarius, King Robert I may have gone to Paisley to receive the Papal absolution (perhaps from Abbot Walter [149]), on behalf of Pope Clement V (1305-1314).

James the Steward died in the following year, and he is presumed to have been buried in the ruined choir. His son Walter III (1309-1326) did not give much to the abbey in the way of benefactions, for it was a time of war. When Walter III, the Steward, married Princess Marjory, daughter of Robert I, he became a member of the Royal Family, and the birth of a son (and eventual heir to David II), made him the father of the Stewart dynasty. When Marjory died in 1316 Walter remarried, and raised a monument to his late wife in the choir at Paisley. Indeed, the effigy of a recumbent female, still extant in

the present abbey choir, is presumed to be that raised by Walter to his wife.[150]

There is much controversy among commentators in dating the rebuilding of Paisley Abbey, after the fire of 1307. Howell states that the rebuilding of the abbey began in 1317[151], possibly under Abbot Roger (1312-1321), on the grounds that Marjory was buried in the abbey in c.1316[152], but this is hardly evidence.

In 1318 the Steward bestowed the church of Largs with its lands and revenues on the abbey.[153] This would have been of great help, as the abbey insisted that it was suffering considerable financial constraint.[154] In the same year the Steward also bestowed the income of the chapel at Cumbrae, on Paisley, both revenues being given to alleviate the cost of rebuilding of the abbey.[155] These gifts were confirmed by Bishop John de Lindesay of Glasgow (1323-1325) (this was quite usual at that time.)[156] The fact that there is a difference of eighteen years between the burning of Paisley and the granting of the revenues of the churches of Largs and Cumbrae is not evidence of the condition of the fabric of the abbey church at that time.

Walter III, the Steward, died at Bathgate in 1327[157], and his heir Robert, grandson of Robert I, became heir apparent to the throne after Robert I's sons. Robert I died in 1329, and was succeeded by David II (1329-1371).

It has been suggested that during the short regency of Randolph[158] the situation looked more promising for a start being made on a restoration of the abbey church.[159] If this were the case, building work may again have been delayed until more peaceful times, namely after the

signing of the Treaty of Edinburgh on 13 March, 1328. It is presumed that subsequent warfare saw a suspension of work again; and that little work was done during the reign of David II.[160] It has been argued too that the rebuilding of the choir would have taken precedence over the nave[161], which would have been the case had the choir also been in a ruined state, although there is no evidence of this.

Despite what has been written regarding the rebuilding of the choir in the fourteenth century, there is little (if any) evidence to indicate what, if anything, was going on at that time. Unfortunately, there is no systematic account of building work in earlier texts, so there is little or no evidence to work on. Indeed, it is more than likely that no serious attempt was made to carry out the work until the accession of the Stewarts in 1371.

Since 1220 Paisley Abbey had conditionally enjoyed the privilege of electing its own abbot, as authorised by Pope Honorius III[162], with the abbot of Cluny, Hugh VI de Courtenay ratifying it in 1245. Nevertheless, the abbot of Paisley was still denied the dignity of wearing the mitre and ring. The abbot at that time (Walter perhaps), appealed to Pope Benedict XI (1303-1305)[163] for the right to do so. Although Benedict XI may have conditionally granted Walter the right to the wearing of the mitre and ring at this time, it was not ratified until 1395 at Avignon by Pope Benedict XIII (1394-1419).[164] Final approval to wear the mitre with episcopal vestments, as well as using the episcopal missal and giving the pontifical benediction, was not granted to Paisley Abbey until 18 June 1492, during the abbacy of George Schaw.[165]

CHAPTER 11
(PART 11)

The History And Architecture Of The Medieval Abbey Church From Its Rebuilding To The Reformation1371 - 1560

In 1371 King David II died without issue. His nephew, Robert the Steward, succeeded as Robert II (1371-1390) becoming the first of the Stewart line of kings. Thereafter, Paisley became virtually a royal foundation. Under this new regal patronage its prosperity resumed once again and continued until the Reformation in 1560. As has been suggested, the accession of King Robert meant that brighter days were in store for the abbey, for it was perhaps during his reign that a lengthy period of rebuilding at Paisley began.[1]

It appears that the major rebuilding of Paisley did not really take place until sometime after the election of John de Lithgow I as abbot in 1384. Since the burning of Paisley in 1307, seventy-seven years had passed, which is a considerable time, even in the Middle Ages, for any building to remain in disrepair. Besides, there is no evidence of any intermediate work having taken place in the nave. Although the structure may have been damaged by falling timbers, there may be another reason why the nave required a complete rebuild. If the silt, on which the north flank of the choir and crossing was originally built, continued along the building line of the north aisle, this could have resulted in inadequate foundations being laid, and hence made them insecure just like those of the choir and crossing. If the fire damage further destabilized the nave arcades, then the only practical solution could have been a complete rebuilding of the nave.

In the Middle Ages it was customary for any major church building work to be carried out in the then, "*modern*" style. In Scotland this was the situation until after the reign of Alexander III, when architecture in Scotland was beset with problems. Up till then English

architecture could be said to have played a crucial role in the development of Scottish architecture, and this is easily explained by the overwhelming influence of the Anglo-Normans in Scottish life. In the context of Paisley, the Fitzalans (or Stewarts) provide us with an excellent example of how well some Anglo-Norman knights succeeded in their search for power and influence in Scotland.[2]

With the death of Alexander III, and the attempts by the English to usurp the kingdom, it is hardly surprising that in Scotland, from then on, the course of architectural history did not develop as progressively as it did in England. The major result of the Wars of Independence was that England and the English became the hereditary enemy. Secondly, at the outset, while contact between Scottish and English masons may have continued, there may have come a time when English masons were unwelcome in Scotland. Thirdly, Scottish architecture suffered because the eventual departure of English masons meant that Scottish masons were denied personal contact with masons experienced in England's latest advances in architecture, especially, the Decorated and Perpendicular periods.

Fourthly (and most importantly), the long period of war created a crisis in architecture, for during that time comparatively few major ecclesiastical buildings arose in Scotland[3]; this is only to be expected. Indeed, work stopped at the Cathedrals of Glasgow and Elgin, and at Sweetheart Abbey, because the war effort took first place. This crisis did not have an immediate effect on Paisley, certainly not until after it was burnt by the English. Whatever its condition, Paisley appears to have remained so for many years, as would have some of its contemporaries.[4]

Unfortunately no documentary evidence has yet come to light referring to the reconstruction of Paisley. The reason why Paisley's nave was still built in the fashion of the late thirteenth early to fourteenth century is a mystery, for in England, it would have been definitely old fashioned. After all, English architecture had developed along its own lines to become the Perpendicular, which can be seen in the fenestration of the presbytery at Melrose, probably under construction at that time. Perhaps the use of the Decorated at Paisley was a measure of Central Scotland's isolation from the rest of the British Isles.

Thus, there is no way of knowing what the condition of the abbey church was when John de Lithgow I became abbot in 1385, apart from the portions of the Early English church, already discussed. The interior of the west end [fig 9a] is, more or less, as the abbot would have found it. He is credited with the restoration of the nave up to, but not including the triforium[5], and the north aisle, with its new porch and inscription supposedly referring to him. The work initiated by Lithgow I, makes a considerable contrast with the simplicity and austerity of the Early English work.

It is my contention that Lithgow planned the complete rebuilding of the nave including the triforium, clerestory and also a new roof. *THE NATIONAL ART SURVEY* supports this argument by suggesting that at his death, Lithgow I's rebuilding of the nave "had been carried up to the level of the clerestory."[6] The possibility that work stopped just at clerestory level may explain the statement, that Abbot de Tervas (1445-1459) built the nave from the "bricht stair" up. The bricht stair was perhaps the winding stair at the west end, which may be the only explanation for this term.[7] On the other hand,

"bricht stair" could perhaps be a mistaken transcription of the "bricht storey" or clerestory.

Lithgow's building campaign at the west end probably consisted of the addition of the intersecting tracery to the mullions of the triple windows; and a close observation of the windows suggests that the mullions appear to have retained their original form, so probably belong to the Early English front. In all likelihood, the later intersecting tracery was built to accommodate the existing window mullions [plate 46]. The argument that the mullions of the west front are original, is furthered by the fact that the interior is Early English. Moreover, the unusual heaviness of the intersecting tracery at Paisley (so unlike that at Elgin [fig 21], or even the tracery of the windows of the nearby St Mirren's Aisle), suggests that the master mason (whoever he was) had to accommodate his design for the Y tracery to suit the existing thirteenth century mullions.

These west windows at Paisley, with intersecting tracery, also resemble the great north window of the Chapel of the Nine Altars at Durham Cathedral, begun in 1242.[8] [plate 47] The Durham window is a single one of six lights, and set deep into the intersections of the Y tracery are cusped circles more delicate in form than at Paisley's west front. Yet, in the deep mouldings and in the proportion of the Paisley windows there is a close similarity, which may indicate English influence. Of course, intersecting, or Y tracery had been very popular in Britain since the thirteenth century, and has a long history.

Even though the Y tracery at Paisley's west front belongs stylistically to the late thirteenth century[9], it is a compromise between what was extant and a desire for

a new fashion or technique, when perhaps what was really required were new windows. Perhaps lack of funding in the time of Lithgow I was the real cause for the unusual compromise.

Six circlets, of varying sizes, and uncusped, are set into the intersecting tracery. The lack of cusping in the circlets in the west windows at Paisley is not in keeping with early medieval practice, as seen at Glasgow and Elgin. At the late fourteenth century choir of Temple Church, Lothian, the lack of cusping is seen as being typical of that epoch in Scotland[10], and so may explain the absence of cusping within the circlets at Paisley.

In the thirteenth century transepts at Glasgow Cathedral we may find the models which could have influenced the Paisley master mason. Here at Glasgow [plate 48] the western openings of the triforium consist of thick polygonal shafts divided to form Y tracery, with inserted circles as at Paisley. Despite their being cusped, the deeply inserted circlets resemble those at Paisley's west front windows, as does the shortness of the arms of the Y, which is probably more accidental than intentional.

When Lithgow's master mason set about drawing up plans for the rebuilding of the interior of the nave he was faced with having to accommodate his plans to the existing Early English west end and south aisle [11] [plate 49]. Thus, true to medieval building practices, his joining of the west front with the later work of the nave has not been well executed, and when compared with the overall architectural appearance of the nave itself, looks clumsy and unprofessional [see fig 27]. The reason for this is that the masons quite obviously cut back the thickness of the walls by one foot, on either side, at

the westmost bays so as to lighten the effect of the interior of the nave. By doing so they increased the width of the nave to 29 ft, which it is believed did not leave adequate space for a complete clerestory walk [12] [see plate 25].

Certainly, the joining of different building campaigns was not unusual in medieval times, and evidence shows that medieval masons often showed scant regard for previous work, building the new with little, if any, effort to integrate it with the old. At the east front of Notre Dame, Laon, there is evidence of an incomplete building programme. Obviously, the plan was to replace the original north rose window with one of a later design [13] [plate 50a; see also plate 50b where two bays at St-Remi, Reims, of differing elements stand side by side with no attempt at disguise]. At Westminster Abbey the joining between the thirteenth and fourteenth century work is also quite noticeable [plate 50c]. However, it must be emphasised that at Paisley Abbey we have a later nave added to the remnants of an earlier church, unlike so many, which often show different forms of architecture being used, as part of their evolving and continuing building history.

A change of plan in the course of construction of the new nave, or a mistake in the initial Early English setting-out, is indicated by the greater width of the eastmost bay of the nave arcades, so that it almost becomes a drop-arch. Above the ground floor level, in the setting-out of the triforium and clerestory, the builders have returned to an equal division in the arches of both upper floors, becoming gradually decentred from those below as they proceed from east to west [fig 11].

Once inside the nave, and past the earlier west front, it is obvious that Paisley, like those other great European churches, presents the observer with a dramatic vista of massive arcading rising to support the triforium. Above the triforium is a clerestory of clustered shafts flanking six pairs of twin lights, and from each cluster a vaulting-shaft rises to support the roof above. Instead of the usual continuous clerestory walk, the walk alternates between the wall passage and platforms which spring from the spandrels of the triforium [see plate 49].

The piers of the nave [fig 11] are seventeen feet high, and are Decorated in character, being moulded rather than clustered, with four segments to each side. The shafts of the nave piers are filleted at the extremities, and lozenge-shaped as at Exeter Cathedral. Exeter has been described as "undoubtedly the finest and most complete cathedral of the Decorated period in Britain" and built uniformly in that manner.[14]

The capitals of the piers comprise three mouldings, the upper two cut straight, whilst the third follows the outlines of the piers [plate 51a; compare that with plate 51b the south transept at Lincluden]. They contrast with the thirteenth century piers at the west end, where the mouldings of the capitals follow the contours of the piers, as at Glasgow's nave.[15] Yet, the capital of the north-west pier is in the earlier style of a moulded capital and so follows the contours of the pier. The bases of the piers (which are also similar in form to those in the south transept of Lincluden and in the interior of the first two chapels in the south aisle at Melrose), are divided into four deeply moulded segments per side. However, the base of the north-west pier is different from the others as fig 22i & ii illustrate.

Above the nave arcades, the triforium gallery [fig 23] consists of low segmental arches springing from squat lozenge-shaped piers, five feet high, of clustered shafts decorated with roll and fillet moulding, carried on into the gallery arcades of the triforium. The arcades are further divided into twin arches with cinquefoils, the spandrel being filled with an elongated quatrefoil. These twin arches are supported on intermediate lozenge-shaped shafts, and decorated with concave chamfering, to represent clustered shafts. The capitals and bases of the triforium consist of three mouldings, two cut straight, with the third following the contours of the piers [fig 24biii & iv], and so are similar in form to those in the fourteenth century arcading below [fig 24ai & ii].

The moulding of the arches of the triforium is also similar to those of the nave arcades, whilst that of the main and intermediate piers is similar to the vaulting-shafts in the north aisle. Thus, the archaeological evidence suggests that the triforium at Paisley was built with the nave as part of an overall plan, rather than, as has been suggested so often, built with the clerestory as part of Thomas de Tervas's fifteenth century building campaign.[16]

Indeed, the workmanship of the triforium is of a very high quality, the deep cusping of the cinquefoils being reminiscent of the triforium at Melrose Abbey [fig 25]. At Paisley these are slightly ogeed, a typical Decorated feature, as is the hollowed cusping which springs from the soffit.

In the triforium at Paisley, the form of the north-west and south-west bays immediately at the west end, are similar to the other bays of the triforium. They are narrower to take account of the thirteenth century

arcades below [figs 23 & 11]. In the north-west bay the workmanship is more awkward and not quite as professional, for the arcading springs directly from the wall rather than from colonettes, as it does at the south-west bay [plate 26].

The triforium at Paisley has often been compared with that at Dunkeld, because of the use of the semi-circular arcading divided by elongated trefoils into semi-arches. The three storeys at Dunkeld's nave are not quite as distinct as at Paisley (or earlier twelfth and thirteenth century churches), for the clerestory, which does not have a wall passage, sits immediately over the triforium. The obvious grandeur in the fine workmanship at Paisley is absent at Dunkeld [plate 52], which has no moulding, but only simple chamfering, the sole decoration being the rather elegant trefoil in the spandrels. Perhaps the only real connection between Paisley and Dunkeld is that they both make use of the round arch, which was re-used in Scotland in the fifteenth century. The re-introduction of the round arch, together with the round piers, as at Dunkeld and St Machar's Aberdeen, could simply signify a re-use of older forms. Yet they could also be a sign of north European influence, especially from the Low Countries, inspiring the development of a national Scottish Style.[17] The simple quality of Dunkeld's architecture may be a direct result of Dunkeld Cathedral being apparently less well endowed than Paisley Abbey.[18]

Although the two westmost bays of the north aisle are of the Early English church, the following four bays are a complete contrast in style, being of the Decorated period. As the interior of the north aisle shows [plate 53], it was obviously built along the lines of the south aisle with which it is symmetrical. As expected, the

triple vaulting-shafts defining the bays in the interior, are similar in style to the nearby Decorated nave piers even to the fillet decoration. Unlike those in the south aisle, they lack shaftrings joined by a string-course. Again, as in the south aisle, the vaulting-shafts spring from a stone bench.

As is common in large medieval churches, the aisles at Paisley are vaulted, but with sexpartite vaulting[19] which springs from the vaulting-shafts, window arches rising to complete the design. In England the use of the sexpartite vault had practically disappeared by the middle of the thirteenth century.[20] The reason for the sexpartite vaulting in the later north aisle at Paisley is simply because it had to follow the plan of the south aisle, still extant at the time of the fourteenth-fifteenth century rebuilding. The vaulting ribs in both aisles are made of plaster, as well as being identical, for the same mould was used during the eighteenth century restorations.[21] Indeed, two of the original Early English bosses are still extant in the south aisle.[22]

In the interior of the north aisle, the eastmost respond [fig 26i] is characteristic of Lithgow I's nave and crossing piers [figs 26ii & iii]. Indeed, the three segments of the north aisle respond are identical in circumference to those forming the piers of the nave, showing that they all belong to his building campaign, as do the capitals. The form of this north-east respond [plate 54a] is very similar in style to that at the south transept of Lincluden [plate 54b], though the circumferences of the segments are different from Paisley's.

If the exterior of the north aisle at Paisley is compared with that to the south, then the change in style

is very obvious. The four north aisle buttresses, which terminate with an acute angle to the roof line are stepped [plate 55], so are much more prominent than their pilaster-like southern counterparts. Although they correspond to the Decorated period they lack the niches and crocketed canopies which decorate the buttresses of the south transept at Melrose, and the choir of St Michael's, Linlithgow. The base course has only one moulding carried across the four bays [fig 27a].

The cornice over the four eastern bays is foliated, tablet flower decorating the bay next to the north porch, whilst the other three bays are decorated with vine leaves. The style of this foliation is similar to that in the cornices at Lincluden College and over the south aisle chapels at Melrose Abbey. The form the window mullions take at Paisley, Melrose and Lincluden are very similar [figs 28ai-iv], while the string-courses at Melrose and Paisley are virtually identical [fig 28bi-ii]; and also the mouldings of the buttresses at Paisley are very like those at Lincluden [figs 29i-ii].

The four windows of the north aisle [plate 56a] besides being taller than those in the south aisle, actually fill the bays, as though to house stained glass windows. (Unfortunately, no medieval glass remains, but the existing nineteenth and twentieth century glass gives the observer an impression of what the interior lighting might have been like in late medieval times.)[23] The north aisle windows have hoodmoulds, the two nearest the north porch have simple Decorated dripstones, while the hoodmould over the two eastmost windows merges with the buttresses.

The tracery of the north aisle windows, in keeping with the Decorated period, is a complete contrast to the

simple lancets of the south aisle. The two eastmost windows have tracery which appears to be more Flamboyant than Decorated, with deep cusping [plate 56b & c], while the two to the west are complete contrasts having plain intersecting tracery [plate 56a and fig 27b], with tracery and mullions moulded similarly to those at the west window in St Mirren's Aisle. As the rebuilding of the church in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century progressed from east to west, the change in tracery in the west windows may suggest an incomplete building programme, for all have the same style of sloped reveals whose circumference is the same (having measured them myself).

The Flamboyant tracery of the windows in the north aisle at Paisley [plates 56b & c], is similar in style to that in the windows at Lincluden College, and in the first two chapels from the east in the south aisle at Melrose Abbey. Also, all of these windows are built in the same fashion, even to the use of sloped reveals [plates 57a b & c]. As figure 28a [i-iv] illustrates, the similarity of the window mullions of all three churches (noted above), is more than just a coincidence, for if the curved reveal is the mark of a particular mason then by using it he is claiming authorship of this work.

At Lincluden and Melrose the style of the reveals change from the sloped to a more moulded form. Also, at Melrose there is a subtle change in the tracery, for it ceases to be quite as Flamboyant as in the first two chapels in the south aisle there. As there is no evidence to explain this sudden change in style at all three churches, perhaps Morrow, whom we shall see later played an important part in the late medieval reconstruction of Paisley Abbey, had died[24] or gone back to France.

The source[25] of these curved reveals is said to be the Ste Chapelle, Riom [plate 57d], or St Merry in Paris [plate 57e] and those at Paisley are certainly similar. There are also similarly built windows in the clerestory of the rebuilt nave at St Serge, Angers.[26] Another of this particular master mason's devices, in conjunction with the sloped reveal, as noted above, could be his use of foliation consisting of vine leaves and tablet flower.

The overall design of Lincluden has been attributed to John Morrow[27] so perhaps there is an even closer connection between Paisley and Morrow than was accepted in the past. His time of working at Lincluden roughly overlaps the rebuilding of Paisley's nave[28], so he may well have been the man who drew up the overall plan for Abbot John de Lithgow I. Indeed, the differences in the circumferences of the mouldings between Paisley and Lincluden could be explained simply by a change in template.

There has been much speculation about Morrow who is often regarded as a Frenchman[29], Scotsman, or a Franco-Scot. It has also been suggested that he was of the family of Maurier of Anjou, for the shield with three trefoils in the secondary inscription at Melrose bear the Arms of Le Seigneur de Maurier, but this is inconclusive.[30] Yet, all we know of him is that he was born in Paris[31], as his plaque in the south transept of Melrose Abbey so proudly proclaims [32] [plate 58 - restored].

In fifteenth century Europe, because of the French connection, it was not unusual for Scots to claim dual nationality with France, which is more or less what Abbot Thomas Morow meant when he claimed to be in the service of both the kings of France and Scotland.[33] There is

also an impressive list of Scots who held benefices in France, John Crannach, bishop of Brechin, for example, enjoyed the confidence of the kings of France and Scotland, namely Charles VII and James I.[34] Indeed, Abbot Morow had sought two or three French benefices for life (but not abbatial benefices) to the value of 2000 scudi[35]. Apparently, he sought these benefices to help defray the cost of repairing his abbey church, which he claimed was lately burnt by the English.[36] Perhaps what he meant was that he required extra funding to continue with the work of restoration begun by John de Lithgow I, for it is unlikely that Paisley was harmed further by the English in 1423, especially since both countries were now at peace.

The south transept at Melrose Abbey is that part of the building also attributed to John Morrow. His claim to having carried out "all mason work at Paisley" has often been misinterpreted in popular works as meaning that he was the architect of Paisley Abbey[37], but there is little doubt that the different architectural elements in the building demonstrate long periods of construction.

Nevertheless, the archaeological evidence suggests that Morrow probably carried out major work at Melrose (Abbey), Nithsdale (Lincluden College), and Paisley (Abbey); and from archaeological evidence to be found at these three churches, it is quite clear that the similarities are more than coincidental. It also shows that Morrow was aware of the current developments in ecclesiastical architecture in France and northern Europe, and especially in the Low Countries. Current architectural developments in northern Europe included the use of curvilinear triangles, squares, rectangles and also mouchettes [38] [figs 30a-33c].

Morrow used similar forms at Paisley, in the eastmost windows of the north aisle. The second window from the east [fig 30a] is wider than its neighbour, and is divided into two lights, the tracery above, comprising a curved triangle with curvilinear quatrefoils inserted into it. At Lincluden there is an almost identical window in the south wall of the Lady Chapel [fig 30b]. Archaeological evidence suggests that here the lights were divided again, to make four, so it is more than likely that the lights of the second window from the east at Paisley were likewise four in number. A print showing this particular window divided by tracery into four lights was published in 1805 by Verner and Hood, London [plate 59]. If this print is accurate, then the evidence suggests that any change in the window tracery of the eastmost window would have occurred after that date, for as the print illustrates the eastmost window is actually a doorway reached by stairs, affording access to the galleries in the interior of the church.

The eastmost window in the north aisle [plate 56b and fig 33a] is narrower, to account for the spiral stair at the crossing. It is divided into three lights (trefoliated), the middle one shorter, with two curved trefoliated triangles, the larger at the top of the window, with two mouchettes, one either side. This window is identical to the centre window in the south side of the choir at Lincluden [figs 33b-c], and also to that in the eastmost chapel in the south aisle at Melrose Abbey [plate 60b]. What is even more interesting is the use of the same window design at Paisley and Melrose in similar locations, for both windows are sited next to a turret stairway, as though specifically designed for that purpose. Thus, these three windows, despite their different locations, may have been erected

simultaneously, though it is not possible to determine which is the earliest, and which the latest.

The tracery of these windows at Paisley is roll moulded, as at Melrose [see plates 56b & 60], which is in keeping with the Decorated period in England[39], and the Flamboyant in France, especially in the tracery of La Grange Chapel at Amiens.[40] The prominence given to the use of the curvilinear forms as major elements in the tracery at Paisley, Melrose and Lincluden is more characteristic of French Flamboyant tracery than the flowing or Decorated tracery in England, as seen in Beverley Minster.[41]

Because of his use of Flamboyant forms, it is suggested that John Morrow, master mason, may have been taught at Antwerp[42], for he appears to have had an "apparent knowledge of Central Europe (Prague, for example)[43] as well as French Architecture."[44]

It was at Amiens, in La Grange Chapel between 1373 x 1375 that the use of traceried forms, accentuated by the use of roll moulding (present in Paisley's north aisle), were used for the first time as primary elements in window tracery, rather than just as background elements. Indeed, Morrow's knowledge of Flamboyant tracery could well be derived from first hand experience of (say) La Grange Chapel at Amiens [plate 61], where there is a motif of a circle enclosing three curvilinear triangles, identical to that in the second chapel from the east in the south aisle at Melrose [plate 62], where Morrow worked. Since the work at Amiens was completed by 1375, such a date is only a short step away from working at Paisley from c.1384.[45] The quality of workmanship at La Grange Chapel is of the highest order. We also know that Morrow's work at Paisley, Lincluden and Melrose shows

that his art was also of a very high quality, and that his contribution to Scottish medieval architecture is a very important one.

There are also examples of Flamboyant tracery at other places in Scotland, like Crichton Collegiate church, suggesting that this was all part of a general architectural movement in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century.[46]

If Morrow's inscription at Melrose is correct, then he must have had a very busy workshop. The similarities in tracery to be found at Paisley, Lincluden and Melrose explain what his plaque at Melrose suggests - a Morrow workshop. A parallel instance is the English Master Mason Henry Yevele.[47] John Morrow would have been in a similar position to Yevele travelling from Melrose (which his plaque confirms was his base), to wherever his services were required, whether advisory, or in simple building repairs, or in new work.

Had Morrow been the master mason who designed Lithgow's nave he would also have planned the building of the crossing piers, which play a fundamental role in the design of the nave of any large church. The crossing piers at Paisley consist of four segments to each side, with fillets to the outer shafts. The circumference of the segments of the crossing piers is identical to the other nave piers, showing that the nave and crossing piers all belong to Lithgow's building campaign [48] [fig 26i-iii]. There is, unfortunately, no indication of the style of the two eastmost piers, or the whereabouts of any remnants since the fall of the Hamilton's tower in the first half of the sixteenth century, though they probably stood where Rowand Anderson's restored piers stand today.

The crossing leads into the north transept [plate 63] which was also begun during Lithgow's term as abbot, as shown in the form of the buttresses, mouldings and base course which are all identical to those in the north aisle. Also, there is the evidence of masons' marks [fig 35] shared by both the north aisle and transept.[49]

The great north window [plate 64a], and west window [plate 65a] of the north transept would undoubtedly have been part of the overall design, as laid down in Lithgow I's time. The great north window has reveals, moulded as though clustered shafts. The arch mouldings of simple chamfered hollows rise from springers as though capitals - a form used at the great south transept window at Melrose. Indeed, the north transept window at Paisley (as restored by Salmon) is divided into two by a huge Y, the area between the two arms filled with quatrefoil tracery. The two halves formed by the Y are further divided into four lights, each quatrefoiled, the upper parts of the window filled with Decorated tracery, surmounted by a quatrefoil identical to those in the clerestory.

The roll moulded tracery of the great north transept window appears to owe much to the south transept window at Melrose [plate 64b] for it is more Decorated than Flamboyant, so lacks the flowing character of the tracery in the nearby north aisle windows. Since the roll moulded traceried windows of the north aisle were built during Lithgow's building campaign (and quite distinct from tracery anywhere else in the abbey), this also supports the argument that the north transept was begun in Lithgow's time.

The tracery in the west window of the north transept, also restored by Salmon [plate 65a] is similar in style to that of the two eastmost windows of the north

aisle, yet has its window arches rising from moulded springers as at the nearby north window. The tracery is not roll moulded but moulded in a fashion similar to later work in the abbey, and from my own close examination I found that Salmon used remnants of the original tracery as models [plate 65c]. Nevertheless, the curved reveal, and the method of building the west window are identical to those of the nearby north aisle windows [plate 65b and plate 57a]. This evidence suggests that the same mason who designed the west window of the north transept also designed the north aisle. The circumference of the curved reveal differs from those of the nearby north aisle windows, yet is identical with those in the south-east chapels at Melrose, and also at Lincluden.[50] As suggested earlier, the apparent difference in circumference is more likely to suggest a change in template rather than the master mason.

The rebuilding of the north transept by Rowand Anderson meant that its interior [plate 63] lost any extant evidence of its medieval aumbry [figs B and 75b], and any evidence of its liturgical setting which may have survived the fall of the tower. It was Anderson who inserted the two simple lancets in the east wall of the transept, based on extant archaeological evidence.

Contrary to medieval building practice, the transepts at Paisley only rise to clerestory level, and not to the full height of the nave and choir [fig 34]. The suggestion that the transepts were rebuilt in this fashion after the fire of 1498 is untenable[51], and if anything, the more likely explanation is French Cistercian influence, though there is no evidence to suggest that this is the case.[52] Moreover, as to its rebuilding in the fifteenth century under Tervas[53], or even much later under George Schaw[54], the evidence of its

mouldings shows that the north transept was certainly an integral part of Abbot John de Lithgow I's building campaign. The restored corner buttresses, surmounted by corbelled turrets, and gable are nineteenth century rebuilds [fig 34]. A similar turret sits over the south-east corner at St Mirren's Aisle, which suggests the same building period. Dunkeld Cathedral is also decorated with similar turret formations, which are not unlike the corbelled-out bartizans of contemporary castles.[55] Questions can be raised about just how complete the north transept was when Lithgow I died in 1412.

Abbot John de Lithgow I is believed to have governed the monastery well over a long period, which included the reigns of three kings, as well as witnessing the great Papal Schism.[56] With the passing of the good John de Lithgow, what is certain is that peace and tranquillity, as well as good government, were not enjoyed again by the monks of Paisley for many years to come. The troubles began with the election of a successor to Lithgow I, which (from the outset) proved to be anything but straightforward.

Papal documents record that Alan de Govan, a monk of Paisley, was elected by the community to succeed Abbot Lithgow I, but Benedict XIII at Avignon declared the election null and void because the monastery was reserved to Papal provision.[57] Yet, the chartulary records that William de Chisholm (who had been procurator to Abbot John de Lithgow I in 1388[58]) was elected abbot. In a charter of 1413 he is referred to as "the venerable father and lord, William de Chisholm by the grace of God abbot of Paisley,"[59] yet Lees has him being appointed Coadjutor by Lithgow I in 1414[60], but there is no mention of him in the chartulary after 1413. In a second letter from Avignon written on 10 December, Benedict suggested

that the bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow examine John de Lithgow sub-prior of Paisley, as to his suitability for promotion to the abbacy.[61] Although there is no evidence to prove it, it is more than likely that Lithgow II was related to his predecessor Abbot John de Lithgow I.

In the meantime, John de Lithgow II appears to have been elected by the monks of Crossraguel as abbot, and Roland, abbot of Crossraguel was elected by the monks of Paisley.[62] At Avignon, Benedict XIII must have decided to declare the elections null and void, for in December 1415, John de Lithgow II was promoted to the abbacy of Paisley, instead of Crossraguel.[63] The bishop of Dunblane (appointed judge in the matter by Pope Benedict[64]), appears to have presided over the transfer of John to Paisley and Roland to Crossraguel.[65] In the following January, Abbot John de Lithgow II appears to have received further approval, with his appointment as Papal chaplain to Benedict XIII at Avignon.[66] It appears that Lithgow II did take possession of the abbey, but for how long would be conjectural.[67]

The Great Schism lasted from 1378-1418, and with the submission of Scotland to the new Pope, Martin V (1417-1431), John de Lithgow II was confirmed as abbot of Paisley. It was a deliberate move by Pope Martin to rehabilitate the Scottish Church by

> "absolving, habilitating and restoring to their pristine state, all and sundry who had adhered to the schismatic Benedict XIII and who had obtained graces from him or by his authority; and renew any and all appointments which Benedict had provided."[68]

Despite John de Lithgow's rehabilitation and reappointment as abbot of Paisley, the letter dated 16

June 1419 also mentions one Thomas Morow, who was claiming the abbacy of Paisley.[69] According to Lees, this same Thomas Morwe, or Morow, had been appointed coadjutor to John de Lithgow I from 1418, and was still abbot in 1444.[70] This is not the case, for it is quite clear that John de Lithgow II was actually abbot of Paisley at this time. Therefore Lees, like most commentators on the abbey's history, took for granted that the inscription in the north porch referred to only one John de Lithgow.

Despite the claims of Thomas Morow to the abbacy of Paisley, John de Lithgow II appealed to Pope Martin V, obviously in an attempt to keep his abbacy from one whom he saw as a usurper. In his appeal to Pope Martin, Abbot John, and the convent of Paisley, accused Morow of being a public falsifier of seals of the Governor of the kingdom and the office of abbot of Paisley (King James I being in captivity at that time). They also accused Morow of being an apostate, but such accusations may refer to his attempts to govern the monastery on the strength of royal letters[71], as opposed to Papal approval.

Even though Lithgow was appointed abbot in October 1414 by the Avignon Pope Benedict XIII, it appears that Morow had letters of approval of appointment from Robert, abbot of Cluny.[72] What is ironic about Morow's appointment by the abbot of Cluny is that Cluny at that time (like all the French Cluniac houses), supported the Avignon Popes, so that Abbot Robert's appointment of Morow to Paisley does appear to contradict Benedict XIII's promotion of Lithgow II. King James I also sought confirmation of Morow's appointment as abbot of Paisley, perhaps because Morow was his procurator and first chaplain.

Pope Martin V was prepared to consider Thomas Morow's eligibility to be appointed abbot of Paisley, but before doing so he made one proviso for that approval. Thomas's provision to Paisley would have to have been confirmed before Scotland's declaration of obedience to himself. This was indeed the case, for Morow, who is said to have served in the great abbey of Cluny itself[73], was presented as abbot of Paisley by Abbot Robert on 10 March 1418[74], when Morow was at the Council of Constance as procurator for King James I.[75] The Three Estates - the Scottish Parliament - did not meet at Perth until October 1418, where they voted to render obedience to Pope Martin V.[76] Thus, during the Great Schism the Scottish Cluniac houses of Paisley and Crossraguel, like Cluny itself, had owed allegiance to Avignon, whereas Cluny had broken off relations with its English houses, which owed their allegiance to Rome.[77] Martin V finally confirmed and approved the provision of the monastery of Paisley to Thomas Morow by the abbot of Cluny.[78]

Indeed it should be pointed out that Cluny's approval of Morow's appointment to the abbacy of Paisley in 1419 was actually made during Pope Martin V's reign, and since Martin was considered the legitimate Pope, it could be construed that Morow's claim was more lawful than Lithgow II's, who (as noted) owed his abbacy to the schismatic Pope Benedict XIII. Therefore, Pope Martin may have found it more difficult to repudiate Morow's appointment, even though he had already rehabilitated John de Lithgow II in 1419, and re-appointed him abbot of Paisley. What may have made Thomas more acceptable to Martin V was the fact that he had worked for the reconciliation and re-unification of the Church at the Council of Constance[79]; and four years later in 1423 Morow is said to have been an outspoken critic of the abuses within the Church, at the Council of Siena.[80] At

the Council of Constance, he had worked hard to obtain James I's freedom; and he also had the election of Pope Martin published in Scotland.[81] As noted above, King James was actively supporting Morow's claim. Therefore, with such credentials it is hardly surprising that Thomas's appointment as abbot of Paisley was confirmed. (The complete lack of evidence of all of these appointments in the chartulary suggests that important evidence relating to Paisley Abbey's history is no longer extant, and at best, mislaid.[82])

Thomas Morow was now abbot, but there appears to be no mention at all of William de Chisholm. Lees suggests that Chisholm's "disappearance" was due to his being replaced as coadjutor because of a lack of discipline within the monastery[83], and worse still the breaking of the vow of poverty by the owning of property.[84] Lees also makes the point that contrary to the spirit of the common life Chisholm may have sanctioned the division of the dorter into separate chambers for the monks, as happened at Balmerino[85], but this practice was common at the beginning of the fourteenth century.[86] It appears that with regard to Chisholm, Lees misread the evidence, for similar allegations were made against Abbot Thomas Morow in 1444.[87]

These accusations ultimately led to Morow's resignation, but before this happened he had to face many problems. One which would not go away was his quarrel with the deposed abbot, John de Lithgow II. The continuing problems Morow was having with Lithgow suggest that not only was Lithgow angry and resentful, but he may have been the source of dissent within the convent. Perhaps Lithgow II, who was still being described as abbot in 1430[88], hoped that if he caused enough trouble he would be re-appointed to his rightful place. The

differences between Abbot Morow and the fractious monk continued until December 1432 when a compromise was finally reached. On the eighteenth day of that month, Pope Martin V provided John de Lithgow II, monk of Paisley, with the parish church of Dundonald, together with the manor and mains of Monkton for life until he had regained either the dignity of an abbacy, or an equivalent one, within the Order of Cluny.[89]

What appears to be certain is that Lithgow II was never restored to the dignity of an abbot, nor did he die on 20 January, 1433, the date inscribed on the east wall of the north porch. John de Lithgow II was alive on 3 April, 1445, and still causing problems for the abbot and convent of Paisley. The problem was that the financial arrangements made in December 1432 between John de Lithgow II and Abbot Morow, were apparently causing financial hardship to the abbey.[90]

This also suggests that Lithgow II would not have been in a position to choose the north porch as his burial place, so the inscription on the north wall cannot refer to him. Therefore, the inscription more than likely refers to the re-interment of Abbot John de Lithgow I (rather than his burial), but only when his north porch was completed. There is no doubt that a man was buried in this place, for during James Salmon's restoration male skeletal remains were found in a burial vault beneath the north porch.[91]

Thomas Morow continued as abbot until 1444, when he resigned.[92] In March 1441 he had been accused of neglecting the fabric of the monastery, and worse still, the spiritual life of his monks. He was also said to have sold, as well as mismanaged, the abbey's property.[93] There is every likelihood that the accusations that he

neglected the fabric of the buildings are correct, for the nave, begun in the time of John de Lithgow I, was still incomplete when Thomas de Tervas was appointed abbot.

Morow as abbot, and confidant of King James I, may have had other outside interests which were more important to him than managing a monastic community. Indeed, in the earliest years of his monastic career, as we have seen, he had already enjoyed preferment, and had acted as ambassador or procurator for King James I. 'In that time (as we have seen) he travelled abroad to the Council of Constance, in the king's service.[94]

One immediate result of his travels away from the monastery for long periods was that he was known to the curia.[95] This appears to have worked in his favour, for he had been promoted to Paisley in 1418, even though Paisley had an abbot in the person of John de Lithgow II. His imprudent remarks at the Council of Siena in 1423 are said not to have gone unnoticed[96], and as a result he said little at the Council of Basle in 1434.[97] His presence at these Councils means that he would have been absent from the convent of Paisley for prolonged periods, so the day-to-day management of the abbey would have been left in the hands of the cloistral prior, a common occurrence in those days.

Alan de Govan, whose election as abbot was never ratified, was appointed prior in 1415[98] and was followed in office by Andrew Stewart who, as an illegitimate son of one of the Stewarts, was of royal blood.[99] Whether either of these priors carried on with John de Lithgow I's building campaign is unknown, but the Stewart Arms, with a crozier placed behind the shield, are to be found on the west buttress of the north transept. This may

suggest that Prior Stewart was responsible for its completion. Contrary to what recently has been suggested[100], these are not the Arms of Abbot George Schaw, for his Arms, which once sat over the formal entrance into the cloister from the west range, which he probably had refurbished are now to be found decorating the westmost gable wall of The Place [plate 66]. Therefore, it is most unlikely that the north transept was completed in the time of George Schaw.[101] Andrew Stewart died in 1440[102], after being prior for twenty-nine years, by which time the transept could well have been completed.[103]

On Morow's resignation, Richard de Bothwell, sacristan of Dunfermline, was appointed abbot of Paisley, but the unfinished church, together with the rumours of problems within the monastic community itself[104] may account for Richard de Bothwell's hesitancy in accepting the abbacy. In any case, he is said to have doubted the validity of his election as abbot, because the statutes of Cluny were said to forbid the appointment of anyone to the abbacy of Paisley who was not of that Order.[105] Seven months later, Bothwell, who had retained his sacristanship of Dunfermline[106], was appointed its abbot. So it is unlikely that Bothwell would have accomplished much in his rather short term as abbot of Paisley.[107]

He obviously had a greater effect on Dunfermline for there he left a permanent monument, in the form of his new north porch of 1450[108]; and his reconstruction of the west gable, the north-west tower and the two adjoining bays in the nave and aisle.[109] Bothwell appears to have been an efficient administrator[110], and had he remained at Paisley, then he, rather than Tervas, might

have been the abbot who is remembered for completing the nave of the abbey church.

Robert Barber, monk of Paisley, was elected abbot after Richard de Bothwell was translated to Dunfermline. However, since Thomas Morow had resigned the monastery into the hands of the Pope, in favour of a third party, Robert Barber's promotion was rescinded.[111] As a consequence Barber appealed to the Pope to provide him with the office of cloistral prior, with all the rights enjoyed by his predecessor Andrew Stewart.[112] Barber was duly appointed Prior of Paisley and allowed to enjoy the income of the rectory of Kilbarchan.[113] He was eventually dismissed.[114]

In 1445 Thomas de Tervas or Tarves, who also had the advantage of having contacts at the Court of Pope Eugenius V (1431-1447), took advantage of the fact that the abbacy of Paisley was vacant, and by paying a considerable sum to the Papal Chamberlain procured it for himself.[115] He was a monk and procurator of the abbey of Arbroath, of the Order of Tiron, and appears to have taken his name from Tarves, a parish in Aberdeenshire held by that abbey.[116] Despite his indiscreet methods his appointment proved beneficial to the abbey for not only was he a spiritual man, but a practical one, and he proved himself to be an assiduous abbot. Thomas's appointment as abbot was a "God-send" for Paisley Abbey, for during the fourteen years of his abbacy, he made a real contribution to the rebuilding of the fabric of the church.[117]

The continuation of Paisley's building campaign by Tervas is thought to have began around 1445 and continued to 1459. Although Tervas has been credited with the building of the church from the nave arcading upwards, it

is unlikely that the builders could have accomplished the completion of the triforium, clerestory, roof and probably the turrets surmounting the west buttresses in such a short time. However, a more realistic building programme for Tervas to accomplish in that time would be the building of the clerestory and putting a roof on the nave, as well as completing the west gable window, and perhaps new western turrets. He was probably responsible for the building of the new east window in what was later to become St Mirren's Aisle, and began a new campaign of fenestration of the south aisle windows.[118]

In the interior of the church, the clerestory, built during Tervas's building campaign [fig 36] is divided like the nave below, into six bays with two sets of twin lights per bay. Each bay is formed by clustered shafts, fronted by a single vaulting shaft which supports the roof. The moulding of the caps of the westmost vaulting shafts is continued into the bays as in the Early English work. The clustered shafts all have moulded caps and bases in a style like the bell caps and bases of the thirteenth century work [fig 37], rather than the fourteenth-fifteenth century work in the nave and triforium below.

The twin lights in each bay are further divided by mullions into pairs with trefoliated heads surmounted by a quatrefoil, the deep cusping, being in the spirit of the triforium below. Although this form of cusping was not uncommon in Scotland at that time, it was out of tune with English developments where the Perpendicular was the *modern* style, which style emphasised a deeper clerestory. This English influence can be seen at the east end of Melrose; and also at the east end of the parish churches of Stirling and Linlithgow.

Windows similar to Paisley's clerestory can be seen in the nave at Melrose after 1385, and in the choir aisle of Haddington Collegiate Church where the design was still being used as late as 1462, though with different cusping. But the fact that they were still being used in Scotland in the fifteenth century may not imply a preference for old-fashioned style, rather, as noted earlier, the creation of a "*national style*" [119] using these older forms. The style of the clerestory windows at Paisley could be said to owe more to a triforium of the early Decorated period, as at Lincoln Cathedral [fig 38], than the fenestration of the later Decorated. Indeed, if the clerestory windows were of the same dimensions as the west gable window then they would be more in the spirit of the later Decorated period, as seen in the nave at Exeter [fig 39].

The twin lights are not in keeping with the later Decorated period when large expanses of windows for the display of stained glass were usual. The elements used in the clerestory at Paisley, contrast with those found in the nave at Glasgow, with which it has often been compared.[120] At Glasgow's nave, two sets of twin lights of simple Y tracery fill each bay of the clerestory, whilst in the choir, each bay of the clerestory is filled with triple lancets.

However, the existence of the Early English arcading in the westmost bays of the nave prevented the master mason from creating a clerestory of six twin windows, so again a compromise was reached. Since the westmost bays were too narrow to take a pair of windows, he had no alternative but to arrange the fenestration of these bays so that they would not upset the symmetry of the clerestory. Thus, the west-most bays are lit by two lights, one identical with the twin lights in the

clerestory, while the other one a smaller, narrower lancet and built up [fig 36]. There is no evidence to suggest that these single lancets were ever glazed, or that they originally formed part of the thirteenth century clerestory, though it cannot be ruled out.

The clerestory walk at Paisley [plate 67a] is certainly unique among contemporary British churches, for it consists of the customary wall passage which alternates with platforms supported by two ranges of receding blocked corbels. These corbels spring from the spandrels of the triforium arcading. Gourlay's suggestions have already been noted[122], but others assume that the purpose of the projecting platforms was to prevent a weakening of the walls of the building, which it is deduced, would have happened had the clerestory walk been built(as was usual in a large three-storey church) into the thickness of the walls. (It was Sir John Stirling Maxwell who wrote that the corbels were said to have been an after-thought.[123]) This is unlikely, because there is no evidence to suggest that the wall of the clerestory behind each platform had previously been breached.[124] Again like the turrets on the north transept, the corbelling is like that which supports a bartizan on a castle wall, or castellated house.

Despite the uniqueness in Scotland of Paisley's clerestory, it is invariably criticised as being clumsy. Certainly, its platforms do not resemble the aisle passages at Rouen [plate 67b] with which they are often compared. At Rouen, the projecting gallery is carried round the press of the nave on the side next to the aisle, supported on shafts springing from corbels, with a light stone parapet resting on it.[124] The shafts spring from the nave arcades to support the plates above, and their openness gives the nave walks a lightness which

those at Paisley lack [plate 67c]. It has also been compared with that at St Serge, Angers[125], but here [plate 67d] it is more of a projecting platform than a clerestory walk which also penetrates the nave piers, fronted by a railing, and supported by blind arcading. St Maurice, Angers, which has a similar gallery to that at St Serge is also claimed to be related to Paisley.[126]

Even though such comparisons can be made, there is really no similarity between the galleries at Paisley and those at St Serge and St Maurice. Even though Paisley's projecting galleries alternate instead of being continuous, they are certainly not English forms, but are more likely to be found in France and the Low Countries.[127] Therefore, there is a strong possibility that the clerestory galleries in the nave at Paisley could be an adaption of some French or north European source.[128] Indeed, at St Pantaleon, Troyes, the galleries in the nave and choir have continuous projecting galleries, fronted by railings, which actually skirt the piers of the nave.[129]

Another unique aspect of Paisley Abbey is the total lack of evidence of there ever having been any stairs at the junction of the transepts and clerestory, to provide access to the upper storeys, common in almost every large medieval church. Since it appears that Paisley's choir in its present form was always aisleless, it would never have needed access to the upper storey, but it was usual to have access to the upper reaches of the transepts. The fact that the transepts are much lower than is customary, would have made it difficult to build access passages from both the triforium and clerestory in the transept. The two turret stairs at the west end still provide access to the triforium and clerestory, and even though there is a turret stair extant in the north aisle, there

is now no evidence to suggest that this afforded access to the triforium. (This turret was restored during Salmon's restoration and afterwards used as a belfry.)

On the exterior [plate 68a], the plain parapets above the north and south clerestories are identical, since they both belong to the building campaign of Thomas de Tervas. Again, like their counterparts over the north and south aisles below, they are supported by a simple corbel table. Below these corbels are thirteen gargoyles which are human or animal in form. Damaged gargoyles on the south clerestory were recently replaced, some of which are more traditional in appearance, while others are more modern, for one is obviously a Devil in the form of an Alien! [plate 68b].

Undoubtedly, the work on the clerestory would have taken a long time, so the building of the west gable could have been progressing simultaneously with that of the clerestory. The present large window (14ft x 9ft) [plate 69a] dominates the west front, and no doubt replaced the earlier thirteenth century fenestration. The window is broader than its height, so in proportion it is very typical of the later Decorated period.

Flamboyant tracery fills the upper half of the west gable window at Paisley [plate 69b] whilst the lower half is divided into five lights with trefoil cusping, the central light slightly smaller. It has been argued that it is the work of Abbot Thomas de Tervas.[130] The archaeological evidence of the window itself suggests otherwise, for its style has more in common with that accomplished during the building campaign of Lithgow I, particularly in the triforium and at the north aisle windows. In the first instance, the reveals on the exterior of the west gable window are curved like those

in the north aisle and not stepped like the clerestory windows, or those in the south aisle, both of which are recognised as the work of Tervas.

Secondly, the tracery of the west gable window is roll moulded like the two eastmost windows, whilst the tracery itself is also unlike anything done in the time of Tervas; and thirdly, the tracery consists of two large circles of intertwined mouchettes, with two smaller mouchettes above [plate 69c]. Not only is the cusping of the tracery deep [plate 69d] (in the spirit of the north aisle windows) but it is also reminiscent of that on the triforium gallery in the nave; and fourthly, the west gable window is built in a similar fashion to those in the north aisle, though the sloped reveal is not quite as deep. (I have measured and examined it) [plate 69e], Irrespective of when it was actually built or who built it, the tracery is similar to contemporary tracery from the Low Countries [plate 69f], which again shows northern European influence in the tracery at Paisley.[131] Nevertheless, to describe the west gable window as the work of Tervas, is to ignore the evidence.

Although the tracery of the west gable window at Paisley is not seen as being the work of John Morrow[132] the fact that it is in a fashion very similar to the windows in the north aisle, suggests that here the work of Morrow may have been continued by either a pupil or a colleague. Therefore, contrary to previous opinion, there is every chance that the work of replacing the thirteenth century fenestration in the west gable was initiated during the abbacy of John de Lithgow I.

In the apex of the west gable, is a quatrefoil light which replaced the simple Early English one. Its deep cusping would suggest that it was built at the same

time as the west gable window below. The completed west gable would have been surmounted by a finial cross which probably replaced one in an Early English Style. The finial cross still decorated the apex of the gable for almost one hundred years after the Reformation until we read that as late as

> "May 1st, 1645, the presbytery ordered the finial crosses on the church to be taken down and on the fifteenth day of the month, the ministers, Messrs. Calvert and Dunlop, reported that they were down."[133] The stump, however, is still extant.

There is no doubt that the nave was completed during Abbot Thomas de Tervas's building campaign because he "put on the ruff" of the abbey kirk "and theekit it with sclats".[134] Thus, the nave as finally completed was fitting tribute to his zeal and inspiration. Moreover, as well as finishing the roof he "built a great portion of the steeple, and also the gate-house, which was of a stately character."[135]

It has been argued by some commentators (quite contrary to the evidence), that the roof of Paisley's nave was vaulted.[136] If by this is meant the Early English nave, there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that Paisley Abbey in the thirteenth century had a stone vault. The evidence of the vaulting shafts in Tervas's clerestory suggests that his fifteenth century ceiling was of wood, and perhaps barrel vaulted. The choir roof would also have been of wood.[137] In the choir at Glasgow, the timber barrel vaulted roof though largely modern, follows the style of the original early sixteenth century one and makes use of the late medieval ribs and bosses.[138] St Machar's in Aberdeen also has a fine wooden roof built 1520 x 1530 by James Winter of Angus[139], though much renewed. Therefore, it is more than likely that Paisley would have had a nave roof

similar to that either in St Machar's nave or Glasgow's choir.[140] Unfortunately, there is no record of the appearance of the roof before the plaster roof was put up.

The nave at Paisley, begun by Lithgow I, and finally completed by Tervas, is regarded as conforming to the English Decorated period. There are certainly elements of the later Decorated period to be found in the nave at Paisley. The mouldings of the piers and corresponding mouldings in the triforium all conform in some way to the later Decorated period. The deep cinquefoil cusping in the triforium is very notable, as are the profiles of the mouldings in the north aisle and transept, and the almost drop-arches of the aisle arcades and triforium above, again are all in the spirit of the English Decorated. However, as noted earlier, the clerestory is more in keeping with the early Decorated period, illustrating that the architecture of Paisley is certainly not chronological. All or most of these forms are visible in the choir bays at Ely [fig 40a], which provides a good comparison with Paisley [fig 40b]. On the exterior, the use of tablet flower, and other foliated devices, which decorate the cornice over the north aisle, are also typical of the Decorated period in England.[141] But, as noted earlier, the only Paisley window which conforms to the Decorated period in size is that in the west gable.

Although the forms and elements of Paisley's triforium are said to be in the Decorated Style it is unlike that in England (as typified by Exeter) where the triforium lost its use and became a mere blind arcade [fig 39], or is omitted altogether; while the clerestory increased in size and importance for the exhibition of painted glass and elaborate tracery. Paisley nave is therefore very "old fashioned" for the fourteenth-

fifteenth centuries and, as noted above, may be seen as being the first major Scottish church to be built in a "*national style*".[142]

Thus, at Paisley we have a three storeys high late medieval nave (when no others were being built) Decorated in form, and designed for a timber ceiling. This type of three storey church design was very popular in Scotland. We find it at most Scottish abbeys, with perhaps the exceptions being Holyrood and Melrose, which had vaulted roofs. Even though great emphasis is laid on the triforium gallery below, the polygonal platforms, which form part of the clerestory walk, jut out three and a half feet and fill the spandrels between the triforium arcades. Although it has been suggested that the platforms were intended to have balustrades, there is no evidence in the clerestorey to suggest that this was the case.[143] The presence of these platforms distracts the observer's attention away from the masons' wonderful achievement in the triforium gallery, for at Paisley attention and emphasis is laid on the gallery, whilst the clerestory above consists of two small windows per bay which, because of their size, would probably be considered unsuitable for painted glass.

There is no documentary evidence which proves that Paisley Abbey church was ever completed, never mind being completely rebuilt by the late fifteenth century (apart from the tower and spire). With the completion of the nave by Tervas it is likely that the abbey church of Paisley was complete [fig A: conjectural reconstruction of Paisley Abbey]. Abbot Thomas de Tervas may have been responsible for the changes in the east window of St Mirren's Aisle [plate 70] for, as recorded by the *NATIONAL ART SURVEY*, it is identical with that in the clerestory [fig 36]. Archaeological evidence on the

outside window sill suggests this east window, with its early Decorated tracery, replaced an earlier one. It has also been argued that the curvilinear window in the fourth bay of the south aisle [plate 71] formed part of Abbot Thomas de Tervas's building campaign of c.1445-1459[144], and may represent the first stage in a refenestration programme to replace the triple lancets with more "modern" windows, a common practice in the later Middle Ages. The elongated quatrefoils[145] are reminiscent of those of the great window in the north transept.

Today the crossing between the nave, choir and transepts may well follow that built in the thirteenth century. At forty feet square, it is bigger than Glasgow's. Lithgow I's two western crossing piers were largely rebuilt as part of Rowand Anderson's[146] restoration work in the 1890s, much of the original stonework being replaced in the process.

There is no real evidence to suggest when and how the second choir was built, but it is known that Robert II, who died in 1390, took an interest in the abbey and its rebuilding, for in 1387 he managed to obtain permission from Pope Clement VII at Avignon, for Paisley to continue receiving the revenues of the church at Largs. If this Bull[147] is a confirmation of the various charters granting Largs to the abbey of Paisley, then it is likely to confirm that the income from Largs was to defray the cost of rebuilding the conventual church.[148] In addition, Robert II had given a gift of £30 Scots in 1389 towards glazing the abbey[149], so building work of some kind was still going on even though there is no indication which part of the abbey the glass was meant for. However, it has been suggested that the glass could have been for a new choir.[150]

When Robert II died in 1390, he was buried at Scone rather than at Paisley. It is suggested that this was because the choir was still being built[151], though this rebuilding could have been just a remodelling and that the glass was for new windows, perhaps like Dunblane. Robert II may have been buried at Scone, yet his first wife and his Queen are said to have been buried in the choir at Paisley.[152] Whatever the reason, Robert II chose to be buried at Scone, whether the choir of Paisley was roofed or not. Robert III (1390-1406) made provision for his last resting place in the choir[153], so during his reign, work was either proceeding or completed. He died in 1406, and was the last Stewart buried in the abbey church.[154] Eighteen years later, his son, James I, gave eighteen shillings to the abbot of Paisley in payment for the obsequies of his father.[155]

The only evidence we have of the medieval choir are the four walls. They stood about nine feet high, and lay desolate for 350 years [plate 72a], though there are some clues which do help the observer to reach some understanding of the mystery.

Dunblane, though restored [plate 72b], is an excellent example of an aisleless medieval choir, and is a reasonable model for the medieval choir at Paisley. On the other hand, the ruined aisleless choir at Bolton Priory, Yorkshire, with its tall single (traceried) windows, and great east window, supported by huge buttresses, may present the observer with a more authentic image of the dignity and beauty of a ruined monastic choir. (The form of the choir at Dunblane could have influenced MacGregor Chalmers, as it did Rowand Anderson, when he prepared the drawings for the choir at Paisley.) The windows of the late medieval choir would have been built in a similar manner to Chalmers',

supported by buttresses, but thinner than the modern examples. A fragment of a window mullion was found which, according to Gourlay, came from the choir. He sketched this artefact at the time [156] [fig 41]. It was roll moulded and in form compares favourably with the mullions in the eastmost windows of the north aisle [see figs 28i-iv]. If this artefact belonged to the choir, it suggests that the tracery of the choir windows may have been rolled moulded like those in the nearby north aisle, and perhaps replaced the Early English ones, if the choir was of that period. Indeed, among the moulded stones in the rebuilt cloister is part of a window sill, complete with springers for moulded tracery (see photograph appendix i - photos 77a & b).

The absence of most of the former buttresses of the choir is probably explained by their having been clawed off the walls. An old photograph of the south wall of the choir [plate 72c] shows that the form the buttresses took was like those of the thirteenth century, for they do not compare with the fourteenth century stepped buttresses of the north aisle. Gourlay claimed in 1913 that not only was there evidence of an original buttress, but there were traces of where its neighbours had been clawed off the wall.[157] This deduction is supported by the further evidence of the string courses and base course broken at identical places along the south wall of the choir. The string courses would have become part of the buttresses, just as the base course would have become the base course of each buttress. In any case, it would have been easier to dismantle a buttress for reworkable stone than a wall.

There is no doubt that this did happen occasionally, for at Tintern Abbey, Gwent, the south aisle buttresses, where accessible, were removed for the ashlar. The

removal of ashlar quoins also occurred at Glenluce Abbey, Galloway.[158] A similar situation may also exist at Restennet Priory, Tayside, for the buttresses there are no longer extant.

With the probable completion of the nave [figs A & B] in the time of Tervas, the abbot set about furnishing the choir and presbytery with dignity and beauty in the form of the "staitliest tabernackle" in Scotland, and "staitlie stallis for his twenty-five monks".[159] Had Tervas's new stalls resembled those excellent Flemish examples[160], still extant in Dunblane Cathedral [plate 73a & b], they would have been stately indeed. Tervas was not the only abbot who replaced the choir stalls in his abbey church. At Melrose in 1441, new stalls were brought over from the Low Countries carved by Cornelius de Aeltre of Bruges.[161]

Although the new stalls at Paisley could have been situated where the present stalls are today, they are more than likely to have stood behind the pulpitum at the crossing, the more traditional site [fig B; see also reconstruction of St Andrews Cathedral fig 42]. Like St Andrews, the choir at Paisley would have housed the presbytery with the High Altar, and also relics would have been displayed, on side altars perhaps, or in a shrine, like that of St Kentigern at nearby Glasgow, remnants of which are still extant. Indeed, on 25 July 1506, during the abbacy of George Schaw, King James IV made an offering of twenty-four shillings to the relics in Paisley.[162]

Also, considering the number of members of the family of the founder who must have died since Paisley's founding in 1163 there is every likelihood that tombs of the High Stewards (who eventually became kings), would

have been found in the choir too. It is known that there was the tomb of Marjory Bruce, daughter of Robert I; and Robert III also had his tomb before the High Altar, but there is no evidence of their form. It was also customary to have abbots' tombs in the choir [see figs B & 42].

There certainly were richly decorated Royal tombs in Scotland, as is known from the archaeological fragments found of those raised to William the Lion, Robert I (built from French alabaster), and James III and his Queen, once adorned with a brass plate fashioned by Pierre Bleu de Tournai.[163] The tombs in Paisley choir were probably free standing, for there was no archaeological evidence of such on the choir walls.

Tervas also provided "mony god buks"[164], some of which were probably missals for the Mass, and perhaps choir books for his monks to perform the *Opus Dei*, as well as vestments of silk and cloth of gold.[165]

Tervas's tabernacle could have been either a retable or reredos filled with painted or sculpted figures [plate 74a & b], or a silver receptacle over the altar for the safe keeping of the Consecrated Host [plate 74c]. Indeed, a stone fragment of sculpted tabernacle work [plate 75] (now in the restored cloister), could be part of the architectural framework of a reredos, or an altar. There is also a fragment of a statue in the cloister [see photo appendix i, photos 11 and 5], and a remnant of figures from a Crucifixion and an Entombment [plate 76] is kept in the restored sacristy. Even though these fragments have been dated as belonging to the time of Abbot George Schaw (1478-1498)[166], they do give the observer an impression of the religious art once extant in Paisley Abbey.

Even though Paisley's late medieval choir may have had a waggon roof, perhaps similar to the restored waggon roof in the choir at Glasgow, the painted waggon roof at Carlisle Cathedral gives the observer a good impression of the style of colouring used in medieval churches [plate 77]. Yet the waggon roof in the choir at Glasgow has an excellent display of carved bosses. Similar bosses may well have decorated the roof of Paisley's late medieval choir [plate 25].

Gourlay suggested that the choir would have had a level floor with no steps[167] which may have been the case, but it is more than likely that there would have been steps up at the western entrance to the choir from the crossing. Also, the High Altar would probably have had steps up to it, as was the custom, and may have been surrounded on three sides by heavy curtains [plate 74c]. The steps would more than likely have been covered with coloured glazed tiles, as at Byland Abbey in Yorkshire which has one of the finest displays of such tiles still extant and in situ.[168]

The sedilia [plates 78a & b; see fig 43a & b, restored] are still extant, though badly damaged, and sit near the site of the High Altar. The sedilia sit unusually high above floor level probably because the present choir is at a lower level than that in the time of Tervas. Contrary to custom, the sedilia at Paisley is divided into four compartments of blind arcading, for four seats. There are also four seats at Crossraguel, but at Paisley the eastmost compartment may have been used latterly as a credence table, as shown by the slots for the shelves cut into the blind arcading. The quatrefoil tracery is deeply cusped. They do resemble the sedilia at St Monan's, Fife, but here the mason is also unknown.

To the south of the choir is the modern sacristy, making use of what had been the original doorway[169] [plate 77c]. Apart from the doorway there is a lack of evidence of any foundations for the sacristy, for none was ever found apart from the stumps of bond stones of two walls, or perhaps of two buttresses.[170] Late sacristies are common in Scotland and England; Arbroath has a rather interesting two storey example, as does Pluscarden [restored], so Paisley having a new sacristy towards the end of the middle ages would not have been exceptional.

It was customary in large medieval churches for a tower to rise above the crossing. According to the Auchinleck Chronicle, Thomas de Tervas began the building of a tower [171], which had obviously been planned by Abbot John de Lithgow, as shown by the arch supports which spring from the responds at the ends of both nave aisles. Indeed, the huge crossing piers could only have been intended for a central tower. Tervas's tower is said to have collapsed before completion[172] but there appears to be no evidence for this, though it is possible that the fall of Hamilton's tower is being misinterpreted as that of Tervas.[173]

Before Thomas de Tervas died, Pius II (1458-1464) decreed that at the abbot's death the disposition of the office and all revenues of the abbey should fall to himself. When Abbot Thomas finally died on 29 June 1459[174] Henry Crichton, another Dunfermline monk, was appointed abbot commendator by the Pope, and 300 florins were assigned to Cardinal Pietro Barlo of Venice to be paid by Henry and his successors on the feast of John the Baptist; failure to do so would ultimately lead to excommunication.[175] When Pius died in 1464, his successor

Paul II (1464-1471), deposed Abbot Crichton because of his failure to comply with the terms of his commendatorship. Crichton was reduced to the status of a choir monk of Paisley, and the abbacy declared vacant. Rome then claimed all the revenues of Paisley, and Patrick, bishop of St Andrews, was appointed commendator, but over three years there is little news of him - not even the granting of a charter. Henry Crichton, despite his being out of favour at Rome, was able to make peace with the Papal Court of Paul II. On the 27 February 1469, Crichton was subsequently raised to the full dignity of the abbacy of Paisley.

As abbot he is regarded as having been an energetic ruler.[176] It was Crichton who commissioned Thomas Hector, sculptor[177], to hold himself ready and be prepared to carry out the artistic commissions of the abbot for the convent of Paisley.[178] Part of the conditions of the contract were that as a tenant of the abbey, Hector lived at Nether Crossflat for twenty shillings per annum; and that he would not undertake other work without Abbot Henry's permission. Because of this it has been assumed that Hector sculpted the figured corbels, which support the projecting platforms of the clerestory walk. However, this assumption is unlikely for the following reasons.

These figures have been dated as being of the second quarter of the fifteenth century[179], and since Thomas became a tenant of the abbey in 1460[180] it is unlikely that he was the sculptor. Assuming that the dating of these sculptures is correct, it is more than likely that they were carved during the abbacy of Thomas Morow. If Hector did produce art work for abbot Crichton it must have been something other than the corbel figures of the nave, and had he been a mason too, then he may have been a local master.

These sculptured figures which form the springer corbels are not without artistic merit, but they are somewhat overwhelmed by the massive stone corbels which they support, despite the fact that the figures are arranged such that they appear to support the corbelled platforms on their backs.[181] As has been observed, the set is interesting on account of the costumes depicted, the variety of subjects portrayed, and the strength and quality of the work.

Of the five on the south wall from east to west, we view an ape-like creature with large ears, and a man with hairy legs and hair down the spine [plate 79a]; a human body with legs tucked up and cloak spreading round the body; a large-eared bat; a bearded figure of a man; a young man habited in the short, kilted tunic and wearing a voluminous gugel or chaperon-hood of early fifteenth century character. On the opposite wall, from the east are a bearded man laughing and holding his sides; a gowned man; a dog chewing a bone [plate 79b]; and a lion engaged in like manner.[182]

These are not the only sculptures in the nave at Paisley. The vaulting shafts on sculptured heads [see plate 28] at the west end, have already been mentioned. These sculptured heads are fine examples, and very typical of Early English work. The use of sculptured heads as springers for nave vaulting shafts was common in England at the close of the twelfth century, and numerous equally fine examples of corbel-type heads can be cited as belonging to the first half of the thirteenth century in Scotland.[183] The best and the earliest (of about 1155) can be seen at the Cathedral of St Magnus in Orkney[184], where the corbel-heads support the vaulting shafts in the choir.[185] At Paisley the corbelled heads may well have been just two of a whole series in the nave supporting

vaulting shafts, not just as decoration for the nave but as supports for the roof above.

There are also five small heads which are used as decorative devices in the Early English responds of the south aisle, and west end[186]; and the Cathcart Coat-of-Arms on the central pier on the south side of the nave. On the exterior, at the west end, the rain stops of the windows are decorated with small heads, and small heads are also used decoratively on the west front. There are the thirteenth century gargoyles at the south aisle, and the corresponding gargoyles on the clerestories.

Abbot Crichton made another important contribution to the maintenance of the fabric of the abbey church. It appears that he may have replaced Thomas de Tervas's slated roof with lead, for he received a quantity from King James III (1460-1488) for the roof of the church, which came from Rothesay Castle in 1470.[187] Henry Crichton, at the behest of James III, was promoted abbot of Dunfermline in 1473, rather than being elected by the monks.

Thus the monks were prevented from choosing whom they preferred as abbot in accordance with the privileges they enjoyed. This situation appears to have been ongoing since the time of John de Lithgow I, so having George Schaw, Rector of Mynto, imposed on them as abbot, by the king was not unusual. George Schaw was appointed abbot because of his family connections, and his being tutor to the Duke of Ross, third son of King James III.[188] In the long term this proved to be a good decision as he was an honourable man who brought learning and good sense to his office; he ruled the abbey from 1472 to 1498. On 29 June 1494, Abbot George Schaw was appointed Treasurer of the kingdom.[189]

King James III was killed at Sauchieburn in 1488. He was campaigning against rebels led by his son and heir James, Duke of Rothesay, but how he was killed is unclear.[190] The young Prince James succeeded his father as James IV. Soon after his accession, King James IV (1488-1513) confirmed all the privileges bestowed on Paisley Abbey by his ancestors and the kings of Scotland.[191] By the time of George Schaw's appointment as abbot, Paisley itself had grown into a considerable village on the opposite side of the River Cart from the abbey[192], big enough for Abbot Schaw to petition the Pope in 1483 for liberty to feu certain ground in the village of Paisley[193] which would benefit the monastery.[194] The appointed commissioners approved the request in 1488[195], and in the same year, at Stirling on the 19 August, King James IV raised Paisley to the dignity of a free Burgh of Barony.[196]

In view of King James IV's alleged part in the death of his father, Abbot Schaw, together with the Abbot of Jedburgh and the Chancellor of the diocese of Glasgow, were commissioned by Innocent VIII (1484-1492) to absolve King James for his part in the murder of his father King James III. Although the Bull from the Pope to Abbot Schaw was dated July 1491 James did not appear at Paisley for absolution until November of the same year.[197] There is a plaque on the north wall of the restored choir commemorating the event. George Schaw also sought absolution for himself and William Crichton, monk of Paisley, for their involvement in the recent insurrection against the late King James III.[198] Not satisfied with that, Abbot Schaw personally went to Rome and whilst there sought absolution from Pope Innocent VIII.[199]

During his visits to Paisley, King James IV would have been able to inspect at first hand, the building

work that was in progress. Indeed, between November 1498 and May 1512 James IV left drink money for the hard-worked masons, and occasionally the workmen at Paisley Abbey.[200] This evidence suggests that for quite some time the monastic precincts at Paisley must have resembled a building site, for George Schaw was an enthusiastic builder. Robert Schaw, his nephew and successor as abbot, probably approved building work too. But unlike Abbots Lithgow and Tervas most of Abbot George Schaw's work is thought to have been on the monastic buildings and not on the church. He built the famous precinct wall, is said to have rebuilt the refectory and a new chapter house; and probably rebuilt or renovated the former west range, once adorned by his Coat of Arms.[201]

In 1495 King James had appointed Schaw Royal Treasurer, but he resigned the office within two years. As Abbot Schaw became old, the duties of his office became a great burden, so a successor was sought. His nephew Robert, Vicar of Monkton, was considered the most suitable candidate, but unlike his uncle he was not appointed but canonically elected, his election being approved by both the Crown and the Pope. Alexander VI Borgia (1492-1503) did not give his consent unconditionally, for he insisted that Robert Schaw take the black habit of the Cluniac Order within six months. Robert Schaw (1498-1525) thus became abbot in March 1498, and his uncle, old Abbot George, lived as a pensioner of the abbey until his reported death in 1505.[202] Abbot Robert followed the example of Abbot George and furthered the interests of the newly founded Burgh of Paisley, for which he was rewarded by benefactions in the form of nave altars.

The late medieval nave of Paisley [see fig B], like that of all monastic churches, would have been divided from the choir and presbytery by a stone screen or pulpitum [fig B/1]. (The following numbers all refer to the groundplan; see also fig 42). The pulpitum usually sat between the two westmost piers at the crossing. Although there is apparently no evidence of the former pulpitum at Paisley, it is interesting that the tomb [plate 80a] now in the choir, and erroneously regarded as the tomb of Marjory daughter of Robert I, has little carved figures of kneeling monks, one of whom is John de Lithgow II, as sub-prior, with another representing Abbot John de Lithgow I wearing his pontificals [plate 80b]. Also, the west end of the monument is decorated with three Coats of Arms, the Arms of Paisley Abbey to the left, Cluny in the centre, and to the right is that of Fitzalan as High Steward [plate 80c].

It has been argued (by John Malden, Principal Officer, Paisley Museum)[203] that these different pieces of sculptured stones are the remnants of Lithgow's pulpitum. Indeed, the evidence of these named personages and Coats of Arms, as having been part of a pulpitum (say), is supported by photographic evidence. Plates 81a-d prove beyond any reasonable doubt that these stone fragments never formed part of a tomb chest, yet human bones were discovered inside when it was taken to pieces in the 1950s.[204]

The profiles of the mouldings of the monument are very reminiscent of those on the pulpitum at Glasgow Cathedral [plate 82], so at Paisley we may have the remnants of a pulpitum, perhaps designed by the same hand, and built around the same time as that at Glasgow in 1420[205], and so begun during the abbacy of John de Lithgow I. Glasgow's is not the only pulpitum extant in

Scotland, but it is the most intact and surely the finest.[206]

The medieval rood screen [see fig B/2][plate 83a] usually occupied the next bay of the nave, beyond the pulpitum, and had one or two doorways. It was always surmounted by the Holy Rood, or Crucifixion Scene [plate 83b].[207] Again there is no evidence of the rood screen at Paisley, though on the inner sides of the piers there is evidence of stone being cut out, to support a beam perhaps. These squarish holes (now filled in) are at an equal height on the piers westwards beyond the crossing, and there is also similar evidence in both aisles. Since there would also have been screens across the aisles, to maintain the monastic seclusion, these pieces cut from the stone suggest supports for a beam to support the Rood [plate 83b].

The Paisley monks, like the Benedictines, provided a parish church for the laity, unlike the Cistercians who reserved the nave for their lay brothers. Therefore at Paisley, the altar [fig B/3] for the laity, usually called the altar of the Holy Rood, St Cross or Jesus altar, would have stood in front of the rood screen [208] [plate 83b]. The abbey parishioners also had access to the nave altars. The north door was the people's door, the great west door being opened only on very special occasions.

Thereafter, followed the nave altars. First in the north aisle was the altar of St Catherine of Siena [fig B/4]; St Peter [fig B/5]; St Ninian [fig B/6]; and in the south aisle St Anne [fig B/8 and Sts James and Nicholas [fig B/9].

There would have been a chapel of Our Lady[209] which, if monastic, would have been inaccessible to the laity in any case, and would have stood in either transept or been a separate building within the monastic precinct. The Lady Chapel was quite often an extension of the choir, as at Wenlock [fig 3], but there is no evidence of this at Paisley. Since the veneration of the Virgin Mary was an important medieval practice, there is every likelihood that there would also have been an altar to Our Lady of Paisley in the nave of the abbey church. Although it did not stand in the north aisle, it may have stood in the south aisle near the rood screen [fig B/7]. These nave altars could either have been set against the west side of their respective piers[210], or been part of little chapels, or chantries formed by wainscotting between the nave piers and the aisle walls (as reconstructed).[211] Plate 83c is a reconstruction of similar chapels at Haddington and it gives the observer a reasonable impression of what Paisley may have looked like in the fifteenth/sixteenth centuries [see also fig 42].

The nave altars were all well endowed[212], but the most important was that of James Crawfurd of Kylwynet who, on 14 July, 1499, erected a chapel in honour of Sts Mirren and Columba [fig B/10] in the south transept.[213] There would also have been other altars in the south transept [see fig B/11], and in the north transept [see fig B/12], a very English development[214], but the dedications of these appear to be unknown. Again, these transept altars would have been separated from each other, again by wainscotting or stone walls.

In 1498, the abbey was damaged by fire in the time of George Schaw, or his nephew Robert who succeeded him. It has been argued that the fire was calamitous.[215]

MacGregor Chalmers insisted that it was then that the tower and spire collapsed, necessitating the building of the east wall at the crossing, before their completion in the time of Abbot Hamilton. It is unlikely that Chalmers is correct, for only part of the choir, transepts and crossing could have been destroyed by the fall of Hamilton's tower and spire in the sixteenth century.[216] There is certainly evidence in the west front of an obvious change in the masonry, for the stonework in the west gable is different, where it has been built up from just below the string course [plate 84a & b]. The change in ashlar could simply be evidence of the changes needed to build the new west gable window, probably completed in Tervas's time, for the new ashlar is smoother in texture compared with the old. Indeed (as the evidence demonstrates), the south-west buttress was rebuilt from the string course up [as plate 84b shows], but this would have been a relatively minor repair compared to a complete rebuild of the abbey.

In all probability the extent of the fire has been exaggerated, as well as the fact that repairs of such magnitude were carried out in Robert Schaw's time. The Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer tell us that between 1503 and 1512 James IV left money for masons working at Paisley, which does not necessarily apply to the church. Any attempt to tie this damage in with the fall of the central tower in 1556 or 1557 would be unwarranted.

In 1524 the bishopric of Moray became vacant; Abbot Robert Schaw desired the appointment, but, the earl of Arran wanted it for his illegitimate son, John Hamilton, a choir monk of Kilwinning. There was much wrangling between the opposing parties. Even King James V (1513-1542) had to intervene by writing, on 11 January 1525 to Pope Clement VII (1523-1534) on behalf of Schaw, yet

still recommending Hamilton as abbot of Paisley even though he was only fourteen or fifteen years of age.[217] Eventually, Clement VII acceded and Robert Schaw was promoted to the bishopric of Moray: the Bull appointing John Hamilton abbot of Paisley was signed on 17 May 1525.[218] On 19 October 1525 Robert Schaw was finally received as bishop at Elgin.

There is no date which tells us when the rather youthful John Hamilton was received as abbot by the monks of Paisley, though it would probably have been after the signing of the notarial instrument of 15 September 1525; nor, is there any record of how the monks reacted to having a boy as abbot.[219] Although there is little information regarding the youthful abbot, as he matured, John Hamilton, like most of his predecessors, played his part in the administration of the kingdom. In due course, ecclesiastical privilege came his way.

On 20 January, 1544, the bishopric of Dunkeld fell vacant.[220] Abbot Hamilton was promoted to the vacancy by the Governor, his brother the earl of Arran, acting on behalf of Queen Mary. Hamilton appears never to have been episcopally ordained as bishop, even though he had been legitimized at Edinburgh on 22 January, 1546.[221] On 1 March 1548, he was still being referred to as the bishop of Dunkeld,[222] yet on the 6 November, 1547, the see of Dunkeld was referred to as being vacant, for its bishop had been promoted to the archiepiscopal see of St Andrews[223]; and as late as 24 September, 1548, Hamilton was still being referred to as bishop of Dunkeld and abbot of Paisley.[224]

On 29 May 1546, David Beaton, Cardinal archbishop of St. Andrews was assassinated. Two days after the murder, Abbot John Hamilton was appointed to administer the

archdiocese until the vacancy had been filled.[225] On the 28 November, 1547, John Hamilton was appointed archbishop and Primate of Scotland[226], and despite current rumours to the contrary, he never received the most desired prize of all, the "red hat".[227] Hamilton was appointed Papal Legate on 10 October 1553[228], yet still retained his abbacy of Paisley. With his appointment as archbishop he became the natural leader of the Catholic party in the approaching religious storm.

Though he was archbishop and Primate of Scotland he still kept an eye on his abbey at Paisley. Like his predecessors, "the abbot", as he was often styled, paid much heed to the fabric of his abbey. He built the crossing tower, which is said to have had a tall spire, perhaps similar to that at Glasgow Cathedral [see fig A].[229] Bishop Leslie wrote that it was built at immense expense and rose to 300 ft[230], and at that height it would have been as high as Glasgow's. Although Tervas is believed to have begun the tower[231], George Schaw is also thought to have had a share in it.[232] This was common enough in the Middle Ages.[233] Despite all the confusion, it appears that Paisley Abbey did have a late medieval tower and spire.

Unfortunately, Archbishop Hamilton's successful building campaign was short lived, for the great tower and spire collapsed because of inadequate foundations.[234] Unfortunately, there are no records to indicate when the fall of the tower occurred, or the actual extent of the damage to the choir and north transept. However, it should be noted that the tower would not have completely demolished such a long choir. A collapsing tower does not fall over at 90^0, but tends to go down at the most about 10^0-15^0 out of the vertical.[235] At the most it would have destroyed two bays of the choir, not more.[236]

Greater damage to the choir would only have been possible had it been vaulted, as happened when the tower at Elgin Cathedral fell in 1711 destroying the vaulted choir, presbytery and transepts.[237] Therefore, the reduction of the choir walls at Paisley to nine feet high cannot be blamed on the collapsing tower.

There has been much speculation concerning the damage done to the church at its fall. In the seventeenth century Principal Dunlop wrote that the fall of the tower completely destroyed the choir. If the inner kirk represented the choir it appears to have still been in use in 1551, for a missal was presented to the Lady Altar by Robert Ker, a monk of Paisley.[238] The missal was French, and printed in Paris in 1550 by Jolanda Bonhomme. It is still extant and is in the keeping of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of St Andrews and Edinburgh.[239] But, whatever the significance of the "inner kirk", it may not have been the abbey church, though it could have been the nave, substituted for the damaged choir.

1557 appears to be rather late in time, for so much to happen. Since the Reformation took place in 1560, the tower and spire had to be completed before then, to enable it to fall and destroy the crossing, and parts of the north transept and choir. The eastern walls would have to have been built at the crossing, and at St Mirren's Aisle. These were composed largely of dressed and moulded stone[240], and there is no doubt that what was not used there would have been used by local builders, which probably explains the total disappearance of any evidence of the choir at Paisley Abbey (apart perhaps for a few remnants of moulded stonework now kept in the restored cloister).

1525 on, has been suggested as a more realistic time for the completion of Abbot Hamilton's tower and spire.[241] The controversy surrounding who built the tower and spire was not helped by the enigmatic lack of any evidence of the eastern piers at the crossing, which not only led to expert opinion to question their existence, but also that of the choir itself.[242] If McGibbon and Ross had been archaeologists, they may have felt the need to excavate the site, and so find evidence of the missing piers. The only possible explanation for the apparent disappearance of these two piers is the fact that as cut stone they could easily have been salvaged for re-use. Also, any knowledge of the architecture of the choir itself was also lost, apart from the four walls which stood nine feet high until replaced during the early stages of MacGregor Chalmers' restoration.

The tower at Elgin fell through neglect, but the probable reason for the fall of the tower at Paisley was bad engineering. It appears that three of the four crossing piers sat on a gravel bed, but the fourth did not. The fourth, like the north wall of the choir, was built on the silt of a former tributary of the Cart[243], and the building cracked in consequence. The foundations of the fourth, or north east pier, were only five feet deep and embedded in clay. This pier gradually gave way, sinking by five inches[244][fig 44]. The tower and spire therefore must have fallen towards the north-east, destroying the east side of the north transept.

The archbishop, as leader of the Catholic party, was determined to save what he could, so in 1553 he resigned his abbacy of Paisley, and had his young nephew Claud Hamilton, a boy of ten, appointed as Commendator. Pope Julius III (1550-1555) approved the appointment. Yet Hamilton still continued as titular abbot of Paisley, for

he was responsible for the administration and the spiritual welfare of the abbey until Claud reached his twenty-third year.[245]

By now, the Reformers were to the fore, and in 1559 the men of Lennox attacked Paisley. Sadler, the English Ambassador, wrote on 29 September, 1559, that he had been told that the reformers "had suppressed the abbeys of Paslowe, Kilwinning, and Dunfermling, and burned all the ymages and popish stuff in the same."[246]

Although there is no clear evidence of the damage inflicted on the monastery of Paisley, we can be sure that the monks' stalls, vestments, and all, or most books were burned, and that altars were probably smashed as symbolising idolatry. Tervas's treasures (including his Italian tabernacle), assuming they had survived the fall of the tower, would also have been destroyed[247], and his silver chandeliers or candlesticks were probably melted down, for the silver, as would be all the altar vessels for the precious metals. The altar retable, of which only a solitary fragment may remain extant, would also have been destroyed[248] with perhaps its reredos. In Scotland, such damage was so wide-spread that she, of all European countries, is the one with the least number of extant examples of her former wealth of medieval art.

On 24 August 1560 the Scottish Parliament abolished Papal authority.[249] It was never ratified by Queen Mary, but was re-enacted in December 1567 by the first Parliament of James VI's reign.[250] In 1561,

"The Lords of the Secret Council made an Act

> that all places and monuments of idolatry should be destroyed, and for that purpose were directed to the west, the earl of Arran having joined with the earl of Glencairn, together with the Protestants of the west who burned Paisley. The bishop of St Andrews, who was abbot thereof, narrowly escaped."[251]

Despite these assertions, there is no evidence whatsoever for the extent of the damage to Paisley. It was also reported that Crossraguel, Paisley's daughter house, was destroyed at the same time[252], yet much of the damage to Crossraguel's claustral buildings appears to be to the abbot's lodging and tower (and perhaps much later to looting of stonework by local farmers and builders.)

One possible reason why Paisley Abbey survived better than most of its contemporaries is because it then consisted only of the nave, St Mirren's Aisle, and the damaged choir. Thus the proportions of the nave made it more than suitable for Calvinist worship, which appears to fit in with the views of the Reformers, who sought where possible to utilize existing buildings.[253] Thus Paisley's nave became the parish kirk. But, Paisley was very much against the Reformers[254] so that may also have worked in the abbey's favour. Also, the fact that the abbey had a Commendator in the person of Claud Hamilton (who was more or less made the owner of the property) may have helped save the claustral buildings.

Still the people of Paisley remained firm, and soon John Hamilton, their abbot was there with them, insisting on saying the Mass, for which he was eventually called before the Court of Session, accompanied by a number of priests, some of whom may have been his own monks.[255] Queen Mary was on his side and reinstated him to his former authority, his last act in that sense being the baptism in 1566 of the infant Prince James (later

James VI), according to the Roman rite.[256] Two years later after the Battle of Langside he was shut out of Paisley. Claud Hamilton, who had fought on the side of his Queen, was declared forfeit together with all his lands and properties[257]; and James, Earl of Moray, granted the abbey lands and titles to Lord Sempill.

After the assassination of Moray on 17 January 1570[258] by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh, Abbot Hamilton returned to Paisley and occupied the abbey house, which, as Lees suggests, may have been restored by the Sempills. The abbot wrote to Elizabeth of England describing Paisley as "standing waste"[259] with only a boy holding the key of the gate.[260]

In 1571, John Hamilton was executed at Stirling for his alleged part in the murder of the Regent, Moray. He was the last pre-Reformation archbishop of St Andrews, and last Cluniac abbot of Paisley. After his death the situation looked rather grim for his nephew Claud Hamilton, Commendator of Paisley.

Despite its many later vicissitudes, even the threat of the total destruction of the church in the eighteenth century, Paisley Abbey survived. Moreover, since its foundation as a Cluniac monastery in 1163, Christian worship has continued on this site for over 800 years. The tragic fall of the tower and spire in the late sixteenth century was only redeemed by the faith of the people of Paisley in the first quarter of the present century, with the final act of restoration of the choir, tower and spire.

CHAPTER III

Aspects Of The Planning Of The Monastic Buildings In Relation To The Standard Monastic Plan, As Seen In Cluniac & Benedictine Sites

Introduction.

Since the *OPUS DEI* was considered the essence of the monastic life, then logically the church and its choir comes first. That is why In chapter II (parts 1 & 2) I discussed the history and architecture of the abbey church together; and the monks' need for domestic buildings, though very important, takes second place.

Therefore, chapter III discusses the cloister and monastic buildings of Paisley Abbey in their historical context, that is in relation to what is known about Cluny II and the plan of St Gall; and architecturally with what is known about Cluny II by excavation, and by comparison with British Cluniac, and other monastic houses.

By the beginning of the ninth century, at the monastery of St Gall [fig 45], a practical solution had evolved which resulted in the setting out of the essential monastic buildings round a cloister, a layout which formed the basis of the later standard monastic plan.[1] This monastic plan eventually reached fruition at Cluny II [fig 46], and later at Clairvaux.[2] They both followed the example and traditions of St Gall, and so developed their buildings as solutions to problems arising at differing times. As at St Gall, the architectural solutions consisted of four ranges of buildings grouped round an open courtyard, usually attached to the south aisle of the church, so that it gave access to the church, to the living quarters, the work buildings and then the out-service facilities. Thus, the courtyard or cloister became the nucleus of the monastic plan.

This grouping of related buildings was a practical response to those questions which arose out of people living the religious life in community. This efficient, carefully considered and almost perfectly related solution to monastic living problems (the standard monastic plan) did not occur overnight, but developed over centuries. Though there are no extant plans for those earlier attempts at arrangement of monastic buildings, textual descriptions do exist.[3] None of these earlier plans had the square layout of St Gall which eventually became the pattern for later monastic planning at Cluny II and, as will be seen, at Paisley and elsewhere.

Although religious, or monastic communities existed before St Benedict compiled his Rule c.529, by doing so he became the father or founder of western monasticism. In time, Religious communities which were founded specifically to follow Benedict's rule came to be known

as Benedictines. Eventually, reformed versions of that way of life, or Order, appeared also at Cluny, founded 909 (to which family Paisley belonged), Citeaux founded by Robert of Molesmes in 1098, and at Tiron in 1109 by Bernard of Poitiers. Indeed, so great was St Benedict's influence that nearly all the major Religious Orders of enclosed monks in the Middle Ages, except the Carthusians, lived their lives either according to the Benedictine Rule, or in an interpretation of it, as well as living in monasteries which were similarly laid out. The friars also lived in houses based on the standard monastic plan, though on a smaller scale [4][fig 48].

Even in some monasteries constructed in the nineteenth century, the medieval monastic plan was adhered to. A good example is Buckfast Abbey in Devon [5] [fig 49]. It became an abbey in 1902. Another modern example is that of Mount St Bernard [fig 50], a Trappist monastery founded in 1835, whose plan is laid down along traditional monastic lines. It became an abbey in 1848. These relatively modern examples of monastic building emphasise that the essence of monasticism is still stability and continuity.

Thus, when a medieval monk of Paisley took his monastic vows, he not only promised to reside for life within the monastery where he was professed[6], but by virtue of his profession became a monk of the great Abbey of Cluny, itself. Indeed, in 1447 Robert Barber, a monk of Paisley, was described as a member and subject of the monastery of Cluny.[7] Since the Order of Cluny was one of the strictest and most austere interpreters of the Benedictine Rule, Paisley's Cluniac monks would have followed the particular Cluniac emphases of that rule, whilst living in a house whose layout would have formed a

major part of the collective experiences of all Cluniac monks.

The actual layout of the monastery of Cluny can be traced back to the Customs of Cluny. A copy of these customs, known as the Customs of Farfa (Consuetudines Farfenses 1030-1080), was believed to have described the customs of the monastery of Farfa, near Rome. However, they have been identified as transcriptions of the Customs of Cluny, which Farfa followed.[8]

The importance of Cluny II in promoting the well-tried and most practical cloistral plan of St Gall[9] cannot be overestimated, because Cluny now assumed a very important planning role, namely promoting the ideas inherent in the St Gall plan, and encouraging creative adaption (but not slavish copying) among its dependant houses and priories. Thus, the ground floor plan of Cluny in its second phase (994-1048) can be seen as that which eventually became the typical Cluniac ground plan. In planning, the layout of Cluny II best represents British Cluniac designed monasteries and, before 1150, European Cluniac houses in general.[10]

In England, the arrival of the Normans after the Conquest heralded not only a re-organisation of the Church, but also the introduction of the well-tried monastic plan as handed down from Cluny II.[11] The later introduction of the Benedictine monastic system into Scotland is due to the influence of Queen Margaret, second wife of Malcolm III. They were married about 1070.[12] At Margaret's request Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, sent Goldwine and two other monks[13] northwards to Scotland to begin the great work of introducing European monasticism into Scotland by founding a priory at Dunfermline c.1070. The priory

became an abbey in 1128.[14] In doing so they brought the well-proven monastic plan to Scotland; and from an examination of Scottish monastic plans[15], there is no doubt that the standard monastic plan prevailed in Scotland until the Reformation in 1560. Thus, it can be said that the transference of the traditions inherent in the plan of Cluny II arrived in England and played a major part in the aftermath of the Norman Conquest. Therefore, Paisley as a house of Cluniac Benedictines should be compared with its peers, the contemporary Cluniac houses of the Anglo-Scottish Province.

The Priory of St Pancras at Lewes [fig 51] was the first English Cluniac foundation. It was founded in 1077 by William de Warenne and Gundreda, his wife.[16] Eighty-six years later, in 1163, the foundation charter of Paisley was witnessed at Fotheringay.[17] Other important Cluniac houses were Wenlock in Shropshire [fig 3], the mother house of Paisley, and the priories of Castle Acre [fig 52] and Thetford [fig 53] in Norfolk.

Hugh V d'Anjou, abbot of Cluny (1190-1207), organized and formed the Order into Provinces. He also introduced periodical General Chapters, to be held at Cluny.[18] Because they "were immediately subject to Cluny"[19] Paisley and Crossraguel were more or less independent of the English houses, from the beginning. Wenlock was founded after 1070, and since the monks who travelled north to Renfrew or Paisley after 1163, (like their Benedictine counterparts from Canterbury) would have come from a well-established house with buildings that were more or less complete, although not necessarily new. The present ruined church at Wenlock was completed by the middle of the thirteenth century.[20]

What can be deduced from a cursory glance at the ground plans of all of these particular Cluniac monasteries is the rather strong similarity among them, which suggests a single source. The obvious similarities in the plan of one monastery with another did not come about by accident but rather by design. Indeed, the efficient arrangement of the related functions (of the monastic complex) all bespeak a long planning tradition and comprehensive grasp of religious and utilitarian needs.[21] The success of the standard monastic plan can be measured by how well it kept the world at bay.

Even though Cluniac houses, like Paisley, conformed, in the general sense, to this standard monastic plan, the planning of individual Cluniac and Benedictine houses depended on the needs of each community, and the dictates of each site. Therefore, only occasionally do Cluniac houses resemble the mother house[22], and when this resemblance occurs, as it does at Lewes, it is an indication of that special relationship enjoyed between Cluny II and her daughter houses.[23] Also, the standard Benedictine plan differed little from the Cluniac plan.[24]

In this respect, Paisley which ultimately depended on Cluny II, itself founded as a reformed Benedictine monastery, would not have broken from the earlier traditions begun at St. Gall, whose very layout embodied the practical necessities of the Benedictine Rule.[25] Whether Paisley's ground plan actually conformed to that of Cluny II can only be ascertained by comparing Paisley with that of Cluny itself. A comparison between Paisley and other extant Cluniac houses of the Anglo-Scottish Province is also necessary, for they may bear some relevance to what may, or may not have existed at Paisley Abbey in the pre-Reformation period. Thus, it is essential that, within the context of the standard

monastic plan, answers be sought to Paisley's cloistral problems.

Also, it is important that Paisley's cloistral layout be discussed and reconstructed - not just within the context of the monastic plan - but more specifically because of her membership of the Cluniac Order. As a Cluniac house, Paisley's cloister should be seen to entail forms perceptible in any building tradition as suggested by the cloistral layouts of her English contemporaries. As a monastery, a living symbol and member of the Cluniac Order, Paisley's cloistral arrangements would have depended on the architectural traditions and developments of the ground plan of Cluny, as described in the Customs of Farfa, and perceived in the English houses of the Order.[26]

Although architecture can be regarded as being responsible for the design of buildings, it was Scholastic Theology which influenced the development of the liturgy, in turn, helping to create the monastic architecture in the Middle Ages. Therefore, it could be said that the spiritual aspects of the monastic life played a crucial role in the development of the standard plan, for a monastery was not just a group of buildings, but rather a house of prayer. Hence, the importance of the "*Spirit*" in the monastery cannot be ignored, for Paisley, as a monastery, was likewise a house of prayer, and this important aspect of her life must also be considered.

The idea of people withdrawing from the world to join, and/or form religious communities[27] was not new, but the scale of withdrawal in the Middle Ages certainly was.[28] It created a completely new social grouping, The Religious, and it is within this particular context that

the community of Cluniac monks of Paisley must be examined. The Paisley monks were no different from their contemporaries, because they too required organised structures, in the form of both rules, by which their lives could be organised and administered, and essential buildings which would have provided them with a "home", where they might live secluded from the World, and come together as a community to pray, take counsel, sleep and eat.[29]

Although it would be true to say that it was Benedict's spiritual formulations which were the foundations of the monastic layout (the standard monastic plan), what his Rule did not do was to lay down strict plans as to how the essential buildings needed to house the monks, should be laid out. Rather, his basic rules were aimed more at creating stable and better organised communities for those people who chose to seek God by living together in such a community, where each monk could seek the "ecstatic union" with God he so earnestly desired. His Rule set out simple formalised structures which not only encouraged the growth of, but also considered virtually every aspect of, life in a fixed or stable community.

To achieve this, two prerequisites were necessary : firstly, a personal vow of stability, and secondly, a suitable site. Indeed, the introduction of the vow of stability is seen as "St Benedict's most special and tangible contribution to the development of monasticism."[30]

For Benedict, the essence of the monastic community, as perceived in his Rule, is oneness, in the sense that all members of the community live together in unity, "a life lived wholly within the precincts of the monastery,

the occasions of going forth being reduced to the minimum, and regarded as definitely undesirable and dangerous."[31] In the beginning they were obliged where possible to "sleep in one place" the monks and abbot sharing an unpartitioned dormitory.[32] Thus, idealistically a religious community could be described as a "true corporative entity."[33] Although it could be said that this "true corporative entity" was achieved initially by the vow of stability, it was ultimately the development of the standard monastic plan which helped make it a reality.

Since isolation was the key to the making of the religious community into a true corporative entity, it was the eventual formation of "the cloister" which made it possible for the soul, seeking Christ, to live in seclusion, according to Benedict's dictates. For the monks, besides having access to all the buildings within the cloistral area, it was the cloister which safeguarded and guaranteed his seclusion from the World. Indeed, seclusion was considered absolutely necessary if the individual monk was to achieve the oneness with the Divine, by abstracting himself from the World in such a way as to behold it objectively. So, in the beginning, continuity once established, encouraged, not just the erection of buildings, but buildings (like Paisley) which brought solutions to the problems arising from the creation of the community; and when a plan (the standard plan) was devised which resolved these problems, in the true spirit of the monastic tradition, it was transmitted from one generation of monks to another, at Paisley and all other monastic houses.

Therefore, to find this seclusion, the individual (whether he was a monk of Paisley, or not) had first to withdraw from the World, and if the postulant was not

going to be a hermit in the desert, then to seek the ascetic life it was essential for him to withdraw to an isolated place, or to an isolation inherent in the structure of the buildings themselves.[34] This isolation worked in two ways: firstly, the designs which eventually formed the standard monastic plan deliberately isolated the community from the World; secondly, the rule of silence[35] isolated the monks from each other, so that in the Christian monastic context this deliberately created isolation, meant that each individual monk could seek a greater union with God. Saint Benedict had also written "on account of the great value of silence, let leave to speak be seldom granted to disciples, even though it is for good, holy, and edifying conversation."[36]

The monks of Paisley (as part of the great Cluniac family) shared in the great Benedictine tradition by taking the three vows, of Poverty, Chastity and Obedience, and by living and sharing in the communal life, where everything that was done was done for the Lord, in the spirit of the Gospel. Thus, through the *OPUS DEI*[37] they could seek the perfection inherent in the invitation to leave everything and follow Jesus.[38] The *OPUS DEI* for the Cluniacs was singing the Divine Office in choir, seven times a day, and once at night.[39]

Unfortunately, during the thirteenth century, medieval monasticism changed, perhaps because many of the monasteries had become great and wealthy with many manors, sometimes spread across the country, and at a great distance from the monastery itself. For the Cluniacs, praying in choir occupied most of their day, because the *raison d'être* of the Cluniac monk was to seek an even greater perfection of the common spiritual life. But it was not his only one, for the praising of God was interspersed by periods of reading, study and work.[40]

So, obviously the Cluniac monks had little time to do any farming.[41] However, for the monk the necessary work of the monastery, the mending and washing of garments, the cleaning of shoes, the baking of bread, and the cooking of food, were allowed to count as manual labour[42], as was the cloistral occupation of copying manuscripts. Yet ironically the Cluniacs were expected to live a life of total exclusion from the World, and simultaneously remain self-sufficient.[43]

Although the development of the more important monasteries into large manorial estates contradicted the monastic ideal, the donation of land by benefactors meant that contact with the outside world became necessary. Moreover, this land was sometimes so far from the monastery that contact with the *outside* was inevitable, if it was to be managed with efficiency. Paisley had a manor at Blackston, in Renfrewshire, but there may have been others.[44] Therefore, it is more than likely that their estates would have been worked by many servants and peasant labourers. Moreover, the Cluniacs of Paisley, like the Benedictines (but unlike the Cistercians), were not usually handicraftsmen, so the hamlet, and later town of Paisley grew up around the monastic perimeter (as was so often the case), to cater for the varied needs of the community. This was certainly the situation at Paisley in the sixteenth century.[45]

Idealistically, the monks of Paisley, like all religious, were not called on to manage estates but to give up the World and seek perfection, inherent in the call to leave everything and follow Jesus.[46] This was to be a life of repentance, or metanoia.[47] This repentance, or conversion, is directly linked with the abandonment of riches[48] and therefore of attachment to the World, which the monk expressly does in the vow of poverty.[49] The monk

free from the World was thus able to commit himself fully to the *OPUS DEI*.[50]

Therefore, having discussed the *raison d'être* of Paisley, whose architectural antecedents go back to Cluny II[51] (as well as St Gall)[52], the plan of the monastery of Paisley must be looked at anew within the context of the standard monastic plan, because much has been written erroneously on the buildings of Paisley Abbey - even as recently as 1969.[53] As has been shown it was stability which made monasticism a practical proposition, but it was the site which made it a reality.

The development of a monastery like Paisley, into a living entity, was dependant on the choice of site.[54] With regard to the monastic site itself, Benedict wrote in chapter 66 of his Rule:

> "The monastery should, if possible, be arranged that all necessary things, such as water, mill, garden, and various crafts may be within the enclosure, so that the monks may not be compelled to wander outside it, for that is not at all expedient to their souls."[55]

Thus for a monastery like Paisley to fulfil Benedict's dictates for self-sufficiency, it was equally important that the site had the potential, for a peaceful secluded life. Favourite sites were in the depth of a valley, as at Paisley, or on a hill overlooking a river, as at the Augustinian Abbey of Jedburgh, and quite often these were sites of "great natural beauty".[56] But whatever the choice, the site had to be carefully chosen, even though it would require much later industry from the monks, for at the end of the day the intention was that it would provide the monastic community with all of its requirements. One of these essential requirements was a reasonably level site, where the monastic complex,

including the enclosing wall or hedge, could be constructed without much difficulty. Undoubtedly, the site chosen for the building of the new Abbey of Paisley was such a site: it sat in a wide valley to the north of and close to the White Cart river, a tributary of the Clyde and was thus exceptionally well-placed.

Within the context of chapter 66 of the Rule of St Benedict, Paisley was ideally situated, for being close to the river meant not just having fresh water and drainage, but also salmon and trout from the rivers Cart and Clyde (as well as a mill).[57] To the north and east much virgin land was available, another essential prerequisite for the development of the monastic site.[58] Also, it could not have been closer to Seedhills[59], where the hamlet of Paisley was established[60], "with its mill standing where the Cart falls over a ridge of rock."[61] Metcalfe in his *HISTORY OF PAISLEY* describes it rather poetically, but without reference.[62] Lees, like most commentators, also assumes that this was the case.[63] The fact that Paisley was situated near the lowest crossing point of the river on the way between Glasgow and north Ayrshire, was also rather advantageous.[64]

In the sixteenth century, it was the gate-house [fig 54b] built by Abbot Tervas[65] which would have afforded access to Paisley Abbey, for Abbot George Schaw's great wall which surrounded the whole complex keeping the World at bay [fig 54b]. The gate-house stood about thirty feet north-east of the north-west tower of the abbey church.[66] As was the custom, it may have had two entrances, a larger one for horse-drawn traffic, and a smaller one for visitors on foot. The gateway, itself, was enlarged by Abbot George Schaw when he raised a lofty tower over the principal gateway.[67]The dates for all this work are unknown, though there are various entries in the

Treasurers' Accounts which suggest that this could have been ongoing during these times.[68] The porter's quarters probably occupied the first floor of the gateway. The gate-house at Paisley Abbey was still extant in the eighteenth century and stood at the junction of Abbey Close and the present Gauze Street.

A building known in Paisley as the Yett or Gate House of the abbey stood where the abbey gate-house would have been, that is, on the north-east corner of the entrance to Abbey Close[69] [plate 85a]. It was two storeys high with crow-stepped gables, and had a thatched roof. Although it was believed to be of the seventeenth century (on account of the style of its rybats and lintels over the windows and doors), it may have been of the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries. There is evidence to suggest that it may have had a round tower at its north-east corner. In the print it certainly looks more like domestic quarters than a monastic gate-house, but that would not be unusual within the context of Paisley Abbey, since so much has changed beyond all recognition. The Yett House, like The Place, could have been altered considerably for use as a private dwelling house. Slezer's print of 1693 [plate 85b] shows a prominent building standing approximately where the gate-house would have stood.

In any case, the gate-house was demolished and sold as building material in 1763, leaving no record as to its appearance.[70] A substantial gate-house is still extant at Crossraguel [plate 85c, and fig 55], and although of the sixteenth century, gives a good impression of the type of gate-house perhaps built at Paisley by Thomas Tervas in the fifteenth century. The gate-house would have provided immediate access to the outer courtyard of the monastery [figs A & B]. As was customary, there may

well have been stables beyond the gate-house[71], and perhaps a granary. A pathway would have led from the gate-house to the west front of the abbey church, and then to the west range. Beyond this west range was the cloister, with its four ranges of buildings.

At about the same time as Schaw had the tower added to the abbey gate-house, he had also built the great boundary wall. Bishop Leslie, who saw the wall, described it as "a verie magnifike wal, al hail with four square stane... abone a mile gate, stiking and standeing out verie faire images and verie monie of thame."[72] Whilst Lauder of Fountainhall wrote that they would "almost passe for a miracle, because of their curious workmanship and extent."[73] Schaw also had three Coats-of-Arms mounted on the north side of the wall, the Royal Arms in the centre with the High Stewards on the right and the Abbots to the left.[74] The gate-house at Castle Acre [plate 86] is also decorated with Arms, which was the custom, and that at Thetford, though undecorated, is still extant [plate 87].

A plaque of the Royal Arms which now sits over the fireplace in the flat designed for the minister of the abbey by James Steel Maitland [plate 88] - and completed in 1960[75] - is probably that which once adorned Abbot George Schaw's perimeter wall. It was supposedly found lying in the abbey precincts. Besides adorning the wall with statues, George Schaw had an inscription[76] cut into a single piece of stone mounted on the wall [plate 89].

The wall was more than a mile long, and enclosed the monastic complex.[77] According to Lees there were remnants of the wall extant in his day, including the outbuildings beyond the east range.[78] Although the plan of the wall drawn by Boog in 1821 for General Hutton is

now lost, we do have his notes. If the outline of the plan is drawn on a map of Paisley[79] [fig 54b], the extent of the monastic precinct is shown to have been quite considerable.

Considering the reputation which Abbot George Schaw's perimeter wall has enjoyed over the centuries, there is every likelihood that it would have had more in common with the famous walls of St Andrews [plate 90a], than either Pluscarden's more modest perimeter wall, or the remnants of that at Crossraguel [plate 90b]. Whatever its appearance, this wall at Paisley was as important to the abbey as the cloister, for it symbolised the outer limits of the monastic world, whereas the other side of the wall represented the World the monks had chosen to forsake.

Nevertheless, as a homogeneous part of that great monastic tradition (which went back to, and even beyond St Benedict), it could be argued that its ground plan was no different from that of its contemporaries[80] [see plate 54a]. In other words, Paisley would have shared in those building traditions which, as said above, eventually developed around St Benedict's Rule. Taking this great monastic tradition into account, if there was as much of Paisley's cloistral buildings extant today (ruined or otherwise), it is probable that they would have been similar to those at Crossraguel and Castle Acre.

Both of these monastic sites are extensive, with ruined buildings which are considerable, indicating that both of them, in their prime, would have comprised groups of substantial buildings. As will be shown there is unfortunately little about the buildings of Paisley Abbey today which would suggest it was a monastic

complex. Nevertheless, there is enough evidence to indicate that here once stood a large monastery, and not just a rather outsize parish kirk with attendant buildings.

Firstly, Paisley does have a cloister [plate 91; figs A & B], which is sited south of the church. The cloisters of the extant British Cluniac sites, as at Cluny II, occupy the same southerly position, which is seen as the classic site.[81] In Benedict's time the cloister meant the complete monastic complex, but by the time of Paisley's foundation the cloister had come to mean that inner courtyard accessible only to the monks "where they dwelt in that silence and seclusion, which, requisite for meditation and prayer, constituted the *sine qua non* of the monastic life."[82]

The cloister, as the nucleus of monastic planning, "controlled" the lives of the monks[83], such that they were able to achieve union with God in the choir, and by living a common life they almost became as one, since all their tasks were accomplished as a single unit. Furthermore, this common life encouraged the monks, free from the World's influences, to seek an even closer and individual union with the Divine. But, in Benedict's scheme of things one thing was deliberately missed out, no allowance was made for recreation at any time,[84] yet there is evidence of cloisters having grids for games incised into the stonework of the cloister.

The ideal measurement for the cloistral area was said to be approximately 100 feet square [86] (see appendix v, Scottish cloister garths). The area of the cloister at Paisley was an irregular 80 sq ft., at Crossraguel it is approximately 70 sq ft.,[87] [fig 55a] yet both are

certainly smaller in area than their Cluniac contemporaries.[88]

If the ground plans of both Paisley [fig B] and Wenlock [fig 3] are compared, it is obvious that both cloisters are irregular, and that contrary to the principles of the standard plan, their fraters do not sit at right angles to the east and west ranges. The cloister of Prittlewell Priory was similar [89] [fig 55b]. Although the square regular cloister of the "standard monastic plan" reflects that at St Gall[90], the cloisters at Paisley and Wenlock reflect more the irregularity of that at Cluny II [fig 46]. Even the cloister of Canterbury [fig 56] is irregularly set out, showing that the rigid adherence to a square plan was not always adhered to, largely because the plan of each monastery would have been laid out to suit its own particular site.

The reasons for these unusual cloistral arrangements at Paisley and Wenlock are unclear, as is the fact that both west ranges projected beyond the building-lines of the respective west fronts, as it also did at Cluny II, where the west range projected beyond that of the Atrium.[91]

According to the standard plan, it was customary for the west range, as at Dunfermline [fig 57], to follow the building-line of the west front of the church. If the west range had followed the building-line of the church, the cloister garth would have been much smaller that it actually was. Perhaps this unusual cloistral layout at Paisley, and the other Cluniac houses, is due to the influence of Cluny II.[92] Although the irregularity of Paisley's cloister cannot be said for certain to have been influenced by that at the mother house of Wenlock,

it appears that Paisley, the most northerly of the daughter houses of Cluny, has in the layout of its cloister, more in common with Cluny II itself than those of its contemporaries. Another important custom relating to the cloister was that no major building (apart from lavatoria), was ever allowed to intrude into the cloistral area because of its importance in providing an area of peace within the monastery for the monks, and as a free area, providing immediate access to and from the four cloistral ranges.

The earliest form of construction for the cloister was for the lean-to roofs of the four covered walks to be supported, as was the custom, by open arcading to allow for light.[93] This certainly was the situation at Paisley in the thirteenth century, though there is no evidence of what the cloistral situation was at Paisley Abbey in the sixteenth century. In the later Middle Ages, at some of the greater English monasteries, the cloisters were vaulted and the open arcading was occasionally glazed.[94] Unfortunately, although extant glazed cloisters are to be found in England, the lack of physical evidence of monastic cloisters in Scotland makes it difficult to hazard a guess at the existence of any glazed cloisters. Also, because the monks made much use of this covered area for various purposes, it was usual to have a bench seat round the walls of the cloister, as at Norwich [plate 92a].

MacGregor Chalmers, as part of his restoration of the cloister at Paisley in 1915, replaced the bench seat in the north walk [plate 92b], but it is too low ever to have been seating.[95] Since Crossraguel has no evidence of its cloistral seating arrangements with which to compare Paisley, perhaps the seating at Paisley would have been similar to Inchmahome, where the cloister

seating resembles the window-seats common in medieval domestic accommodation. It was common for the north walk to be wider than the other three, because in the thirteenth century the north cloister walk is often interpreted as the likely site which the monks adapted either as a scriptorium, or used for private reading and study. The presence of the book cupboard near the north cloister walk at Paisley gives credence to this suggestion. In the later Middle Ages study carrels were built for the monks in the cloisters at Gloucester [plate 93], though carrels could easily have been constructed at Paisley using wainscotting; and where a separate scriptorium did not exist, it is more than likely that the day room in the east range would have been utilised for that purpose.

In 1915, MacGregor Chalmers' restoration of the arcading of part of cloister [plate 94], followed what was believed to be the original Transitional corbels being used to support the roof timbers of the lean-to roof. The open arcading is supported by carved and moulded waterleaf capitals[96] [plate 95], and modelled on twelfth century originals found during excavation work for the new cloister.[97]

Unfortunately, there is no archaeological evidence of the cloister at Wenlock (or Crossraguel) to compare with Paisley, except perhaps the waterleaf capitals in the triforium of the south transept. It is at Jedburgh Abbey [plate 96], in the triforium and the clerestory, that we find capitals similar in style to those at the Paisley cloister. Also, at Dryburgh Abbey similar waterleaf capitals are extant in the east processional doorway [plate 97], and in the capitals of the entrance to the chapter house. This Transitional work at Jedburgh, in particular, is seen as having been carried

out by Abbot Hugh between c.1205 x 1220[98]; the similarity between the Transitional work at Jedburgh and similar work at Dryburgh (and their close proximity) would suggest a connection.

This Transitional work is also similar in style to the cloister at the Cistercian monastery at Newminster, in Northumberland, and hence not too distant from Jedburgh [plates 98a & b]. This style of twin capital (though varying in ornamentation), was often found in the cloisters of Benedictine[99] and Cluniac[100] houses throughout Europe in the twelfth century. Also, in the north walk of the cloister at Paisley the east [plate 99] and west processional doorways [plate 36] are still extant, and open on to the cloister in the usual manner. The east processional doorway at Paisley occupies its traditional position in the north-east corner, which gave access to the monastic choir in the church, and the processional door in the north-west corner gave access to the south aisle of the church.

Because seclusion and privacy were the *raison d'être* of the cloister, such that the monks were never seen by the public, their processional route in the interior of the church from the chapter house to the choir was usually obscured from public view by means of wooden screens across the aisles, at the crossing, and forming an extension of the rood screen.[101] In effect this meant that the transepts, with the presbytery, were also part of the cloister.[102] The east processional doorway always stood facing the east walk of the cloister, which fronted the east range. The east range (as was the custom), consisted of a two storey block attached to and following the line of the south transept. The first chamber generally encountered in the east range was the chapter house.

The chapter house was introduced into the east range from Cluny[103] [fig 46] and always stood next to or close by the south transept, though at times separated from the transept by a slype, or alley way, which gave access to the buildings beyond the cloister to the east and north. At the Cluniac Abbey of St Saviour's Bermondsey, the only English abbey in the Anglo-Scottish Province[104], "The chapter house was in its normal position and separated from the south transept by a narrow passage or slype about eight feet wide leading to the monks cemetery"[105] [fig 58], as at Kilwinning [plate 100]. This was not the situation at Paisley, nor at its sister houses, so Bermondsey was the exception, rather than the rule, even though it was the situation at Cluny II. Also, the chapter house sat behind the dorter range at Bermondsey[fig 58] and Cluny, access being afforded by a vestibule, as at St Andrews.

Apart from the extension of the restored north cloister into the east walk, there is little physical evidence of the east cloistral range of Paisley Abbey, apart from the adjacent book cupboard built into the wall of the south transept. At Castle Acre, Monk Bretton, Thetford and Wenlock, book cupboards occupied similar positions. Although at Wenlock it may have consisted of three arched bays, and as such considerably bigger than the norm.[106] Nearer home, in Scotland, Dryburgh Abbey [plate 101] and St. Andrews have excellent examples. Since the cupboard at Paisley is relatively small when compared with these other examples, it may have been used for writing materials only.[107]

The existence of the book cupboard at Paisley's south transept follows the assumption that, in Paisley's earlier days, the monks may have copied manuscripts[108] in the north cloistral walk, which was in fact an

important Cluniac tradition. However, the coldness of the northern climate would appear to rule this out. A separate room for use as a library in its later years is possible, for Crossraguel appears to have had one, and as expected of a great seat of learning, Cluny is said to have had a considerable library.[109] Paisley Abbey did possess a library[110] (but unlike that of its last abbot, John Hamilton[111]) there is scant evidence of what it contained.

In the monastic context, it would have been highly irregular to have had a doorway into St Mirren's Aisle so close to the cupboard. Therefore, this doorway was built after the fall of the tower, by which time St Mirren's Aisle had become the burial vault of the Hamiltons and Abercorns. Apart from the need for an entrance into the Aisle, what may have encouraged the Hamiltons to have the present entrance built where it is, could have been the existence of a much larger book cupboard. A larger book cupboard would not have been out of place; after all, St Andrews has two book cupboards, and situated as near to the processional doorway as the entrance to St Mirren's Aisle; and Dryburgh's is similar in dimension to its lavatorium.

Just beyond the south transept in the east cloister walk at Paisley (and if British Cluniac tradition is followed) the observer should immediately encounter the entrance to the chapter house, as he would at Crossraguel Abbey [fig 55a], and the priories of Wenlock [fig 3], Castle Acre [fig 52], Thetford [fig 53] Monk Bretton [fig 59], and Lewes [fig 51]. Unfortunately at Paisley, the observer instead of encountering the east range beyond the south transept, with its chapter house, vaulted undercroft and the day stairs [fig 60a] to the monks' dorter on the first floor would come face to face with a

four/five storey projecting wing entered by a doorway erected as late as 1914 [fig 61].

At Castle Acre, the chapter house [plate 102] was a grand "single" storey building with evidence of blind arcading[112], as at Wenlock [plate 103], but with no allowance for the dorter in the east range to rest over it. At Thetford [plate 104] the chapter house was probably similar in style to that at the sister house Castle Acre. All that remains of the chapter house at Monk Bretton [plate 105] are a few feet of each of the four walls, with the moulded jambs of the central doorway and flanking windows visible.

Crossraguel chapter house, rebuilt in the fifteenth century [plate 106], and Wenlock c.1140[113] chapter house [as reconstructed plate 107] are contrasting styles. The late medieval chapter house at Crossraguel, with its central pier supporting the ribbed vault, is much in the spirit of the late octagonal chapter house at the Augustinian Abbey of Inchmahome, and contrasts with Wenlock's twelfth century Norman chapter house. At Wenlock, the ornate blind arcading[114] is an excellent example of the architecture of the Norman period, and though it is roofless, it is similar in style to that at Bristol Cathedral, a former Augustinian house.[plate 108] At Castle Acre, the blind arcading on the west front of the abbey church (and very similar to that in Wenlock's chapter house) is seen as perhaps the finest in England.

Without a doubt (and despite the centuries separating both chambers), the architectural grandeur of these two extant chapter houses, at Wenlock and Crossraguel, shows their wealth, and provides us with an indication of the size of the communities.[115] Also Paisley, like her daughter house of Crossraguel, would no

doubt have been endowed with a fine chapter house, perhaps renewed, as has been suggested[116], during the rebuilding campaign of Abbot George Schaw.

Also, the apparent rectangular shape of the probable site of the chapter house at Paisley [figs B & 62] is typical of that found at Cluny II[117], and at the other Cluniac houses mentioned above. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that the chapter house at Paisley would have also been a large single-storey room occupying the two storeys of the east range, like those at Castle Acre and Thetford [fig 53].

Apart from the evidence of the sites of the chapter houses in contemporary Cluniac houses, two large moulded corbels are still extant on the outside of the southern wall of St Mirren's Aisle with a string-course above, which suggests a tall single storey chamber [plate 109a & 109b]. Descending the face of the wall from these corbels are grooves where the vaulting-shafts, which would have carried the roof, were clawed off. (A close observation of the wall will support this argument). Also, the broken end of a shaft on the same wall (but further west) is known to have been found during work in The Place.[118] Since St Mirren's Aisle and the chapter house stood side by side, and shared a common wall, the corbels could have helped support a roof similar in height to that of St Mirren. This is feasible, not just because it was the situation at Castle Acre and Thetford, but also because there is no evidence of springers for vaulting, on what is now the exterior wall of St Mirren's Aisle[119]. At St Andrews evidence of arcading can still be seen on the exterior of the south wall of the nave [plate 110]. It would also be interesting to speculate that perhaps the chapter house could have been similar to the neighbouring St Mirren's Aisle, including the ribbed vault [120] [fig

62]. Of course, there are vaulted chapter houses in Scotland[121], so Paisley with a vaulted chapter house would have been following Scottish precedents.

Nevertheless, if the chapter house had been rebuilt in the time of George Schaw, as a late medieval example, there is every likelihood that it would have been grander and more elaborate than its predecessor[122], and as happened at the daughter house of Crossraguel. It is likely that Paisley's earlier chapter house would have had the traditional "grand formal entrance", and probably flanked by windows of open arcading[123], as would all of its Cluniac sister houses.[124] Good Scottish examples of different periods can be found at Dryburgh [plate 111a], Inchmahome [plate 111b], and St Andrews [plate 111c]

Unfortunately, there is no evidence of the form of the entrance to Paisley's early chapter house. However, considering that nearby stands an elegant Transitional doorway, the chapter house arcading could also have been Transitional. The existence of a large waterleaf capital in the cloister walk [plate 1], with a corresponding large moulded base [plate 2], and moulded corner stone [c/f photo appendix i, photos 35 and 79], similar to those at the east cloister doorway, suggests the existence of another large arch or doorway. So here is perhaps the only extant evidence of the twelfth century chapter house at Paisley. Also, the fact that the chapter house was in use as early as 1177, as the burial place of Eschina wife of Walter Fitzalan[125], would suggest that the entrance to the chapter house would have been Transitional, like the east processional doorway. There are several fine examples of Transitional arches and doorways in Scotland to use as a model for Paisley.

The chancel arches in the churches of St Blane and Kirkliston are Transitional, but it is in the north-east doorway at the latter[126] [fig 63] that we can see waterleaf capitals similar to those in Paisley's cloister. A rather interesting example of a thirteenth century Scottish chapter house entrance is that at Pluscarden [plate 112], but this was probably the exception rather than the rule.[127]

The chapter house at Paisley would always have been an integral part of the east cloistral range. The fact that there is no evidence of the east range at all, is proof that at some time the east range was swept away, including the chapter house, a very important symbol of monastic activity.

In Scotland, at that time, chapter houses are unlikely to have been transformed into a private chapels because of the change of emphasis in religious practices.[128] Yet, at Kinloss it appears that after the Reformation the chapter house was used until 1650 as a parish kirk, after which time, like the remaining parts of the abbey, it was probably taken down and sold as building material by the Laird of Lethen[129]; and, at Balmerino the chapter house became part of the post-Reformation house.

The continued existence of the nave of Paisley Abbey probably meant that the chapter house did not need to be adapted for the Reformed Church services. In any case, with the further altering of the cloistral block by the Dundonalds, who owned The Place in the late seventeenth century, the building of the four/five storey block on the chapter house site for example, would have resulted in the loss of any evidence of the chapter house then still extant.

Irrespective of the form of the chapter house in any monastery, the ground floor, or undercroft, of the east range always consisted of a variety of other offices for the monks, though from the extant evidence of the Cluniac houses there was no set pattern to indicate their layout. It was not unusual for the undercroft to be vaulted like that at Dunfermline[130] [plate 113]. However, since the east range at Paisley no longer exists, it cannot be assumed that the form of the vaulting in the east range would have been similar to that at the west, as seen in old photographs [plate 114] taken during the demolition of the west range.

The warming room, usually vaulted, occupied part of the undercroft of the east range.[131] In the later Middle Ages it might have doubled as a day room, where the monks busied themselves, in inclement weather.[132] At Thetford and Crossraguel the warming room formed part of the undercroft of the east range, but not at Castle Acre[133] [plate 115] where (like Cluny II) the warming room was situated in the south or frater range.

Other rooms commonly found under the dorter were a vestiary or treasury, and an inner parlour or slype.[134] At Cluny, a large room (90ft x 34ft) occupied the undercroft below the dorter. It is described as a "store" in the Farfa text, but there is no real indication as to its purpose although it may have been a vestiary.[135] However, it cannot be ruled out that this was the day room at Cluny II. The inner parlour or slype was usually conveniently sited in the undercroft where it could provide easy access to the outbuildings beyond the east range. The inner parlour would have had bench seats, as was the custom, which can be seen at Crossraguel [plate 116] between the treasury and day or warming room [fig 55]. This allowed the monks to

converse, as well as providing access to the buildings further east of the range, such as the monastic infirmary.

There is nothing at Wenlock to suggest where there might have been a slype, but at Castle Acre [fig 52] and Thetford [fig 53] there are slypes between the dorter stairs and the dorter undercroft, whilst at Monk Bretton the slype is between the inner parlour and the earlier warming house.[fig 59] From this varied evidence at the other British Cluniac sites it is obvious that there was no fixed site for the inner parlour or slype in the east range, if indeed it was part of that range. The inner parlour, or slype, could have easily have occupied a site in the south range at Paisley.

On the upper floor, above the undercroft of the east range, was usually found the monks' dorter. Although it is mentioned in the Cartulary[136] there is nothing to suggest that it was other than "an external building....to the south or south east of the priory church."[137] No doubt the dorter was built on the traditional site as part of the east block, and since the charter is dated c.1177-99 this will refer to the earlier one. If the original dorter was damaged by the English in 1307, during the burning of the abbey, it would probably have been rebuilt on the same site as soon as was practical. In any case, dorters were most liable to change, so were often rebuilt (more than likely on the original site).[138]

At Paisley, there is no extant evidence of the dorter itself, except for that of a built-up archway in what is now part of the abbey minister's office. Although this arch [plate 117] is of considerable proportions (10ft 7 ins x 7ft 11 ins), the present floor

level suggests that part of it is hidden as a result of (modern) internal alterations. The archway itself now forms part of the interior of the east facing wall of the abbey [fig 60a & b], and may well represent the only extant evidence of the dorter. Were it possible actually to measure, or even better, x-ray the building, it would be seen that this arch lies in close proximity to the arched entrance to the day stairs of the dorter, on the ground floor below. It would not have been impossible to construct a stairway, in the wall, from the archway on the ground floor [fig 60a] to the archway on the upper floor [fig 60b]. On the exterior of the east wall it might appear, as in fig 64b. The absence of any evidence of this archway on the exterior wall of The Place suggests that the eastmost wall has been rebuilt, or refaced with new masonry.

In the earlier monastic period, the dorter was usually a long narrow open-plan room as at the Cistercian abbey of Cleeve in Somerset [plate 118]. The dorter at Paisley, as was the custom in the later medieval period, would probably have been partitioned off to form individual cubicles for each monk, sometimes furnished with a desk and chair; and perhaps lighted by tall single windows allowing the monks the opportunity for reading during the afternoon rest periods.[139] It has been suggested[140] that Abbot Chisholm may have allowed the partitioning of the dorter at Paisley into separate chambers for the monks, as had happened at Balmerino.[141]

The monks' dorter at Paisley would have extended beyond the line of the south range, in accordance with the standard monastic plan.[142] This development was the direct result of the introduction of the chapter house into the east range at Cluny II [143] [fig 46]. This is the reason why the standard plan differs from the tradition

set out on the Plan of St Gall [fig 45]. Thus, all British Cluniac monasteries, including Paisley, and those of the other Orders, coming after Cluny II, invariably have this elongated east range. Had the dorter not occupied the "classic position for such a room" (that is the upper floor of the east range[144]), it would have upset the domestic economy of the plan.

To account for the site of the drain, the dorter at Paisley might well have been about one hundred feet long. It could be argued that a room of such proportions would have been too large, initially, for twelve monks and a prior. Yet, a room of similar proportions existed at Castle Acre [plate 119], the remains of which are rather spectacular. This building is one hundred and ten feet long and lighted from the north.[145] It was originally supported on central piers, whose stumps are still extant: Castle Acre was originally founded for a community of twenty-six monks[146], and undoubtedly such a dorter would also have been too large for so few monks. Therefore, there are several good reasons why the dorters at both Paisley and Castle Acre were built larger than was apparently necessary.

Firstly, there would have been the expectation of increased vocations. At Castle Acre the monastic community did increase to thirty-five monks by 1279, the highest number recorded[147]; secondly, any increase in vocations would have to be housed. At Lewes, for example, this did occur, but the dorter had to be doubled in size from 102 ft x 35 ft to 213 ft x 69 ft. Since this also necessitated the virtual rebuilding of the cloistral ranges, the resulting upheaval of the monastic site was probably quite traumatic for the monks themselves.[148]

Nearer to Paisley, the remains of the monks' dorter at Dunfermline [on the right of plate 120a] give the observer an indication of just how substantial the dorter at Paisley could have been.[149] Access to the dorter in most other monasteries was normally via the day stairs from the east cloister walk, as at Cluny. Next to the site of the chapter house at Paisley, in the remains of the south-east corner of the cloister walk, there is archaeological evidence[150] of what is likely to have been the entrance to the day stairs to the dorter above. This archaeological evidence consists of the remains of the springer of an arch [plate 121a], its smoothed dressed ashlar sides chamfered up to the spring with just enough of the extrados showing to indicate that it had indeed been an arch. It is unlikely that the archway connected originally with the south range, as it does now, for the present turret stair swings in a circular direction leading to the gallery built over the south cloister walk after 1560.[151]

Although the day stairs at Cluny II occupied a site similar to that at Paisley, unlike Paisley the stairs at Cluny were apparently external to the dorter in that they may have occupied part of the cloister walk [fig 46]. At Paisley the day stairs would probably have been actually part of the structure of the dorter itself, access to the stairs being afforded by the aforementioned archway, as at Castle Acre. If the site of this archway at Paisley is compared with its Cluniac contemporaries, it will be noted that it occupies a similar position to the day stairs at Thetford [plate 121b], Castle Acre [plate 121c], Lewes, and perhaps at Bermondsey [fig 58], that is, immediately to the south east of the chapter house.

The stairs rising up to the monks' dorter at Castle Acre through the round-arched entrance next to the chapter house (they share the same wall), afford an excellent picture of the achievements of monastic architecture of the Middle Ages, a view which is readily verified from within the ruined undercroft of the dorter itself [plate 121d]. The evidence of the stairs at Thetford, which occupied a similar position, is not quite as dramatic since only a few of the stairs are still extant.

There is no such evidence at Wenlock where the dorter range (apart from the chapter house) no longer exists. At Monk Bretton the earlier and later daystairs were built into the south wall of the inner parlour, and the north wall of the frater respectively. The east range is much in evidence at Crossraguel, and in the fifteenth century, access to the dorter on the first floor was made by a stair built into the treasury below [plate 122a & b]. The entrance to the stairway occupies a similar position to the remains of the archway at Paisley.

The situation is similar at Crossraguel, where the dorter is separated from the south transept by the fifteenth century scriptorium and library over the sacristy and chapter house, probably built by Abbot Colin.[153] Therefore, the site of this remnant of an archway at Paisley is common to most medieval monasteries, all of which followed the lines of the standard monastic plan. The proportions of the archway enclosing the day stairs of the Norbertine or Premonstratensian abbey at Dryburgh is a good indication of what could have been the situation at Paisley in the medieval period [plate 124].

Furthermore, the fact that Cluny II herself had no night stair[154], would suggest that here is an important precedent for Paisley where, like its contemporaries, the only access to the dorter would have been via the day stairs in the east cloister. Though some Cluniac houses (like Payerne, Switzerland) had night stairs[155], others (like Maillezais, Vendée[156]) did not. This suggests that there were even variations of the monastic layout within the Cluniac tradition. Nevertheless, it appears that, in the majority of cases, the British Cluniac houses followed the tradition of Cluny itself in not having night stairs.

Contrary to what has been suggested, there appears to be no evidence that a night stair from the dorter to the south transept existed at Paisley.[157] There were no night stairs at Castle Acre or Thetford[158] [figs 52 & 53], nor is there is evidence of any at Wenlock [fig 3]. However, Crossraguel does appear to have had "night stairs in the turret in the south side of the choir" [fig 55] providing access from the library and scriptorium down into the sacristy.[159] But, Crossraguel is a comparatively compact site, and the night stair is late [plate 125].

In the first instance, the night stair was usually sited against the west wall of the south transept, as at Hexham (Augustinian Canons) [plate 126a], and Pluscarden Valliscaulian) [plate 126b]. At Hexham and Pluscarden the night stairs extend along the west walls of each south transept; at Hexham the night stair extends approximately thirty yards along the wall, whilst at Pluscarden it extends approximately six yards.[160] In both cases the night stair occupies the greater part of the west wall of each south transept. Thus, Hexham and Pluscarden show the need for space to build night stairs, since to

construct one too steeply, would have made it a safety hazard.[161]

At Paisley south transept [fig 66], even though there is approximately thirty feet between the south wall and the thirteenth arcading to build a night stair, the existence of the arcading would have been an insurmountable obstruction, in any case, there is certainly no evidence to suggest that one existed, never mind a doorway to the dorter. The only feasible stairway in this part of the abbey would have been a newel stair, as at Crossraguel and St Andrews, but there is no evidence for such a thing.

At Melrose [plate 127], the archaeological evidence of the night stair, leading from the doorway of the dorter down the west wall and into the north transept, is quite obvious. If the present west wall at St Mirren's Aisle is later, then this could be the reason for the complete disappearance of any evidence of an early night stair. Furthermore, the flat buttress on the north side of the arcading is very Early English in appearance, and is there mainly to support the arcading so it could hardly have supported a night stair as has been suggested.[162] The fact that Cluny, and its daughter houses in England, had no night stair would suggest that there is every likelihood that the situation was the same at Paisley.

It has been suggested by most commentators on Paisley Abbey that the west range (demolished in 1873) [plate 128], was in fact the dorter range.[163] There are precedents. Durham, for example, a Benedictine cathedral priory, had its dorter rebuilt c.1400 on the west side, probably because of drainage problems. A similar situation existed at Easby Abbey [164], another

Premonstratensian house, but these are the exceptions. The rere-dorters at both Durham and Easby were built to the west of the south range, so avoiding close contacts with the frater and the kitchens. Because Paisley was a well-drained site, its layout would have followed the well tried and successful standard monastic plan. The dorter would have occupied the top floor of the east range as was customary, and not the west range, where it would have been near the kitchen, thus upsetting monastic dictates regarding hygiene.

At Cluny, beyond and parallel with the traditional west range, was one exclusively for the use of the *famuli* or lay-brothers, who were quite distinct from the Cluniac *conversi*. The Cluniac *conversi* (unlike their Cisterian counterparts) were other monks in the fullest sense, and even though they did not participate in the full liturgical observance they shared the same accommodation as the choir monks.[165]

However, as there appear to have been no facilities at the British Cluniac houses for lay-brothers it is more than likely that they would have been so few in number as not to merit separate apartments. The reason is that few of the Cluniac houses in Britain appear to have had lay-brothers, and of those that did have them, there is no record after the thirteenth century.[166] Whether Paisley had lay-brothers or not is conjectural, and even supposing Paisley did have lay-brothers, there would not have been enough to merit the use of the west range as a lay-brothers dorter, as was the custom in houses of the Cistercian Order.

The extension of the dorter range did not change the site of the rere-dorter which continued to occupy its traditional site south of the dorter (and attached to

it), either at the south end, as at Castle Acre Priory[167], or parallel to the east, as at Dunfermline [plate 120a], with access by the usual bridge still the norm. It was also usual for the monks to have access to the rere-dorter from the ground floor of the east range. The door originally giving access to the rere-dorter can be seen in the southmost corner of the day room at Pluscarden [168] [plate 129].

Although there is no archaeological evidence for the rere-dorter at Paisley there is evidence (no matter how slight), that it did exist. A map of Paisley [fig 66a] based on one of 1499, purports to show buildings, probably the dorter, reaching southwards to the line of the drain, which is also evident. A smaller building to the south probably represents the rere-dorter. Moreover, considering the extant archaeological evidence at Castle Acre, Thetford, and Monk Bretton, Lewes and Crossraguel, where the rere-dorters sat astride the great drain, there is every likelihood that the rere-dorter at Paisley would have followed the custom of its Cluniac contemporaries [fig 66b].

At Castle Acre, in particular, there are also extensive remains of the rere-dorter[169] [plate 130a], which is a substantial two-storey building, like the dorter range. There is considerable evidence of the moulded and dressed stonework which formed the cubicles, the channels and the supporting arches which spanned the channels themselves [plate 130b]. The observer is provided with a good contrast if he compares the water-filled open drain at Castle Acre [plate 131a], weather permitting, with Monk Bretton's well-preserved stone drainage system [plate 131b]. At Crossraguel, considerable remains of the rere-dorter lie to the south of the dorter range, with the water still flowing

through [plate 131c]. At Monk Bretton and Thetford there are remains only of the outline of the rere-dorter. All this evidence suggests that Paisley's rere-dorter would probably have been a substantial two-storey building, but perhaps not quite as long as that at Castle Acre.

If the rere-dorter had been attached to the east cloistral range (as would be expected) there would have been a drain to carry sewage from the rere-dorter. The great drain at Paisley 7 ft high x 5 ft wide, built in ashlar, and having a ribbed roof, has recently come to light again (largely due to the sustained efforts of John Malden of Paisley Museum) [plates 132a & b]. It runs southwards in the direction of Abbey Bridge, approximately fifty yards from the present abbey buildings and has often been referred to as a secret passage between the monastery and beyond.[170] At Paisley, to the west of the abbey, the drain is said to have run into Ellis's Lane[171] [fig 68]. Though it no longer exists, Ellis's Lane ran parallel to the nave as a continuation of Abbey Street, passing close to where the south corner of the west range would have stood.

The great drain [modern plan fig 69a & b] runs in a north-west direction, showing that the monks of Paisley took advantage of the flow of the White Cart to provide them with all the fresh water they needed, besides carrying the sewage northwards away from the monastic buildings. No doubt, this is one of the major reasons why that particular site, on the south bank of the River Cart, was chosen for the Abbey of Paisley. When the site of the great drain, together with that of the monastic buildings is compared with other Cluniac sites (such as Castle Acre, fig 52), the similarities in the layout of the monastic plan are self-evident. The change in the form the drain takes (at * on fig 69a), would suggest

that a building would have sat astride the drain at this point.[172] Thus, both the dorter and rere-dorter, as integral parts of the east cloistral range, probably occupied similar positions to those extant at either Crossraguel, or Castle Acre.

Though the monasteries were dissolved in 1560, this did not really affect Paisley Abbey, apart from the dispersal of the remaining monks, for in 1553 Archbishop John Hamilton arranged to have his nephew Claud appointed Commendator of Paisley. Thus, the change in religious practices meant that the abbey now became the property of Claud Hamilton. During the fighting between Mary, Queen of Scots, and the Lords of the Congregation, led by her half-brother James, earl of Moray, the Hamiltons joined the Queen's party. In the meantime, the abbey was given to the Sempills, who held it in the name of the Lords of the Congregation. When the abbey was retaken by the Hamiltons from the Sempills in 1570, it is most unlikely to have been *cast down*, as has been suggested, by the Reformers[173], for it appears to have remained intact.

In January 1571 John Hamilton, last abbot and last pre-Reformation archbishop of St Andrews, returned to his "awne place" only to find it empty, apart from a boy who held the key of the gate.[174] Had it been otherwise, Claud Hamilton would hardly have needed to take back his own abbey and The Place by force, putting a garrison of soldiers in it. In 1568 Claud Hamilton, and his abbey of Paisley, were declared forfeit for defending his queen. He did regain his Commendatorship of Paisley Abbey for a while, but was declared forfeit again in 1579. Therefore, due to the politics of the times, Claud's enforced absence once more from the abbey, now known as The Place of Paisley[175], meant that he did not return until

1585[176], by which time the Commendatorship had been held by several families.

Claud was made Lord Paisley in 1587, and in 1597 he entertained Anne of Denmark, Queen to James VI, in The Place. Not only Claud but his son James, first earl of Abercorn, John second earl, as well as the earls of Angus and Dundonald, all lived there at different times. It is difficult to say for certain what changes, if any, Claud Hamilton (and others) made to alter the fabric of the building to make it into a home, after he returned in 1585. Assuming the continued existence of the abbot's lodging, it would have provided the Hamiltons with more than adequate accommodation, whilst alterations were being carried out on the other monastic buildings in order to form a mansion house.

On 24 July 1617 James VI (1567-1625) came to The Place, where he was entertained in the Great Hall of Abercorn, by Lord Claud, then an old man. Although there appears to be no mention of the Great Hall prior to 1580[177], wherever this hall was sited, it was certainly not in the west block, for there was no accommodation there whose proportions could have merited being described as "great." However, had it been in the east range, then it could have been the converted dorter, which would have been of considerable size, and hung with tapestries, it would have resembled any great baronial or banqueting hall extant at that time. Despite the suitability of the dorter for conversion to such a grand room of state, the Great Hall was more than likely the monastic frater, whose original use would have enabled it to be used with minimum (if any) alterations.

Assuming that all or most of the monastic quarters were still extant when Claud came into his inheritance,

the dorter, in particular, could easily have been converted later into domestic accommodation, a not uncommon practice.[178] In Scotland, at Dryburgh, the east range was converted for domestic use by the Haliburtons who lived in it until 1671.[179] The south and west ranges at Glenluce were altered to form domestic accommodation by the Commendator in the seventeenth century.[180] There are also similar examples in England, at Combermere Abbey, Cheshire, for example, the east range, including the dorter, was converted and became part of a post-Reformation mansion house.[181]

Lord Claud died in 1621, and with him died the Hamiltons' last link with the monastery of Paisley. He was succeeded by his grandson, the second earl of Abercorn, (Lord Claud's son James, the first earl having predeceased him). In 1626 the Abercorns were still living at The Place of Paisley, but had sold it by 1652 to the earl of Angus, who in turn sold it to Lord Cochrane, later, earl of Dundonald, in 1653.[182] The earls of Dundonald made further additions and alterations to The Place in 1672. The abbey witnessed many changes and alterations over the succeeding years, but, there appears to be no record of when and what these changes actually were, and when the frater in particular, was turned into a dwelling house [plate 133a].

Some of these changes are obvious; the extension of the frater to include the cloister walk with its corresponding passageway on the upper floor, the spiral-stairs at each end of the frater. Chimneys and internal walls were built, and an extra floor was introduced, but all at various times. A later addition, at the south-east corner of the old frater, next to St Mirren's Aisle, was the building of the tower block with crowstepped gables.

gables. This was added in 1672 (as the date-stone on the dormer window shows), to form a five storey block.

Indeed, this present cluster of buildings [plate 133b] to the east and south of the site of the chapter house, three and four storeys high, obviously dates from the post-Reformation period, because it bears no relationship to what would have been found forming part of a medieval monastic complex.[183] The tower block itself is reminiscent of the typical Scottish L-plan house of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century.[184]

If the east range at Paisley was not converted to domestic use, its complete disappearance (together with the rere-dorter) could be accounted for by its demolition and sale as building materials. Indeed, it could have provided its new owners with a considerable amount of available building material, not just for building a family residence, but also for sale to others.[185]

There are precedents. There is evidence that buildings were demolished at Arbroath Abbey in the sixteenth century for resale as building material[186], and at Inchcolm Abbey, when the church was partly demolished and the material sold off to Edinburgh Town Council in 1581.[187] Cambuskenneth Abbey was also demolished and the material also sold off, some of the stonework perhaps being used in the building of Mar's Wark at Stirling, for some of the dressed stones there have what are obviously consecration crosses cut into their faces.[188] Similarly, parts of the wall of Kinloss Abbey were used in 1650 to build the citadel of Inverness.[189] Indeed, as late as 1757 the gate-house of Paisley, built by Tervas, George Schaw's famous precinct wall, and other parts of the abbey, were taken down and sold off as building stone.

Because the frontage of the four storey block is of random rubble (which is in keeping with the stonework on the north front of the existing south block), it is more than likely that the ashlar belonging to the chapter house was not used to build this part of The Place over the east cloister walk, which as has been suggested, was the work of the Dundonalds.[190] The south front of The Place actually occupies the south line of the cloister walk, which was incorporated into the building [plate 134a]. Therefore, it is unlikely that the Dundonalds could have extended the south cloister walk and incorporated it into their new residence, for they did not purchase The Place from the earl of Angus until 1653, who had only taken possession of the abbey the year before.

On the other hand, the most likely explanation is that it was the Hamiltons who began the extension of the monastic buildings into living accommodation, sometime after 1585. After all, by 1652 the Hamiltons, or Abercorns as they came to be known, had occupied the abbey for over seventy years. As noted earlier, the earls of Dundonald added the L-shaped tower block in 1672[191], which extended into the east cloister walk, as well as occupying part of the site of the chapter house of Paisley.

The east walk of the cloister led naturally into the south walk, now the ground floor corridor, which fronted the frater, or refectory [fig 61]. As already noted, this part of the cloister was built over, during the conversion of the abbey buildings into a mansion, for one of its post-Reformation owners, the Hamiltons.

This southern building, on the site where the frater would stand, is now of varying height, and is built of

ashlar blocks similar in size and texture to those on the west front of St Mirren's Aisle itself, suggesting the same quarry and building period. It occupies a position similar to the frater at Cluny II and stands where the Paisley frater should be located, and where the fraters of the other British Cluniac monasteries (already examined) stand. Although much altered, this building undoubtedly holds the remains of the frater of the Abbey of Paisley. A similar situation exists at Ardchattan Priory, where after the Reformation the frater was converted for domestic use. Even though it was further altered between 1847 and 1855 by Charles Wilson, the monastic frater at Ardchatten is still the nucleus of the present building.[192]

The reconstruction of the frater at Paisley is said to have taken place in the late seventeenth century.[193] This reconstruction of the frater has been dated as late sixteenth-seventeenth century[194], and, later than the construction of the L-shaped tower block. Whatever the situation here, the wood panelling in the first floor rooms of The Place would determine that the interiors of the first floor rooms were remodelled at a later date, just as the plaster ceiling would date the wing as having been redecorated by the earl of Dundonald in the 1670s.

Unfortunately, because of its internal division into several storeys, the much altered frater resembles what it was not intended to be, a house rather than a monastic building [plates 133b & c]. Its domestic character is more than emphasised by the dormers (one a modern replacement), and the additions made by the earls of Dundonald. Indeed, in form the dormers matches those on the L-shaped addition of four to five storeys [plate 133b]. The seventeenth century style windows [plate 135], with sash-and-case frames, inserted into the south front

of the frater, have roll moulded jambs, like the roll moulding decorating the fireplaces in the ground floor of The Place.

There is also archaeological evidence which suggests that the south range is the frater. In its west front is a roll moulded jamb [plate 136] probably belonging to a large window, or even twin windows [see a conjectural reconstruction of the west front of the frater with window(s)[fig 69], and certainly of more modest proportions than that in the west wall of the frater at Dunfermline [plate 137].

Probably the greatest argument in favour of this part of The Place as the monastic frater is the fact that in the 1950s, during the conversion of the attic area into a flat for the minister, it was discovered that the roof was supported "every two feet by arched oak timbers shaped out of the solid tree to form a semi-circle." James Steel Maitland, the Paisley architect in charge of the conversion, considered that because they extended the whole length of the building, the oak beams were the original vaulting of the frater. The fact is

> "that the internal walls taking the chimneys were built at a later date when occupied as a dwelling house.....since the oak timbers remain within the stonework of the chimneys and are continuous from end to end and from side to side."[195] [plates 138a & b].

Also, when the earl of Dundonald added the wing in 1672, portions of the oak members of the old roof were removed, which left gaping unfilled mortices in the sloping members (which were filled in during the 1959-1960 restoration)[196] {fig 71; and figs 71a-71c}.[197] Indeed, J S Richardson, Inspector of Ancient Monuments, in his report of May, 1937, concluded that there was some evidence of monastic building in the south

range, and considered that the oak roof was probably the frater roof, though altered by the Abercorns.[198]

There are obvious similarities between the form of this ceiling at Paisley and that at the frater of Inchcolm, a house of Augustinian canons. Inchcolm has a timber barrel roof[200] [plate 139] supported on oak beams, like Paisley, but just visible through the plaster. Inchcolm was also lived in as a family residence after 1560, so the beams there could have been plastered over by the new owners. Similarly, at Paisley, due to changes in building styles since 1560, the timber beams of the roof of the frater could also have been plastered over several times, hiding the supporting beams. When Steel Maitland exposed the beams he probably exposed what was the original appearance of the roof of Paisley's frater [plates 138a & b]. Perhaps a better model for the ceiling at Paisley is the wooden beam roof at Bardowie Castle in Stirlingshire[200] [plate 140]. Although Bardowie is a fortified house, it presents the observer with a reasonable impression of the original appearance of the roof at Paisley's frater, as well as comparing favourably with that at Cleeve.

Irrespective of the form of the interior of Paisley's frater, the oak beams (had they been visible) would undoubtedly have given it much dignity, and considering the internal measurements of approximately 70ft x 20ft x 30ft high, and perhaps lighted by single windows, it would have been a frater worthy of any great monastery. As was the custom, the abbot's table would have stood on a dais below the east window(s). An ornamental hanging or pelmet would have hung above the high table, perhaps adorned with a painting of a religious theme, or his Coat-of-Arms, like those of George Schaw on the south gable of the frater. In the

prior's hall at Wenlock there is still evidence of where and how the hanging sat over Prior Singer's high table. In the south wall, and close to the abbot's table, would have been the reader's pulpit as at Dunfermline [plate 141] and Inchcolm.

Cluny II had a single storey frater like Wenlock, as suggested by the one remaining vaulting-shaft or springing joint [plate 142a] in the one corner of the refectory still standing. Also, there are what could have been two serving hatches in the west wall[201] [plate 142b], for they occupy a similar position to those at Paisley and Monk Bretton. At Paisley at ground level, are built up hatches, or windows which could well be the serving hatches to the frater [plate 143a], because Paisley, like Cluny, Crossraguel, Monk Bretton [plate 143b], Castle Acre, Thetford and other English Cluniac houses, all had kitchens close to their fraters.

The remains of the frater at Monk Bretton [plate 144] also indicate its importance. It too was a single storey building which still has its serving hatches. By the fourteenth century it had become an independent Benedictine house, and when the frater was partly rebuilt window tracery of a Decorated character was installed, of which little now remains. These alterations were, nevertheless, made to the late thirteenth century Cluniac refectory, which means that it has remained unchanged.

At Thetford (even though very little of the monastic buildings now rise above three or four feet) the remains of a single storey refectory of truly grand proportions can still be seen [plate 145], where the site of the dais on which sat the prior's table is suggested by the raised earth, as are the raised platforms parallel with the walls where the community sat. At Castle Acre[202], despite

the meagre remains, it is likely that the refectory was also a single storey building similar to that at its sister house of Thetford.

In view of the Cluniac tradition as seen at Cluny II, Castle Acre, Thetford and Monk Bretton, where the fraters were single storey buildings, it would be easy to assume that at Paisley, the frater would also have been a single storey building, rather than one of two storey building as at Crossraguel and Lewes.[203] At Crossraguel, the refectory sat over the monks' common room reached by stairs from the cloister walk, but since it is a much more compact site than Paisley it should not necessarily be seen as a precedent for the mother house.

The important Benedictine monastery of Dunfermline also had a two storey frater, largely because of the steep site, but that is not the situation at Paisley where the monastic site is quite flat. Other Scottish abbeys like Culross, Dryburgh, Glenluce, Inchcolm, Iona, Jedburgh, Pluscarden, and St Andrews had two storey fraters.[204] What this evidence suggests is that in Scotland the two storey frater may have been the norm, and considering that there appears to be no definite evidence of single storeyed fraters existing in Scotland (excluding perhaps Cistercian houses), there is none with which to compare Paisley. Also, Paisley Abbey as part of the mainstream of Scottish monasticism probably followed what may have been the norm, so more than likely would have had a two storey frater like its Benedictine contemporaries.

As already noted, at Paisley there is evidence of roll moulding in the west gable, which probably is the only extant evidence of the west window(s) of the frater. It could not have been an upper doorway providing access

to the frater for any external stairway would have been in the way of the kitchen below. In any case, there is no archaeological evidence to suggest the existence of an external stairway. So the probability is that the roll moulding belonged to the jamb of a window, whose remains sit about twelve feet above the present ground level. [plate 136, I have measured this] This suggests that the window sat high above floor level, as at Dunfermline, and appears to have been the monastic custom.

The extant frater at Carlisle [plates 146a & b] (now the library), is a good comparison with Paisley, and perhaps similarly proportioned. Carlisle has an expansive vaulted undercroft reached by stairs, for it is well below ground level, whilst access to the frater above is afforded by a segmental arched and moulded doorway leading to the stairway at the west end, the customary site. Also, Carlisle has the traditional large west window [plate 146a], but those lighting the north wall are extremely small, to allow for the cloister walk [plate 146b]. The windows lighting the south wall are the full height of the upper floor, but may not be quite as tall as those late examples at Monk Bretton. Here is an obvious precedent for Paisley, where the fenestration of the frater presents the observer with quite a problem. If the Paisley frater had been lit by tall windows (as at Dunfermline and Monk Bretton), it would have been extremely difficult for the post-Reformation masons to disguise their presence, but if the windows were similar in proportion to those at Carlisle, then the masons' job may have been more straightforward.

When the Royal Lodging to the south-west of Dunfermline Abbey became a royal palace, the earlier fenestration was much altered to provide windows more befitting a royal residence, but, as the archaeological

evidence shows quite clearly, remnants of the earlier fenestration are still extant [plate 147a]. Any archaeological evidence would have disappeared had the south front been completely rebuilt, but since the ashlar is similar to that at St Mirren's Aisle, this appears to be an unlikely alternative.

The only probable explanation of (and practical solution to) the problem is that the frater at Paisley was lit by windows similar to Carlisle, which could easily be replaced by the present large sash-and-case windows. These are approximately 8 ft x 5 ft (I have measured these), which may explain the lack of any archaeological evidence of earlier windows. This is another argument in favour of Paisley's frater being two storeys rather than one.

Steel Maitland also formed the opinion that the frater was a two storey building. The archaeological evidence of the roll moulding suggests that there would have been just enough room for cellars below the frater, provided that the floor level of the cellars was below that of the cloister, as at Carlisle. Indeed, the fact that the cellars in the former west range rose to a height of 6 ft 6 ins. supports the argument that the frater was of two storeys. Also, if cellars were below cloistral level, this would have allowed the window in the west gable of the frater to sit above floor level, and so follow monastic building practice. So it is more than likely that the frater at Paisley was a two storey building as at the daughter house of Crossraguel, and Lewes the mother house of the English Province.

On the ground floor, in the former south cloister walk and in the interior of the frater or Place of Paisley, there is evidence of a springer and large

corbels, now disused. These do not prove conclusively that the frater originally was a two storey building, for the corbels could be later inserts, as a means of dividing the building into separate floors in order to increase the residential accommodation.[205]

Thus, it is more than likely that the ground floor rooms off the south walk of The Place were built some time after 1560, at which time Paisley Abbey had ceased to be monastic, becoming a mansion house for Lord Claud Hamilton as we have seen.[206] The presence in the ground floor rooms of The Place, of fireplaces with roll moulding, of probable seventeenth century date, also supports this argument.

Above the present ground floor rooms, are three apartments, similarly proportioned, but with higher ceilings, and wooden panelling of late seventeenth or early eighteenth century. Such renovations within the frater would have destroyed its original appearance, together with any evidence of the obligatory reader's pulpit.[207] Access to these upper rooms is by a corridor or gallery built over the south cloister walk, whose windows, with those on the ground floor below, lie along the original line of the arcading of the south walk. The unusually steep pitch of the roof as it reaches down over the (former) south walk of the cloister, explains the unusual shape of the gallery roof on the first floor. This long gallery, with its oak beam roof, is post-Reformation, and with its narrow walk, makes it similar to that at Prior Singer's new lodging at Wenlock of the last quarter of the fifteenth century.[208]

Before the changes which took place after 1560, the observer, before encountering the formal entrance to the

frater, should expect to find in or near the southern cloister walk at Paisley, the lavatorium, or lavatory where the monks would have washed their hands and faces prior to entering to take their places at table.[209] The "formal entrance" to the frater would have stood in the west corner of the south cloistral walk, as at Wenlock [plate 148], and still visible at Norwich even though (like Wenlock) the frater has long since disappeared.

Wenlock, the mother house, boasts what is probably the most renowned Romanesque lavatorium in England, but at Paisley like its other Cluniac contemporaries (including Crossraguel) there is no evidence of the monastic lavatorium at all. Norwich has a wonderful example [plate 149a], but at Dryburgh Abbey there is a good plain Scottish example [plate 149b], though rather spartan when compared with Norwich.

However, J S Richardson, Inspector of Ancient Monuments, in his report on the condition of The Place (17 May, 1937), specifically mentioned the extant remains of the Gothic frater doorway, which he suggested "should be relieved of the false building and treated for preservation."[210] There is no indication of where this "remnant" was to be found.

There is scant evidence of the doorway into the frater at Monk Bretton, and none at Thetford, Castle Acre, Lewes, or Crossraguel. There is every likelihood that the entrances into the fraters of the more important Cluniac houses would have been as grand as that at Wenlock, though perhaps not similar in style. This is not so at the daughter house of Crossraguel, where it is more than likely that the entrance would have been as simple as that to the chapter house. There is no doubt

that the grandeur of the entrance to the frater emphasised its importance within the monastic complex.

Dr Boog, minister of Paisley Abbey in the late eighteenth century, wrote that he had witnessed the taking down of the frater, which stood in the south-east section of the monastic complex.[211] Boog was obviously mistaken, for the frater is still standing. What Boog may have witnessed was either the taking down of the monks' dorter, or even the remains of the abbot's lodging, since that is probably where it stood.[212]

Close to the frater, and to the south-west, the observer should find either the monastic kitchen or evidence of it, as at Dunfermline [plates 150a & b]. Unfortunately, there is no extant archaeological evidence at Paisley of the monastic kitchen. There was evidence of arcading on the south wall of the former west range [plate 151], which could be interpreted as fireplaces, if compared with the evidence at Dunfermline. This evidence together with the blocked window [plate 143a], and doorway, on the west gable of the frater, suggests that here stood the monastic kitchen, which would have been a continuation of the west range itself (as at Monk Bretton, Castle Acre, Thetford, and other Cluniac houses). Also this blocked doorway and hatch, at Paisley, are ideally situated to provide access from the kitchen to the nearby frater[213], as at Carlisle [plate 146a]. During the demolition of the west range and the laying-out of the new road, Semple recorded[214] that

> "in digging southward to make the new foundation of the widened street, (archaeological remains consisting of) the foundations of old arches, extending thirty feet southwards, were discovered, and in all probability these were the cloisters of the monastery."[215]

Its area of approximately 30 sq.ft. makes it equal in size with the kitchens at the previously mentioned Cluniac houses, as well as occupying a similar position. Moreover, as noted above, the remains of the old arches may have been the kitchen fireplaces.

Unfortunately, this important archaeological evidence, which showed that these remains were the monastic kitchen of Paisley, were misinterpreted by Semple. The probable site of the kitchen at Paisley would obviously have been near the recently re-discovered great drain. Indeed, it would have had its own drain as did the kitchens at Castle Acre[216], Crossraguel, Thetford, Wenlock and Monk Bretton. The south cloister walk not only led to the frater and the kitchen, as located, but also led northwards into the west cloister walk which fronted the east wall of the west range.

The west range [plate 152a] (like the frater) survived the turbulent times which followed the year 1560 and was still extant in 1873. It was a two storey building and measured 82ft 6 ins long x 33ft wide, and was 20ft high at the west front. It was built with polished ashlar, and projected nine feet beyond the south buttress at the west front of the abbey church.[217]

The only extant evidence of the west range is in old photographs which captured its demolition. The character of the building was ably described by David Semple, the Paisley antiquarian, though rather sadly he unfortunately misinterpreted the evidence.[218] Were this range extant today Paisley would have had an almost complete set of claustral buildings, similar to Inchcolm, of great architectural, historical and archaeological importance.

Although Semple said that there was a marked difference in the ashlar between the ground floor and the first floor, a close scrutiny of plates 152a and 152b (of the exterior and cloister walls of the west range), reveals that the ashlar on the first floor is similar in size and texture to that on the ground floor. However, the ashlar above the west gable window of the abbey church is different from that of the lower levels, yet no one would suggest that this was not medieval, so in the same way the first floor could have had different ashlar due to a rebuild, or due to a change in master mason. Access to the cellarage on the ground floor was by four entrances 6ft high x 3ft wide (marked B on plate 152a), two of which are not in the photograph. It was lit by four loop-holes 1ft 11 ins x 6 ins wide. There was also an arched entrance (marked A on plate 152a) 8ft high, and decorated with roll moulding.[219] This was indeed the main entrance into the cloister, as at Castle Acre where it afforded entry to the original prior's quarters [plate 153]; there were similar entrances at Thetford, Monk Bretton and Wenlock, but not at Crossraguel, it not having a west range.

According to Semple, the arched entrance, at Paisley, led into "a passage 33ft in length, 5ft 3 inches in breadth, and 8ft in height at the centre of the arches. It was arched with seven strong ribs,"[220] perhaps like that at Buildwas Abbey, Shropshire [plate 154]. This arched passageway leading to the cloister at Paisley was clearly visible during the demolition of the west range [plate 155]. Above the eastern entrance to this slype were affixed "the Arms of Abbot George Schaw, with three covered cups with a crozier behind the shield [plate 156a]. Abbot Schaw was the brother of Schaw of Sauchie."[221] These Arms [plate 156c], were enclosed in a hood-mould [plate 156b], showing that the building was

certainly medieval, and probably rebuilt or remodelled at some time during the abbacy of George Schaw. The hood-mould compares favourably with a similar, though late medieval example, in the fore tower at Tantallon Castle, dated 1556 [plate 156d].

During his restoration work in The Place, Steel Maitland discovered the remains of part of Schaw's stone archway, and though he says they were found at the west end he did not give their exact location. From its mouldings, he dated the arch as late fourteenth or early fifteenth century. It could have been that part of the formal entrance to the frater, which Richardson commented on (see fn. 198). Maitland assumed that Schaw's archway led to the cloisters[222], and he was correct [plate 155]. Steel Maitland's find could well have been that half, built over when the frater was extended northwards to encompass the south walk of the cloister.

Semple, unfortunately, did not regard the slype as medieval, because the ribbed bays lacked symmetry.[223] However, had he looked more closely at the abbey church of Paisley he would have noticed that it lacks the symmetry he assumed all medieval churches enjoyed.

The ground floor of the west range was divided into four arched cellars [plate 114], two on either side of the slype, each 23ft 3 ins x 13ft 9ins broad x 6ft 6 ins high, and divided by a pier 2ft thick. In the interior, on the cloister side, both cellars had an arched communication slype 5ft high x 3ft 9ins wide. The floors of the cellars were one foot below ground level. The style of these cellars is very similar to examples at Crossraguel and Inchmahome, and at other monastic sites in Scotland and England.

A slype, or outer parlour, was usually found on the ground floor of the west range of the monastic complex, which provided easy access to the cloister from the outer court.[224] At Paisley, there was an entrance below the external stairway [plate 157] next to the church, which was the customary place for the outer parlour.[225] Here the monks would have met their visiting relatives, and the cellarer, or other officials of the abbey, would have discussed business with the local merchants of Paisley. A good example of an outer parlour is that at Buildwas Abbey, Shropshire [plate 154]. Remnants of another archway are said to have been found and subsequently used in the rebuilding of the entrance to the cloister.[226] Thus at Paisley, there was a door occupying an identical site to that of the outer parlour at Cluny II, and its contemporary English Cluniac houses. In 1873, Semple mentioned the finding of evidence of a fine archway in the north-east corner of the cloister court.[227] Yet, as plate 114 illustrates, there was obviously no such division between the parlour and cellar at Paisley; and plate 152b shows that there was no evidence of such an archway in the cloister.

More important evidence relating to the parlour lies in the extant archaeological evidence of two springer corbels [plate 158a] still in-situ attached to the south-west corner buttress at the west front of the abbey church. This is very important archaeological evidence, and when compared with similar corbelling at both Inchmahome Priory and Mar's Wark, Stirling [plate 158b], these can only be the springers from which the vaulting rose to support the stone roof of an outer parlour. Examples of the kind of vaulting possibly at Paisley are to be found at Dunfermline Abbey [plate 158c].

The stairs giving access to the upper floor were seen as having been built by the earl of Dundonald in 1763.[228] The platform of the external stair at the north-west corner was supported on corbelling decorated with dogtooth moulding [229] [plate 157]. Dogtooth moulding is indicative of the Early English period of architecture as seen at the west front of the abbey church, and suggests that the corbelling, at least, may have been erected at the same time as the west front. The presumed date for the erection of the stair is dependant on the belief that the west range was not medieval, but an addition of the earl of Dundonald. Logically, then, the external stair had to be post-medieval. What is most likely is that the pre-Reformation stairs were adapted to later use, having a wrought iron railing added to it in its later history. Thus, as old prints and photographs illustrate, the former external stairway, with iron handrail [plate 152a] at Paisley's west range, is certainly not out of character; even today, people still live in tenements which are reached via external stairs with handrails.

External stairs in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were not uncommon.[230] Crossraguel had an external stair to the first floor of the abbot's lodging, and situated in a similar position to that at Paisley, though there is scant evidence of it.[231] Wenlock may have had a stair in the north-west corner of the west range, but the evidence is not conclusive.[232] Indeed, the upper floor of the guest accommodation at Inchcolm was also reached by an external stair, but there is no longer any evidence of it.[233]

The upstairs of the west range at Paisley was divided into two rooms, that on the north 28ft long x 25ft broad, whilst that to the south measured 39ft long x 24ft broad; both rooms were 13ft 6 ins to the ceiling.

Both interiors were wood-panelled with pilasters and stucco finishing (perhaps in the manner of the interior of The Place), which would have been late seventeenth early eighteenth century work, and executed no doubt by the earl of Dundonald.[234] Each room had a fire-place 7ft wide x 4ft 7 ins high.[235]

On the exterior, above the slype in the centre of the ground floor, was a chimney supported on corbelling [plate 152a and also plate 152b, where the chimney can be seen from the cloister court]. This evidence suggests that this was a medieval chimney[236], and that the accommodation in the upper floor would have had the customary fireplaces for the guests.

The sash-and-case windows of this range were 8ft 6 ins high x 4ft 3 ins broad, and probably seventeenth century replacements, and contemporary with those in The Place. The window architraves were decorated with roll moulding, again similar to those at the windows in the south wall of the frater and decorating the fireplaces in the interior of The Place.

These seventeenth century windows were considered as proof of the first floor's lack of antiquity [plate 152a], but as suggested earlier, windows of such proportions could easily have replaced smaller medieval ones, nor did the presence of those windows disprove the range's claim to antiquity. Some have argued otherwise.

Rowand Anderson in a lecture delivered to the Glasgow Archaeological Society on 16 March, 1882, concluded that the ground floor and cellars were certainly fifteenth century, and that although the upper floor to the eaves was probably of the same date it had been altered to form part of the Dundonald mansion.[237]

Nevertheless, the great deal of evidence which showed that the west range was medieval was either ignored in 1873 to hasten the demolition of the range, or ignorance of archeological matters is to blame; it is more than likely to have been a combination of both.

If the west range is compared with Castle Acre[238] and Monk Bretton, it is obvious that (as was the custom[239]), these first floor rooms, before the building of any later accommodation, were the original prior or abbot's lodging with guests' accommodation. The upper floor was divided into a smaller chamber on the north-west and a larger one to the south-west with a fireplace, hence the chimney immediately above the slype or entrance into the cloister.[240]

Originally the guests' accommodation would have catered for the wealthier visitors, and not the poorer travellers, who were probably housed in or near the gate-house.[241] Unlike the west ranges of other monastic houses there is no evidence to suggest that it was extended in the later Middle Ages. Thus Cluniac Paisley, which appears to have retained some contact with Cluny until the Reformation[242], followed the practice seen at Castle Acre, Monk Bretton and Thetford, where the west range was the original prior's lodging with guests' accommodation. Entry into Paisley Abbey is said to have been by way of a great pend[243], perhaps similar to those at Arbroath and St Andrews, which were separate from the gate-house and afforded access into the inner court of the monastery [244] [fig A],

An excellent example of a Cluniac west range is to be found at Castle Acre, where the original mid-twelfth century apartments were continually being added to, eventually resulting in the building of the famous

prior's solar and chapel in the fifteenth century[245] [plate 159]. Prior Richard Singer also had a new range, or lodging, built at Wenlock in the fifteenth century. The reason why these priors' and abbots' lodgings were extended was in response to their new "*social status*" for as monasteries grew in importance abbots and priors found themselves playing the role of Lord of the Manor, as well as spiritual head of the convent. Therefore, it became necessary for religious superiors, as Lord of the Manor, to have separate lodgings and kitchen to entertain important guests.[246]

The original prior's lodging at Thetford was replaced by more commodious accommodation to the north-west c.1300-1400[247] [plate 160]. At Crossraguel, the abbot's fourteenth century lodge was extended in the fifteenth century. In the sixteenth century a rather substantial tower house [plate 161a] was added to the abbot's lodging [plate 161b].

All of these priors' lodgings were substantial buildings, and some were of considerable "style", but none matched Prior Richard Singer's magnificent new lodge at Much Wenlock, built in the last quarter of the fifteenth century [plate 162]. The east front is built in the grand manner with its remarkable range of windows. The interior is palatial even when compared to the relative grandeur of the prior's lodge at Castle Acre.[248] These elements give this range of buildings a unique character, making them one of the finest examples of late medieval domestic architecture in England.[249]

Unfortunately, like most of the monastic buildings of Paisley Abbey, there is no extant archaeological evidence of a later abbot's lodging or where such a building might have been situated. The option of a

religious superior having separate lodgings was certainly implied in chapter 53 of the Rule.[250]

Considering the situation at these other Cluniac houses (mentioned above), there is every likelihood that, in later centuries, Paisley, in view of its important position within the kingdom of Scotland, would have had an abbot's lodging. Even its relatively unimportant daughter house Crossraguel possessed an abbot's lodging, as we have seen. Needless to say, Cluny too possessed an abbot's lodging, which was of palatial proportions. Therefore, it is more than likely that Paisley also had its abbot's lodging. A total lack of "physical evidence" could be accounted for by its complete demolition and the removal of the stone in later centuries. As suggested earlier, the abbot's lodging may well have been the building the Rev Dr Boog mistakenly described as the frater, prior to its demolition.

Also, important abbeys like Paisley were often expected to entertain the king and his retinue. There are examples of priors' and abbots' lodgings in Scotland, some of which were considerable structures as seen from their ruins, but the most obvious example is the royal guest house at Dunfermline. After the Reformation, Dunfermline's guest house was so commodious that it was easily transformed into a royal palace. With the accession of the Stewarts to the throne of Scotland in 1371, Paisley, by virtue of its close connection with the new royal house, became a royal foundation. Indeed, the abbots of Paisley would not only have required accommodation for their royal guests, but spacious accommodation[251] perhaps not unlike that at Dunfermline, for visits by James IV were not uncommon at Paisley.[252] A "large hall" is said to have existed at Paisley[253], but

this hall is the one said to have been built by the Hamiltons post 1560, and demolished in 1760-61.[254]

When James IV's grandaughter, Mary Queen of Scots, "progressed" throughout the kingdom, the Court accompanied her, amounting to a large number of persons, together with a considerable amount of luggage and other accoutrements and furnishings, including no doubt a throne of state with embroidered hangings, all considered necessary for Her Majesty's comforts.[255] Indeed, it appears that King James IV also travelled with a considerable amount of luggage, for in 1504 a carter was hired to transport it from Ayr to Paisley, and from there to Linlithgow.[256] James would also have been accompanied by his Court during his "progresses". Where, for example, was the royal entourage housed in 1507 when James IV and his Court came to visit Paisley, and stayed for eight days, at which time he again gave "drink silver to the masons."[257] It is highly unlikely that his court could have been housed in Paisley Abbey, and certainly not in the west range over the cloister, which only had two rooms. The housing of a large number of courtiers and servants would probably have been arranged in the town of Paisley, where the abbey is known to have had considerable property.[258]

Fortunately, the presence of an abbot's lodging does not rest on conjecture alone for it can be inferred from documentary evidence of sixteenth century provenance. Undoubtedly, the abbot's lodging would have had at least two halls and other offices, as was the case at Crossraguel, and the other Cluniac houses. Although there is no mention of the abbot's great hall prior to April 1580, this proves that it did exist before then.[259] There are later references to both halls in the Protocol Book of Thomas Inglis.[260] Significantly, there is

mention of "the outer chalmer" or small hall of the abbot, as being the place of witness to the signing of a notarial act on 15th February 1544.[261]

More certainty attends the mention in 1541 of the chamber of the retired abbot, George Schaw, which may have been situated close to the river[262], though it has also been suggested that Schaw lived in retirement at the abbey's grange at Blackhall.[263] It is possible that as a former abbot he may have been housed in honoured retirement in his own rooms in the abbot's quarters. When he became old and infirm, he is more likely to have been housed in the infirmary.

A survey of Scottish monasteries[264] and English abbeys [265], with evidence of separate abbot's or prior's lodgings, suggests that most of the lodgings were sited to the south or east of the dorter range, with occasionally, some attached to the dorter range itself. Also, as there is no evidence of additions having been made to the west range, it is probable then, that the abbot's lodging at Paisley lay near the Cart, as previously suggested, south-east of the dorter range where it would be both quieter and more private. It would also have been conveniently situated relative to the great drain. Lees, on the basis of the ground plan of Wenlock, assumes that it sat at the south end of, what is now Cotton Street. This would have been an ideal site for it [266] even though it cannot be said to be close to the river.

Any attempt at a conjectural reconstruction of the abbot's lodging is clearly out of the question, but it would seem reasonable to conjecture that at Paisley it would have had similar accommodation to that found in the dwelling of any other abbot or Scottish lord of the

time.[267] Thus, it could have had as many as three storeys, with fireplaces and other domestic amenities necessary for a comfortable residence, with accommodation suitable for guests of the monastery, as well as cellars, kitchens and other offices on the ground floor. A good example would be the abbot's house at Arbroath Abbey [plate 164], but Crossraguel is the obvious comparison with Paisley. Unfortunately, Crossraguel is so ruinous that [plate 161a] it is impossible to come to any conclusions as to its appearance. At Crossraguel the early abbot's lodging, with the later tower house [plate 161b], give an impression of the life-style of an abbot of a relatively unimportant monastery compared to its mother house of Paisley.

Another building which could have existed was the Lady Chapel. Since a Lady Chapel was attached to the monastic churches of Wenlock, Castle Acre, Thetford (all of which were later additions), a Lady Chapel at Paisley may have stood within the vicinity of, and to the east of the chapter house. At Cluny this is where the Lady Chapel stood. There is mention of the Lady Chapel in the "inner kirk"[268], but a more practical solution would be to have had the Lady altar in one of the transepts. The evidence of the sedilia in the choir, so close to the east end, would appear to contradict the opinion that the long choir incorporated a shrine to St Mirren at its east end.[269]

Another important building east of the claustral range was the monastic infirmary, as chapter 36 of the Rule states, it was the duty of the community to look after each member, both body and soul.[270] Unfortunately, there is no evidence for the infirmary at Paisley, although there is at Wenlock, the mother house. The infirmary at Wenlock is quite an important building, with

its chapel and the infirmarian's self-contained quarters[271] [plate 162, the infirmary is to the left of the photograph], with its Romanesque doorway.[plate 163] The infirmary at Wenlock consisted of a hall, with chapel and other offices. Although those at Castle Acre, Monk Bretton and Thetford are not identical to Wenlock, they are of the hall-type, again with chapels and other offices. Like Wenlock, Castle Acre had a chapel attached to the infirmary, whilst Thetford and Monk Bretton may have had separate chapels just like Lewes, where it lay to the north of the large aisled infirmary.

The lack of any evidence of the infirmary at Paisley is typical of that usually found at Scottish monastic sites. Indeed, there is scant evidence of infirmaries in Scotland apart from suggested remains at the abbeys of Cambuskenneth, Deer, Glenluce, Inchcolm and Jedburgh, though at Iona the infirmary was rebuilt as part of the abbey restoration.[272] Considering that the monks at Paisley in the fifteenth century numbered twenty-five compared with forty or fifty at Lewes[273], it is more than likely that the infirmary at Paisley Abbey would have been of the hall-type, with either an attached chapel, or a separate one nearby. The infirmary at Wenlock perhaps gives us an impression of what that at Paisley infirmary may have looked like.

Together with the infirmary, Paisley would have had its dove-cote, malt kiln, abbey smithy, stables, granary, brewhouse, bakehouse and mill.[274] The charter of erection of the Lordship of Paisley for Claud Hamilton in 1591, mentions that all of these together with the

> "the corne-house, kiln, barns, the smyddie-hill, with its houses, the garden called the mustard-yairde, afterwards an orchard, on the south side of the bridge of Paisley, another garden on the north side of the bridge of Paisley, the smyth-house at the east end of the bridge..." [275]

would all have been found beyond the east range of the cloister.

Unfortunately, there is no indication of the actual sites of these buildings, unlike at Castle Acre (and other contemporary Cluniac sites), where there is extensive evidence of barns and granaries; with a malthouse and brewery lying to the south-west corner of the monastic complex. At Crossraguel, there is evidence of the bakehouse and other outer buildings [fig 55]. The mill at Monk Bretton is still extant, and it is a substantial single storey building built with ashlar. Covered walkways would probably have provided access from the external buildings to the main monastic complex, as the evidence at both Castle Acre and Thetford shows.

Like her sister houses, all of these buildings would have been sited to the east of the main buildings at Paisley; and all would have been enclosed by Abbot George Schaw's great wall [fig 54a],

Also, within the enclosure would have been the monastic burial ground, usually situated in the farthest corner east of the monastic enclosure. As happens today, when the monk's life of sacrifice is over, he is carried forth to his eternal resting place. For the ordinary monk, even in death, there was no compromise with the World. The monk had no grand funereal monument, often being buried like a pauper, in a nameless plot. Here is the final anonymity, the final achievement of the cloister, its only *raison d'être*. The abbots or priors, however, were often buried in their chapter houses, or in the choirs of their churches [c/f fig B; and fig 42 the reconstruction of St Andrews].

CHAPTER IV

Restoration And Conservation In The Eighteenth And Nineteenth Centuries

After the Reformation in 1560 the nave of Paisley Abbey provided the people with a commodious parish kirk[1], suitable for the new Reformed liturgy. There is no evidence to suggest when the wall at the crossing was actually built[2] [fig 72a]. It was certainly taken down in 1895, as part of Rowand Anderson's restoration, and was found to be composed of many fragments of dressed and moulded stones[3], more than likely originally from the choir, crossing, tower and the north transept.

Nothing is known about the overall state of the fabric of the church from the late sixteenth century onwards, but what is known about the fenestration of the nave shows that it was anything but satisfactory. The north clerestory windows had been blocked up with wood whilst those to the south, with stone.[4] Some of the windows in the nave were glazed, for it was reported that by 1715 those windows which had been blocked up had been re-glazed.[5] It is only to be expected that some of the aisle windows would have been glazed to let light into the church.

The nave of the abbey, prior to the Reformation, would have had no pews. Paisley Town Council regarded pews in the church as a necessity, so on 25 January, 1672, they decided that pews and galleries would be built in the abbey at its expense.[6] By 6 October, 1673,[7] 'the galleries had been erected in the north and south aisles of the nave[8], Lord Ross of Hawkhead's gallery being reached by stairs built into the eastmost window of the north aisle[9], perhaps portrayed in the 1805 print of the two eastmost windows of the north aisle [plate 59]. Although "*the worthies*" had seats in the galleries, there was none as yet for the congregation in the nave.[10]

In 1730 a bell, cast in Holland and inscribed "*IOHANNES SPECHT ROTTERDAM AD 1730*"[11] was hung in the belfry (specially built for it) on the east gable of the nave [plate 72a].

By the late eighteenth century the abbey church of Paisley was surrounded by buildings [12][fig 72b]. The major reason for this was the dividing of the abbey precincts into feus in 1757, by William, seventh earl of Dundonald. According to Lees, the abbey precinct had changed little since the Reformation[13] until Dundonald demolished Schaw's great precinct wall, with the cachepool and abbey gateway.[14]

An advertisement appeared in the *GLASGOW COURANT* early in 1757 regarding the sale of the abbey gardens.[15] The ground was close to the River Cart, near the old bridge at Paisley, and was to be sub-divided and laid out for tenement housing. Lord Dundonald was also prepared to sell off the hewn stone from the houses and gardens of Paisley at reasonable cost as building materials.[16]

Dundonald also intimated his intention to pull down the ruined north transept and the walls of the choir and sell them off as building material too. The timely intercession of the Heritors stopped Dundonald from carrying out this act of vandalism, for they claimed the choir and transepts as church property. Unfortunately, any remains of the cloistral buildings, which may have stood adjacent to The Place, and which were the property of Dundonald, could not be saved.

When the Abercorns purchased The Place in 1764 Thomas, eighth earl[17], continued to offer feus on the abbey precincts, begun by Dundonald. Abercorn is credited with continuing the destruction of the buildings

around the abbey, pulling down the hall, or halls in 1760 and 1761, reputedly built by Claud Hamilton, first Lord Paisley.[18] Indeed, in 1782 Abercorn granted a feu to the ground opposite the west door of the abbey, a thatched house and steading being built there by 1788 [19] [fig 73].

The Rev Robert Boog had been minister of the First Charge since 1782. By 1788 "the church was in a dreadful condition. The roof was full of holes through which the birds obtained free access."[20] Indeed, the condition of the abbey church was such that in the same year the Heritors made the suggestion that the nave be pulled down and a commodious kirk built with the stone, as had happened at nearby Kilwinning in 1775.[21] The west doorway housed a dunghill and the roof was regarded as being beyond repair. The south aisle doors were still probably blocked up, because the cloister and surrounding ranges were still private property.[22]

In February 1788, the Rev Robert Boog received a letter from the Dowager Countess of Glasgow on the state of the nave. "I beg you will call a meeting of the Heritors of the Parish of Paisley" she wrote "as soon as it is convenient to consider the present state of the church and propriety of putting it into compleat repair." [23] At her instigation Boog called a Heritors' meeting for 3 March, where he read out the Countess's letter.[24] The Heritors accepted the obvious, that the church was in a very poor state of repair, despite their considerable expenditure in the past to repair it. This means that previous maintenance work carried out on the abbey prior to Boog's incumbency, was inadequate for now "a more thorough and compleat repair was *necessary* for the *best* interests of all concerned."[25] On the good Lady's initiative not only did Boog save the abbey from destruction, but set a precedent whereby every effort has

been made by succeeding ministers, and their congregations, to save the abbey and conserve it for posterity. Indeed in Boog's time the suggestion was made that someone be employed who would regularly inspect and oversee the whole fabric of the abbey[26], which suggests a determination on the part of the Heritors to keep the abbey wind and water tight. In 1805 Alex Wallace, slater, was employed to superintend the fabric at 25 guineas a year.[27]

The Heritors' meeting of 3 March, 1788, called by Boog resolved to appoint a committee[28] from their number to meet with tradesmen[29] to consider what work needed to be carried out. A working Committee was formed to superintend the work[30], and the ministers, Boog and Wylie, were asked to invite the Presbytery to meet the Heritors in the church on the 15th April, so that they could approve the decision to restore the church.[31] The Restoration Committee reported that they had advertised, in the first instance, in the Glasgow newspapers, inviting tradesmen to meet them at the church.[32] They commissioned them "to examine the state of the roof and abbey walls."[33] The tradesmen were also requested to consider the feasibility of putting on a new roof, of a lower pitch, on the nave.

The tradesmen reported that the roof couples and sarking of nave and aisles were so rotten and decayed as to be beyond repair. Because of the inherent problems, and the prohibitive expense involved in building a new roof of a lower pitch, they unanimously recommended that a new roof of similar pitch be built.[34] "We are of *the* opinion" the tradesmen added, "that one eighth of the slates may be used again."[35] Therefore, at some time the medieval lead on the roof must have been replaced by slates.[36]

On the basis of the tradesmen's findings, and their own *careful examination*, the Restoration Committee recommended to the Heritors that the tradesmen's suggestions be carried out[37]; and having advertised for proposals and estimates for executing the work, three were received for the mason work, three for the wright work, and only one for the roof.[38] James Findlater's was the lowest estimate for wright work, and it was accepted. Because of the need for a larger working scale drawing for the tradesmen, Robert Findlater was employed to prepare plans on a large scale, of the ground floor and galleries, and of the joisting of the galleries. It was agreed to give him half a guinea for each of the three drawings.[39]

Besides the necessary repairs to the roof, as noted above, the vaulting-ribs over the aisles were repaired with groins of wood, and finished, like the nave roof, with lath and plaster. The walls were secured, but the parapet over the south aisle was rebuilt in the same style, despite the recommendation that it be rebuilt like that, over the north aisle; and it was returned to the gables on the east end. The turret stairs were repaired where required, for they provided access to the roof (the reason for their building in the first place). The turrets and gutters needed some attention too. The turrets were reduced in height to the level of the parapets, both at the west front and at the junction between the north aisle and transept.[40] This action suggests that, in the medieval period, the turrets stood higher than they do at present [fig 7a]. The turrets once lowered, were covered with conical roofs, as in Billings' print[41] [plates 19 and 165], and not pyramidal roofs, as had been suggested in the tradesmen's report.[42]

In the interior, the pavement in the nave was repaired where practical, and the roofs and walls white-washed. New pews and galleries were installed, but in order to find the best arrangements for seating the congregation, tradesman were invited to draw up plans.[43] In the meantime, Boog had also drawn up plans for seating the nave, as did a few private individuals. The Committee left it to the Heritors to decide, which was the best seating plan. They chose Boog's plan as the best, for it would seat "the greatest number most commodiously and most favourably for hearing."[44]

Boog wrote to the earl of Abercorn, On the 17 May, 1788, regarding the seating of the church, enclosing two sketches of differing schemes [45] [figs 74a & b]. He informed Abercorn that "the large spaces in the middle of the church are (to be) occupied by seats. They contain also the Communion Tables, and, by removing one division at each end, they are thrown open and the area accommodated to the distributing of the Sacrament."[46] This appears to fit the description of Boog's own plan [fig 74a], which was approved on 24th March, 1788.[47] Also, and more importantly the style of the seating of fig 74a is reminiscent of that decorating the commemorative medal struck specially for the restoration, and designed by Boog's son.[48a] Also, the style of the pulpit on the Commemorative Medal is reminiscent of a description by Ramsay of Boog's restored nave. Ramsay wrote that the pulpit was "surmounted by a chaste Gothic canopy, rising to a point, at a considerable height; the pulpit and gallery are enriched with numerous carvings."[48b] This certainly describes the pulpit in figure 74c. The obvious difference between figures 74a and 74b, is that figure 74b lacks any seating, or Communion Tables before the pulpit, which appears to be contrary to that commemorated in figure 74c. Even though

figures 74a & b probably represent alternative seating arrangements for the nave in Boog's time, there is no evidence to suggest that figure 74b represents the nave prior to Boog's reseating.

Great improvements were also made in the lighting of the church by re-opening the two main lights in the great west window, completely reglazing them. Others were opened where appropriate, but it is difficult to be certain which windows are meant, for each was numbered as part of a diagram, which is no longer extant. Lastly, and very importantly, the west door was opened up.

The buildings which once surrounded the west front are clearly visible in the ground plan drawn up by Boog [fig 73]. It is obvious from the plan that the access to the church was by the north porch doorway, apart from the door in the east gable wall, which probably provided access to the roofless choir, now part of the graveyard. In any case, the thatched cottage which stood so close to the Abbey House (west range), as it was known, would have made the west door quite inaccessible. When the buildings which obscured the west front were purchased and demolished, the ground before the west front was returned to its pre-Reformation state, as well as providing access for carriages. The aisle windows at the west front were also re-opened and the wall, which extended from the south-west buttress to form an L-shaped porch at the west range or abbey house, was also removed.

When Boog wrote to Abercorn on 17 May, 1788, there is nothing in the letter to suggest that his plans for the seating were accompanied by his ground plan of the west front of the abbey, though there is every likelihood that it was. The intention was to convey to the earl that the situation was desperate, and that the

reopening of the west front would require desperate measures. Since it was imperative that the obstructions at the west end be removed, permission was sought from Abercorn to do so, which he readily gave[49], and no doubt the Restoration Committee was delighted with his response. The Heritors unanimously accepted the report, and approval was given to carry out the suggested improvements. All the remedial work was carried out, except the removal and replacement of the external stairs affording access to the Abbey House [plate 152]. Despite the Restoration Committee's advice that a small belfry, as sketched by Charles Ross, be erected over the porch at the north door of the church, it appears never to have been built. The belfry, previously erected on the east gable in 1715, was a constant source of trouble for the church, because the rope which came through the roof let in rain.

The Heritors, as was previously arranged, had already met with the Presbytery of Paisley on 15th April. The Presbytery approved of the Heritors' plans and the assessment of the parish to the sum of £1452.10s, the estimate for the necessary repairs to the abbey[50] (and quite a sum in those days). It was to be collected in four months' time by their Clerk, James Blair. The restoration began on 18 April, 1788 and was finished by 28 April, 1791. As noted above, the Heritors employed skilled tradesmen, rather than an architect.[51] They were all thanked by the Restoration Committee for their good work.[52] These men used their skill in repairing the roof, and provided Boog with a new plaster ceiling (which was only taken down in 1982).

The Restoration Committee reported on 28 April, 1791, that the fronts of the pulpit and galleries could be finished "in a more compleat elegant manner than

originally proposed" and more in keeping with the original work. The completion of the work on schedule was therefore in doubt because of the changes in design. Moreover, this meant that Mr Findlater did not have enough seasoned wood at the already agreed price to complete the contract, so he needed more time from the Heritors (and perhaps more recompense for his labours) in order to do so. He was eventually granted more time to honour his contract.[53]

Contributions were generously given towards the extra cost incurred by the change of design in the pulpit and galleries from major and minor Heritors and various members of the congregation.[54] Indeed, the finished interior of the nave was commended by many for its good taste.[55] The nave, with the new pews, was seen as being more than dignified[56], and "each section of gallery was ornamented with the armorial bearings of the Heritors".[57] Access to the galleries was to be found in each of the four corners of the church, and the pulpit was placed in front of the central pier on the north side of the nave.

At the Heritors' meeting on 28 April, 1791, the Restoration Committee, now that they had "brought that important business to a conclusion,"[58] gave an account of their stewardship. The final "Account of the Committee to the Heritors" was £1603.9s.2d, that to Mr James Findlater for the restoration work amounted to £1318.15s + £211.17s.9d for the extra work, the final sum being £1530.12s.9d: since £1493.16s. 11d had been collected, the balance due to him was £36. 15s.10d.[59] Indeed, the sale of old materials, including slates, stonework, and the old galleries and seats of 1672, which had been replaced, did eventually affect the final account for the whole work.[60]

As the restoration progressed it became obvious that the work required would be in excess of the estimates agreed to by the Heritors.[61] The work agreed at the Heritors' meeting of 15 April, 1788, did not take into account several important repairs, which at the outset were considered to be too ambitious.[62]

The new couples adopted for the roof were much stronger and better constructed than originally proposed[63]; the side aisles had been lathed and plastered; the joining of the south aisle with the nave was so secure that it kept out rain, and was now covered with lead: as were several of the angles of the roof (this had not at first been thought necessary), and the parapet over the south aisle was now perfectly secured by a covering of pitch and sand. In the interior of the nave, many breeches which had been made in the pillars, to support the beams of the earlier galleries, as well as many doors and openings were now completely repaired with good ashlar. These repairs, which are still visible today, were seen to secure the fabric of the building. The high west gable window had also been opened and re-glazed and the plaster ceiling framed in such a manner as to give a full view of the tracery; and the east window (in the east wall at the crossing) had been divided by a mullion and moulding cut round the sides.[64]

The Gothic spaces, or quatrefoils at the tops of the north clerestorey windows, which were to have remained blocked up, were also opened and re-glazed.[65] Instead of removing the stone and glazing the south clerestorey windows, the Heritors decided to remove the wooden planks covering those to the north and glazing them.[66]

The stairs and railings, affording access to the galleries in the nave, were executed in a much more

elegant form than was originally proposed, just like the new seating in the church. One or two additional repairs, which were not included in the estimate, were also carried out. In particular, extra work was necessary at the west door, and the complete repair of the north-west groin arch with lath and plaster, was finished just like the others. A new passageway was also carried over this westmost bay of the north aisle to the parapets.[67] The extra work was authorised by the Restoration Committee because it was absolutely necessary, and not to have done so could, in fact, have led to greater problems in the future. The extra work meant that £36 was overspent and "still due the undertaker."[68] Even though more work was done than intended "to secure the fabric and elegance of the finishing..." the Restoration Committee was confident that the money spent on any public work, prior to this one, had not been executed "with a stricter attention to economy or with fewer incidental expenses."[69]

As part of Boog's restoration the (alleged) tomb of Marjory Bruce with the canopy [70] [plate 166], was actually put together by Boog's son, a sculptor, from fragments supposedly found within the precincts of the church.[71]

At the Heritors' meeting held on 28 April, 1791, letters commending the work of the Restoration Committee had been received from the former earl, now marquis of Abercorn, the earl of Glasgow, and Mr McDowall, who had read all the reports of the Committee.[72] They particularly expressed their indebtedness to Mr Boog for his single mindedness in ensuring the success of the restoration, and especially for the taste and judgement he had displayed in planning and directing it, and for the economical management of the business at hand.[73]

The Heritors also decided, on the recommendation of the Restoration Committee, to enlarge the vestry; to finish off the north porch with a groin arch (like the arches over the aisles). As old photographs illustrate, the upper storey of the north porch sat square on the porch itself. This Gothick parvise was built in 1789[74], and appears to have been part of Boog's restoration [plate 165]. It was also suggested that the ground before the west front be cleared, levelled off and laid with pavement.

By June 1808 a new footpath had been laid to the north porch. A further suggestion, which was also approved, was that the ground before the west front be enclosed by a wall surmounted by an iron rail[75], for the iron gate into the churchyard, put up in 1779, had already fallen into disrepair being replaced in 1788 by a coarse wooden one, which in turn had also decayed. Therefore, what was required was an iron gate supported by stone pillars.[76] Enclosing the west front would keep the area before the west door clean, as well as allowing access to carriages. Another source of trouble was the problem of "*idle children*" playing in the area, who were often accused of breaking windows. Of course, it was Boog who originally suggested enclosing the west front as part of the overall restoration[77], but it was never carried out. Since the Heritors could not agree as to how it was to be done, they requested that Boog provide sketches, plans, and estimates for the work.[78]

At the next Heritors' meeting held on 21 July, 1808, these were presented by Boog, but none met the required criteria approved in May. It was therefore decided that a committee be formed to tackle the problem.[79] It was 1814 before anything was done regarding enclosing the west front. Dr Boog[80] advised them that he had obtained

various plans and estimates from tradesmen for enclosing the area before the west door. William Fulton and Sons (whose plan was seen as best fulfilling the wishes of the Heritors[81]) were given the contract to execute the railing and gates, all of malleable iron, for the sum of £160; and James Millar, mason, whose estimate for the mason work was £44, was given the contract to build the parapet wall.

By 1815 the boundary wall, surmounted by iron railings, was finally built in front of the great west front doorway, which was received with much admiration and approval by the people of Paisley.[82] In any case, the benefits of the wall and railings were immediately realised because it meant that the west front (and especially the windows) was now beyond the reach of "*idle boys and their ball games.*"[83]

The enclosing of the west front may well have kept the children at bay, but it did little to enhance or protect the great west doorway itself, which was in a dreadful state of decay. The years of neglect had taken their toll, for the nook-shafts flanking the west door, and the orders springing from the shafts to form the great arched entrance, were so badly mutilated and defaced, that the west doorway was now in desperate need of restoration. The Heritors' Records of 25th August, 1816 indicate that they were quite aware of the condition of the west front and indeed regretted it.[84] The Fabric Committee[85] on finding that the mouldings were free standing, rather than engaged (so were replaceable) concluded that they could be completely restored with little difficulty.[86] With the approval of the principal Heritors, the Committee consulted with tradesmen on the subject of the restoration of the great west doorway.

Eventually, all the angles and smaller mouldings were restored with *Roman Cement*; larger pieces missing from the columns were replaced with cut and moulded stone: the hood—mould over the west door was removed, and a complete new one, at a cost of £15, was cut and moulded from the original, and put in place. The restoration work at the great west door was very successfully completed and was much admired, for "from every person of taste and judgement, who (has) examined this work, it has met with the most decided approbation."[87] The successful restoration of Paisley's famous great west doorway saved it for future generations.

The Committee also sanctioned the restoration of the string-mould decorating the base course, and that joining the aisle windows with the west door. Also, the Committee was encouraged to have the nook-shafts restored at the south-west window, from where they had previously been removed, so as to restore the symmetry of the west front. The fact that the south aisle lancet window was opened, and rebuilt in the time of Boog, may well explain why the crown is not quite as pointed as that to the north [plates 4a & 5b]. Again this work was carried out largely on the initiative of the Fabric Committee without first seeking the approval of the Heritors.[88]

Also, in order that the new stonework at the west front should be seen to blend with the old, the Fabric Committee authorised the painting of the stonework of the west door-way, because painting the stonework "brought it nearly to the colour of the original work"; and once the string—courses were restored and similarly painted it would give "the whole of the fine west front its antient appearance."[89] The Heritors on considering the report by the Fabric Committee recommended that they proceed with

their suggested improvements, which were completed by the 15 June, 1818.[90]

It was further reported by the Committee that some restoration work was necessary in the interior of the church, especially the repair of some of the capitals of the arcading with *Roman Cement*[91], which was completed by 27 May, 1819.

In May 1817 an elegant stained glass window, probably the first since the Reformation, had been placed in the east wall over the monument to Mr McDowall of Garthland. In an effort to incorporate the wall at the east end of the nave with the nave itself, a cornice, or string-course of stucco, was added to it at the same level as the string-course in the nave so that they would merge. Likewise, a hoodmould of stucco was placed over the east window in imitation of the medieval windows[92] [plate 167].

Even though the Fabric Committee kept a watchful eye on the church, by 1819 very little had been done either to the churchyard to the north and east of the ruined choir, or the choir itself. These surrounding areas had been so badly neglected that at the south-west angle of the churchyard a great quantity of soil had accummulated, which was detrimental to the fabric of the building. In fact, this accumulation of soil was soon to prove very troublesome. In all likelihood, this accumulation of soil was due to burials, so the Fabric Committee suggested to the Heritors that "means might be adopted for gradually lowering and removing the increasing mass of earth in that part of the churchyard."[93]

In 1825, thirty-six years after the completion of Boog's restoration, the roof of the abbey was again in need of urgent repair. The Heritors again formed a committee[94], and once again they required the services of a skilled tradesman.[95] The committee reported that several skilled tradesmen[96] had been invited to provide estimates by 2 June, 1825.[97] At the next Heritors' meeting of 30 June, when the estimates were opened, the slater work was given to William Mair. It was stipulated that the slates were to be full sized and the nails copper; plumber work was given to Robert Childs, the gutters to be cast iron; mason work was given to Alex & Daniel Davidson; and James Ritchie was to do the wright work. The Heritors preferred that the work be completed by the end of August, and that William Mair should completely point the walls of the building, along with the old work at the entrance to the choir.[98] The total estimate for the work was £202.6s[99] but the Heritors decided to assess themselves to the sum of £300 in order to cover outstanding bills.

It was also suggested at the meeting, held on 30th September following, that an annual sum be assessed considering that £1370 had been spent on repairs to the church between 1814 and 1825;

> "and that a contract be entered into with some respectable tradesmen for a given time to keep the abbey church in a complete state of repair..."

under a Superintending Committee.[100]

The Fabric Committee met one year later, on 29 June, 1826, and reported that on inspection, it was realised that the lower part of the south roof of the church needed reslating, and that the south wall and gables

required repointing. James J Lamb (1817-1872)[101], a Paisley architect, was commissioned to inspect the abbey to decide what work was required to maintain the fabric. On doing so, various tradesmen were invited to provide him with estimates for the Committee to consider within the week, and on the 6th July the contract was offered to Mr Russell.

Although not an ecclesiastical architect, Lamb was an experienced professional, designing many buildings. In 1848, he prepared plans for the School of Design and the Grammar School at Oakshaw in 1863, both in Paisley, and the Municipal Buildings at Renfrew in 1872.[102]

The wooden lintel supporting the Session House was found to be affected by dry rot which, as Mr James Burns factor for Lord Blantyre (one of the Heritors) stated, was the reason for calling a meeting of the Heritors for 25 July, 1828. Burns suggested that the affected part of the lintel be cut out and be replaced by a two inch thick cast iron plate.[103] But before any decision be made on the matter, an architect should be consulted. James Laird, founder, was asked for his opinion on the use of a cast iron plate in place of the wooden lintel. Laird declared that he "considered a plate of the kind described by Mr Burns, as sufficient for supporting more than double the weight of the Session House."[104]

The Fabric Committee subsequently met on 8 August and reported that Mr James Lamb, the architect, had been consulted again on the matter of the Session House.[105] Lamb suggested using cast iron beams as supports, but thought the cost could be prohibitive, a cheaper method would be to replace the present wooden beams with new ones, which would be sufficient to secure the building. The estimates were as follows:-

"Expense for first method.....£35.9s.
Expense for second method.....£11.15s.
Paisley 7 Augt. 1828,
(signed) James Lamb." [106]

The Fabric Committee took Lamb's advice and chose the second method, replacing the old beam with a new one of pitch pine, or whatever Lamb recommended; and that the voids in the east and west side of the Session House were built up with ordinary rubble.[107] Perhaps, the idea of placing a cast iron beam, rather than one of pitch pine in a medieval building was too far advanced, or even outlandish, to be considered seriously. Nevertheless, Laird, the founder, knew just how effective an iron beam would have been.

At the Heritors' meeting on 28 August, 1828, they approved the Fabric Committee's decision.[108] A decision was then taken to form a Superintending Committee.[109]

In view of the repairs to the fabric of the abbey since Boog's time, it is obvious that a change in attitudes had occurred towards the building, which was now looked upon with both respect and admiration.[110] It is hardly surprising then, that in 1829, James Russell, a Paisley architect, made measured drawings of both the interior and exterior of the abbey [fig 75a b & c], with accompanying notes. It was his intention to counter-balance the lack of published material on Scottish ecclesiastical architecture, compared with that available in England.[111]

His desire to preserve the abbey's architectural details from further deterioration was not just seen from the professional point of view. James Russell's are the first recorded measured drawings of the abbey, in modern times, and from an architectural and historical point of

view are very important, for they provide the observer with the oldest extant perspectives of the abbey made only thirty years after Boog's restoration; and, coming before those of Billings in 1852, they probably present the observer with the most authentic record of the abbey (especially the west front) that we have. Billings' print [112] [plate 19], on the other hand, provides the observer with a view of the abbey he wished to promote as a record for the future, rather than a true copy of the building as it really was.

Today the heating of a church is seen as essential to its preservation, but it is debatable whether the Heritors had this at the back of their minds on 11 November, 1825, when they proposed that the church be heated.[113] Four years on, nothing appears to have been done, for on the 30 November, 1829, a detailed report, as requested by the Heritors, was received from the Glasgow company of William Lang on the feasibility of heating the church.[114] William Lang proposed installing a heating apparatus in the church at an estimated cost of £170[115], but several objectors[116] raised doubts about the safety of the abbey church, if it were heated in the manner proposed.

On that very subject, Mr Guthrie Wright, Factor and Commissioner for the marquis of Abercorn, stated that a report should be commissioned from an eminent architect.[117] The Heritors agreed to Abercorn's suggestion that an eminent architect be commissioned to examine the safety factors regarding the different methods of heating the abbey[118], either by Lang of Glasgow, or that by Nott, a heating engineer from Liverpool.[119] Subsequently, David Hamilton (1768-1843), a Glasgow architect, was commissioned to carry out a study as to the feasibility of heating the abbey church.[120] In his report of 23

November, 1831, Hamilton favoured Nott's system, which would not harm the church, providing certain safety conditions were met, which included the stoves being placed on a stone pavement.[121] Abercorn sent his approval of the Nott scheme[122], and it was approved by the Heritors on 22 December, 1831.[123]

As the Heritors' meeting of 4 May, 1832 records, further remedial work was required on the abbey.[124] These relatively minor repairs were completed by 31 October, as the Heritors' records indicate [125], the cost not exceeding £35. More importantly, for the conservation (and eventual restoration of the church , was the suggestion by the Superintending Committee of the Heritors that further improvements could be achieved within the church by the opening up of parts of the great west window and by the removal of rubble, at little cost and with no danger to the fabric. It appears that the upper parts of the great west window had remained blocked up since Boog's time, but obviously the Superintending Committee had realised that its being opened could only benefit the church. A slight opening had been made, to let in the light, as an indication of what might be achieved were the windows to be completely reglazed.[126]

This again illustrates, that the idea that the abbey was much more than a parish kirk, was becoming a reality, a view which would eventually create the environment when major restoration work could actually be carried out. This is shown by the further suggestion, that perhaps additional light could be had, at no expense to the Heritors, "by granting permission to such Heritors as feel inclined to open up any one or more of the windows in the south side of the church, and insert therein, stained, or unstained glass with the Arms of their families," and special preference offered to those

Heritors who happen to have seats underneath particular windows.[127]

It was another thirty years before such an offer was made. In February, 1865, Mr John White asked permission to fill the east gable window[128] with stained glass depicting the Ascension[129] [plate 167], in memory of his father, John White, chemist, who died in Glasgow in 1860, and his grandfather John White, physician, Paisley, who died in 1830. Once this offer of a stained glass window was made and accepted by the Heritors, some of them (as well as other benefactors) did not hesitate to do likewise. Although stained glass cannot be strictly regarded as improving the fabric of Paisley Abbey, it does complement the restorative process.[130] The acceptance by the Heritors of Mr White's offer of stained glass set an important precedent which has continued till the present, and soon perhaps, all the windows of Paisley Abbey will be filled with fine stained glass.

In July 1839, John Waterston, a house-painter in Paisley, whitewashed and partially painted the nave. Waterston then painted false ribbing, in imitation of the ribbed vaults in the aisles below, on the flat plaster ceiling, put up in the nave by Boog [131] [plate 168]. He also painted the walls with a stone wash, and varnished the galleries and pulpit.[132]

Between 1839 and 1856, very little appears to have happened either in terms of the restoration or renovation of Paisley Abbey. When the General Superintending Committee[133] met on 27 March, 1856, the problem of the soil surrounding the abbey was still to the fore, so they felt it was important that the soil level be lowered so as to dry out the interior. They also felt they should sanction some improved mode of heating and

lighting of the church.[134] Baillie Brown was authorised to approach Mr James Lamb, the architect, to examine parts of the church glebe and wall; to inspect the church, and with the help of the Rev Andrew Wilson, minister of the First Charge 1852-1865, determine which windows were in need of repair.[135] The Heritors, influenced by Mr Wilson, decided to fill the damaged windows with stained glass.

The work was carried out by a local glazier, Mr Boyd, who was said to be thoroughly experienced in that medium. Cathedral Glass was used in colours of pale blue and green, with a rich red border, which filled the church with a more mellow and pleasant light. Indeed, on account of the effect of light in the church it was hoped that the south clerestory windows might soon be reglazed in a similar fashion.[136]

Although natural light was important in the abbey church the need for artificial lighting, in the winter especially, was great. At the Superintending Committee's meeting in the abbey on 3 March, 1859 [137], Mr David Kenny of Glasgow was also present. He exhibited several patterns of gas fittings for churches, which were examined by the members. No decision was taken then for Mr Kenny could not give them precise estimates for the installation of particular models. Nevertheless, the plans drawn up by Wilson were approved in principle.[138] Gas lighting was eventually installed in the abbey church at a cost of £120[139], and the abbey was illuminated for the first time by gas on 4 September, 1859.

Seventy-one years after Boog's restoration of 1789 the fabric of the church had once again fallen into disrepair. The church was in a most disreputable state, "the interior was like a vault in a graveyard, water ran

down the walls, and an unwholesome smell pervaded every part of the church.."[140] and the bases of the nave arcading were covered with soil. The interior had changed little since Boog's time. The exterior could at best be described as squalid, whilst the north porch was in a dreadful state, the stone seats broken and only a narrow doorway affording access to the church. The soil from the burial ground not only covered up the base course, but rose up to the level of the windows.[141] The problem of the accumulation of soil around the abbey had previously first been tackled by the Fabric Committee in 1817. Forty-three years had passed yet nothing had been done. Indeed, as Lees wrote, "a few more years would have seen it all in ruin."[142]

By the 19 April, 1860, a Restoration Committee had been appointed.[143] They met in the Session House to nominate and appoint, as architect of the proposed restoration, James Salmon of Glasgow. Salmon was already known in Paisley, for he had built the Union Bank on the corner of Gilmour Street in 1850. In any case, the Restoration Committee were of the opinion that Salmon was the person best qualified to give them the necessary advice. He was requested to meet them on 26 April.[144]

James Salmon was a leading figure in the Glasgow Institute of Architects and one of its founding members.[145] He was an experienced ecclesiastical architect, having built three notable churches in Glasgow. In 1848 he built St Mark's Free Church, Main (now Argyle) Street, followed in 1849 by St Matthew's Church, Bath Street, which was in a "delicate and graceful early Perpendicular Style." He also built the Catholic Apostolic Church in McAslin Street, Townhead, in 1852. Salmon based his design on a sketch by Pugin, and though full of detail it was not very exciting.[146]

Assisted by his son, W F Salmon, he was later to build St John's Church in Paisley in 1863.

The Restoration Committee met Salmon as prearranged.[147] Rev Mr Wilson spoke of the apprehensions voiced by the Session, and the congregation, on the state of the church. Mr Innes also advised the architect, of the differing views within the Restoration Committee on the very subject of a restoration, and suggested that he offer, where possible, alternative ways of assessing how the work might be carried out, as one method might be more economical than another. The architect then examined the church internally and externally with the Committee. Mr Salmon said it was his intention to inspect the church again by himself, and report to the Committee[148]; and as an experienced ecclesiastical architect, he was more than qualified to assess the work required.

The next meeting of Heritors was scheduled for 21 June, but Salmon had his initial report and plans ready by the fifteenth. His detailed plans included a thorough restoration of the entire structure.[149] In his report, Salmon suggested that the great accumulation of soil be removed from the exterior walls of the church; that a wooden porch or screen be erected at the north entrance; and the reglazing of all the blocked-up windows[150] [plate 169]. This door has been described as providing access from the monks' dorter into the church, but a more likely explanation is that it was made to provide access to their pew by the Abercorns, and others who owned The Place.

Salmon also suggested removing the stone from the door in the south wall and forming the space into a window; and the reseating of the nave and replacement of

the flooring with Arbroath pavement. He also suggested the installation of a new heating system.

On the exterior, his plans included the removal of the parvise over the north porch, and its replacement by a more suitable addition in keeping with the architecture of the nave [plate 170a]. The restoration of the turrets, and remedial work should be carried out to protect the extant remains of the north transept. The total sum for the carrying out of all the restoration work was estimated to be £1889.[151] Salmon stressed the architectural and historical importance of Paisley Abbey and suggested that every step be taken to protect the remains of this important historic building.

The Restoration Committee suggested that the report be printed for the information of the Heritors, as well as providing the congregation with the opportunity of reading it.[152]

In the meantime, the Kirk Session at its meeting on 13 July, also formed a committee[153] to consider Salmon's proposals for the restoration of the abbey. The Session members made a thorough inspection of the building and came to several conclusions.[154]

These were read by Mr Wilson, Minister of the First Charge, at the next meeting of the Restoration Committee, on the 20 September. The Kirk Session preferred that no attempt be made to reseat the church, and so save £500; that the soil level in the church be lowered so as to restore it to its original state; that the turrets be restored, with the (north) transept; that the present vestry be taken down and the (north) porch restored to its original state [plate 170b], and instead of building a new vestry, buy the property at the west end (the west

range, then on the market), for conversion into a vestry and Session House, or classroom. The property was, in fact, bought for £226, on 23 August, 1860.[155] The Kirk Session also suggested that it would be better if the restoration and improvement of the building be paid for by public subscription. The Kirk Session then decided to appoint its own quasi-Restoration Committee.[156]

On 4 November, the abbey congregation, along with the Elders and Deacons, held a meeting in Lawn Street School to consider the proposed restoration.[157] The meeting approved of the proposition as well as the estimated cost of £2000 (to which the congregation had already subscribed £400).[158] Quite soon more than half of the estimated total of £2000 had been collected.[159]

In view of the impending restoration work, and the need to close the church to enable the work to be carried on without any hindrance, the Kirk Session took steps to arrange for the congregation to worship in St George's Parish Church[160], which it did until March 1862; and the Kirk Session did not meet again in the abbey until 11 May, 1862.[161]

Salmon produced a further report at the Heritors' meeting on 28 March 1861. He reiterated his earlier suggestions, and added an estimate for the rebuilding of the north transept. Thomas Coats of Ferguslie, a member of the Restoration Committee, who had begun to take a rather particular interest in the abbey (especially in its future), persuaded the Heritors to accept Salmon's more ambitious plan for restoring the abbey. He put forward a few proposals to be carried out as part of the restoration scheme:- (i) the restoration of the north transept be carried out as soon as funds were available but at present the work be limited to the north, south

and east walls, including the window tracery; (ii) the vestry be contained within the new porch; and (iii) the house at the west front, recently purchased by the Kirk Session be pulled down so that an open space be created. Futhermore, he suggested that as each old house in the Abbey Close came on the market it should be purchased and pulled down.[162] Thomas Coats also arranged a public meeting to organise much needed financial support for the restoration.[163]

Dr Daniel Richmond[164] had also been appointed a member of the Restoration Committee. He too shared Thomas Coats' opinion on the future of the abbey, and made the point that the acceptance of Salmon's scheme should not be seen as the end, but rather the beginning of the complete restoration of the venerable building. It was at this meeting that James Salmon produced his conjectural drawing of Paisley Abbey fully restored, complete with choir, transepts, central tower and spire, in the style of Glasgow Cathedral [plate 171]. It was then exhibited for public scrutiny.[165]

An appeal for a contribution towards the Restoration Fund was made to HRH the Prince of Wales, the future King Edward VII. Edward, as Hereditary Lord High Steward of Scotland, Duke of Rothesay and Baron of Renfrew, was seen to be descended from the founder Walter I Fitzalan, High Steward, and founder of both the abbey and a dynasty.[166] The Prince responded by donating £100 towards the restoration fund.[167]

The work of restoration got under way, and as work progressed, large quantities of soil were removed, from both inside and outside the building, so that the floor could be brought down to its original level, and the building revealed in all its fair proportions to the

foundation.[168] In some places on the outside, the soil was ten feet deep[169], and in the interior three to four feet of soil was taken away. The removal of the soil uncovered the bases of the piers, as well as numerous bones, the disposal of which caused many problems. Indeed, the accepted explanation for the numerous skulls and bones exhumed was that Paisley Abbey was an important pilgrimage centre. The considerable number of interments at Paisley does not appear to be unique.[170] The bones were all re-interred.

The Restoration Committee decided at its meeting on 6 June, 1861, that it would meet every Thursday until the work of restoration was complete. The members then decided to form a sub-committee consisting of the sProvost, and Messrs Innes and Murray which would meet more frequently. When the Restoration Committee met with James Salmon on 28 June the Convener, Mr Innes[171], read

> "a proposal made on behalf of subscribers to the Restoration Fund....to have the present galleries in the church wholly removed - the Pulpit erected at the east end of the church - the area re-seated according to a new plan, and a new and larger gallery erected at the west end of the building."[172]

The subscribers were quite prepared to meet the cost of these alterations. Rev Mr Wilson and others, representing the subscribers to the Restoration Fund, were present at the meeting of the Restoration Committee to explain their plans more fully. Salmon produced a further sketch of the proposed improvements to the interior of the abbey, with the pulpit removed to the east end of the nave, the congregation facing it (as it does today), and in line with the then current Ecclesiological Movement [plate

172]. He explained by using sketches that overall, only a few seats would be lost, but hoped to remedy this.[173] Without committing themselves, the Restoration Committee admitted that the proposed alterations would be a decided improvement. Salmon agreed to produce a more detailed report, with lithographed sketches of his proposed seating arrangements, for the next meeting on 18th July.[174]

It could be said that the renewed interest in ecclesiological matters led many to advocate a complete refurbishment of the interior of the church. Indeed Billings himself was opposed to the retention of the galleries at Paisley for the very same reasons.[175] In a letter to the *RENFREWSHIRE INDEPENDENT*, a correspondent mustered Billings' opinions in support of his request that at some future date the galleries should be removed[176] (which they eventually were).

Salmon's altered plans were available by 18 July, as agreed. His detailed sketch included a new gallery at the west end, together with tastefully designed matching pitch pine screens behind the great west doorway, and at the north porch (still in-situ). Salmon argued his case for the new seating arrangements [177], and once the nave was seen in its completed state it allayed any fears uttered on the aesthetics of the medieval building.[178]

For the first time in centuries the base courses of the north aisle and transept were revealed, and with the removal of the galleries the north aisle windows were seen in their entirety, as was the form of the aisles. In the interior of the church, Salmon re-opened the south clerestory windows and glazed them. The doorway, once covered by the west range, was opened up and filled

with a Gothic window divided into twin lights[179] [plate 173]. These windows would only have been seen from the exterior when the west range was demolished in 1874. Salmon also enlarged the window previously built into the east wall at the south aisle, as an access to the old lofts. He also built a matching window in the corresponding wall at the north aisle.[180] The doorway in the centre of the east gable wall was built up, and new doors were hung at the west end, and at the north porch. In the south aisle the former cloister doors were re-opened and hung with new doors, the first since the Reformation in 1560.

Salmon had all the windows - except those at the west end - filled with cathedral glass. The changes in the interior of the church were so effective and immediate as to transform it from being a dark dungeon into a light and airy building.[181] For the first time since the seventeenth century, at least, the medieval architecture was revealed in its entirety.[182] Indeed, the refurbished interior surpassed the expectations of many.[183] A new gas lighting system of bright brass,in a style more in keeping with the church, was installed, in place of that put in in 1859 [see plate 172]. Also, a new under-floor heating system was installed, consisting of hot water pipes.[184]

At the south-west corner the old entrance to the turret was re-discovered and restored, and at the north-west angle a window and a door, which were blocked up, were also restored. The medieval passageway, which provided access in front of the west front windows, was also partly restored. When the north-east angle turret, over the north aisle, was taken down, the stair was found to be badly damaged, probably due to the fall of the tower. The turret door was also exposed and restored and

the turret made to accommodate Johannes Specht's bell, and the ringer - taken from the demolished 1730 church belfry.[185] The bell was rung for the first time from the new belfry on 27 April, 1862, not just to summon the faithful to prayer, but more importantly to symbolise that the Restoration of Paisley Abbey was successfully completed, and that the abbey was once again open for public worship.[186]

On the exterior, Salmon rebuilt the turrets at the north-west corner of the north aisle, and at the junction of the north aisle with the north transept.[187] He did not touch the conical roofs built over the buttresses at the west front in the time of Boog, which remain unchanged to this day. Salmon's turrets are polygonal in design, with shafts at the corners, the whole surmounted by polygonal roofs. Although they resemble those drum-shaped turrets, with conical roofs, put up in Boog's time [plate 170]; he probably used the turrets surmounting the stairwells in great medieval churches (like Elgin) as models.

As noted earlier, Salmon removed the *Gothick* parvise, or Session House replacing it with an upper storey in a Gothic style more in keeping with the architecture of the nave [plate 170a], and is said to comprise much of the original.[188]

The north porch had been in a deplorable state. The bases of the columns were found to be damaged, and the original stone seating was also broken. These were all restored, as were the nook-shafts in the interior. Arbroath flag-stones were laid in the porch, and a pathway (still extant) was laid leading from the north porch to the roadway. In the meantime, the turrets and gable of the north transept were restored, together with

the magnificent tracery of the north and west windows, modelled along the lines of the original.[189] [plate 64a & 65a]. The tracery of the west window of the north transept, as restored by James Salmon, is carved and moulded identically with those in the clerestory. This is quite a contrast to that in the great north window, also restored by Salmon. Even though Salmon based his design on extant remains, this does not really explain why the form of the tracery in this west window differs so much from that in the adjacent north window.

At the west front of the church, the ground was taken down again to its original level, since this had constantly risen over the years. The congregation, instead of walking down into the church as they had previously done, now found themselves having to climb five new steps up to the west door. The house in Abbey Close, which had abutted on the north-west turret, had been purchased by the Restoration Committee and pulled down.

Salmon's restoration was not only necessary for the survival of the abbey, but it also brought it to the forefront of public attention. With the successful completion of this restoration, another important chapter in the great story of Paisley Abbey drew to a close. It was, indeed, a significant step forward.

Despite the overwhelming support for the restoration of the abbey it was not without its opponents, for there were those who were averse to the idea. Lord Blantyre, for example, was one of the more important opponents of the abbey restoration as was reported in the *PAISLEY HERALD* of 13 April, 1861.[190] Blantyre objected to having to pay for the comforts of the congregation. The same journal reminded his lordship, somewhat politely, that so

many, of a lesser pedigree than he, were quite willing to subscribe to it. Fortunately, the arguments of the opposition went unheeded and the restoration took place.

Salmon's restoration work began on 27 May, 1861, and was finished by the 27 April, 1862 [191] [plate 170]. Mr M'Cord of Glasgow did the mason work, and Mr M'Gibbon of Paisley, the wright work. There was much rejoicing and thanksgiving when the abbey was re-opened on the successful completion of its restoration in a style more appropriate to its original character.[192]

The newspaper article describing the celebrations on the re-opening of the abbey, concluded with an emotional appeal to the people of Paisley not to be satisfied with anything other than a full restoration of the transepts, choir, tower and spire.[193] Salmon's restoration cost a little over £2000.[194] The Board of Works refused to give any grant of money towards the restoration, on the grounds that the abbey did not belong to the Crown.[195]

On 17 March, 1863, Salmon delivered a lecture on "Paisley Abbey" to the *Paisley Philosophical Society*.[196] He discussed the work already accomplished, as well as describing how he saw the abbey ecclesiologically (that is in terms of a unified element, west to east and north to south; see fig 76a). Indeed, the suggestion was made that the east gable wall ought to be taken down and the stones applied to their original purpose, to rebuild the transept and tower of the abbey, whose noble base had only recently been laid bare, as clear and sharp as the workmen's tools had left it. Salmon was obviously assuming that much of the stonework from the east wall was usable, and that it originally formed part of the ruined choir and transepts.

In his lecture, Salmon also made an appeal to the Restoration Committee to make a grand and judicious effort to obtain subscriptions from all quarters to restore the transept, tower and spire, and sweep away the old houses in Smithhills Street and Abbey Close.[197] The importance of reopening the transepts, together with a rebuilt tower and spire, would have unified the building. Salmon also spoke of the importance of stained glass, which he hoped would soon fill the restored windows; and the eventual restoration of the choir would once again make the church whole!

Salmon also appealed for the complete opening up of the site as far as the banks of the Cart.[198] Perhaps he envisaged the area surrounding the abbey, opened up as it is today [fig 76b], which (it is hoped) someday soon will be completely excavated, and landscaped.[199]

What Salmon proposed for a completely restored abbey church was very similar to those later plans drawn up by Rowand Anderson, MacGregor Chalmers, and finally Lorimer. His proposals differ from those others in one important point. His conjectural drawing suggests that his choir would have been aisled, complete with clerestory similar to the fifteenth century nave, but quite contrary to the plan of the extant choir walls. Yet, Salmon's drawing obviously has most in common with that of MacGregor Chalmers, in particular the tower and spire, which resembles that at Glasgow so much that it is probable that Salmon used it as his model [plates 171 and 174]. Although Salmon had been commissioned to restore the abbey, as far as was feasible at the time, necessary repairs were still being carried out on the roof.[200]

Some ten years later, on 29 September, 1872, the Kirk Session appointed a committee to look after the

interests of the Session in connection with the proposed removal of buildings adjacent to the abbey, which was to be part of the Paisley Town Improvements Scheme.[201] The Improvements Scheme was finally inaugurated in 1873, and was to coincide with the building of the new Town Hall planned to sit diagonally opposite the abbey. The Town Hall, designed by W G Lynn, was not begun until 1879, and was only completed in 1882.

The widening of the Abbey Close was seen by the Town Council as an important and integral part of the town improvement scheme. To achieve it all, the properties surrounding and encroaching on the abbey (which was virtually overwhelmed) had to be demolished.[202] Indeed, "modern" houses came so close to its very gates that the abbey was hardly visible, apart from the west front [fig 76c]; not even the old cloister court was saved from common uses, and it was difficult to imagine its monastic antecedents.[203]

This is more than a fair description of fig 76c which illustrates the extent to which the abbey was enclosed on all four sides by housing. If fig 76c is compared with a reconstructed plan of the precinct wall of the abbey (built by Abbot George Schaw)[fig 54a], there can be little doubt that the building line of the houses, which eventually surrounded the abbey, followed the line of the wall as feued by Lords Dundonald and Abercorn in the eighteenth century.

To those who appreciated the abbey's importance, both historically and architecturally, this Improvement Scheme put forward by the Paisley Municipal authorities for the widening of the Abbey Close must have appeared as a God-send, for at last the area surrounding the abbey was going to be opened up. Indeed, the present-day

uninterrupted view along Abbey Close may explain why Paisley Burgh Council was so anxious to develop the site. Unfortunately, the joy expressed by those advocating the Improvement Scheme so enthusiastically was short lived, for the Town Council scheme included the total destruction of the west range of Paisley Abbey [plate 152].

Alternative plans were drawn up for the layout of the "new" Abbey Close, which also included the widening of the street in accordance with the wishes of the Council. These alternative plans arranged for the proposed street to run parallel to the west range, thus preserving it intact. The plan drawn up by the Burgh Council unfortunately let the proposed widened Abbey Close swing southwards (as it still does to this day), unfortunately catching the south-west corner of the west range, thus necessitating its demolition [fig 77a].

In May 1873, the marquis of Bute received a letter from Daniel Richmond MD., on the subject of the demolition of the west range of the abbey.[204] Dr Richmond, who as noted earlier, had been a member of the Restoration Committee during Salmon's restoration of 1862, confirmed in his letter that he was the author of an alternative plan, the aim of which was to save the west range from destruction[205] [fig 77b].

Richmond expressed horror at the proposed destruction of the west range, suggesting that it could be restored without much difficulty, and at modest cost, and that the refectory should be incorporated in this restoration, which "when completed would speak for itself, by exhibiting the balance and harmony of the entire structure"[206] [fig 78 and n.227]. He was obviously acquainted with the history of the abbey, but

more importantly, Richmond was aware of its importance both architecturally and archaeologically. The good doctor expressed the opinion that Paisley Burgh did not see the argument from his viewpoint, for what they saw was just "an old house which stands in the way of a useful street improvement."[207]

Unfortunately, the destruction of the west range was approved by David Semple, the Paisley antiquarian [208], a man, whom Richmond correctly pointed out was totally unqualified to make such a value judgement, for he was more at home with old records than with medieval architecture. Indeed, Semple recorded a thorough and extensive description of the west range before and during its destruction.[209]

Alas, Semple recorded the demolition of the abbey buildings just as abstractly as he had recorded much of Paisley's history, but here he failed to realise what was taking place. An important part of what was most important to him, namely Paisley's history, was being destroyed with his blessing. Had he had a proper understanding of medieval architecture it is more than likely he would have understood the significance of the west range, and been as vociferous in favour of its saving, and restoration, as he had been for its demolition. Unfortunately, as he did not really understand the importance of the evidence he was commenting on (as Dr Richmond had so rightly emphasised), it is not too difficult to understand why he misinterpreted it.

Unfortunately, Semple's opinion was seen as being crucial to the argument by those opposing the saving of the west range, largely because of his reputation locally as an antiquarian. Also, as Semple was writing on behalf

of Paisley Town Council which was, like himself, unversed in both archaeology and architecture, the councillors were quite content to take his "valued opinion" for granted that "the demolition revealed that the building was no part of the plan of the abbey, and afforded it no support whatever."[210] Had Semple been acquainted with the history of the monastic ground plan he would, for example, have known that the cloister garth was the square formed by the three ranges and was part of the traditional monastic plan; he appeared to understand its meaning but kept looking in the wrong places for the cloister when he had actually acknowledged its existence. Had he examined other monastic sites, he would have been able to see Paisley in a more enlightened manner. He may well have made the error of comparing Paisley with Glasgow, without understanding the differences, for Glasgow is not monastic and had no cloistral ranges to hide its architecture. He would also have recognized that the change in ashlar at the front of the west range[211] probably indicated different building periods, just as the change in ashlar in the west gable of the abbey church is indicative of repair work being done at a date later than the thirteenth century.[212]

Even though Semple conceded that the inner wall of the ground floor was part of the abbey cloister, because of the similarity of the ashlar[213], he still insisted that the west range was simply a "*toofall building.*"[214] The earls of Dundonald (owners of The Place after the Hamiltons), he argued had converted it into cellarage, and even later, had added the first floor as additional accommodation for their mansion.[215] Here Semple, again misinterpreted the evidence, for the west range was anything but a lean-to building.[216] Had he known the difference, perhaps he would have endeavoured to save

what was an important part of Paisley and Scotland's heritage, something he had devoted his whole life to.

The marquis of Bute in an attempt to preserve the west range from demolition offered £1000 towards a restoration scheme which would have included both church and monastic buildings. Ironically, Provost Murray also offered £500 on behalf of the Burgh Council for the same purpose.[217]

In order to give his claims credibility, and in an effort to convince the authorities of the antiquity of the west range, Bute commissioned the Edinburgh architects David Bryce, Anderson and Bryce early in May, 1873, to survey the building and report on the condition and architecture of the west range, in an effort to save it.[218] The work was carried out by Robert Anderson.[219] Indeed, the marquis specifically commissioned Anderson to report on the "ruined cloisters" of Paisley Abbey, which he wanted restored, and where his ancestors were supposedly buried.[220]

Anderson was well qualified for such a task of examining the west range, having made a special study of Gothic architecture as a result of the considerable experience gained in the office of Sir George Gilbert Scott.[221] By 1873 Anderson had slowly built up a considerable reputation as an architect who specialised in the design of Neo-Gothic churches which were rather stylish, yet, were also both ecclesiologically "correct" and based on a thorough study of the medieval Gothic and its archaeology. Indeed, in 1873 the year Anderson drew up the report on Paisley, he had completed his first recorded restoration, at St Vigean's, Arbroath. For this he studied the medieval churches in that area before beginning his work there.

By June 1873 Anderson had produced a careful and sensitive report, accompanied with measured drawings and photographs[222], the report being published in the *EDINBURGH COURANT* of 13 June 1873. The *COURANT* enquired, rather pertinently, why Scotland could not follow England's good example in subscribing large sums of money for the preservation of such architectural remains as the west range at Paisley.[223]

In his report, Anderson concluded that the ground floor of the west range, with its vaulted cellars, was of the early medieval period, whereas parts of it belonged to the time of Abbot Tervas. Although he did not say for certain in the report that the exterior fabric of the west range was medieval, he was later to express the view that the walls, from foundation to eaves formed part of the medieval buildings of Paisley Abbey; and in the seventeenth century the upper floor of the west range had been altered to form part of the Dundonald mansion.[224]

Anderson's detailed reports, drawings and photographs of the west range at Paisley were certainly important evidence[225], which should have been considered seriously before any decision on the future of the west range was taken. In any case, irrespective of the evidence in his report, those who were not qualified in such matters (which appears to include all those who were anxious to see it pulled down), ought to have proceeded with caution. Caution and consideration of such important evidence was not forthcoming, and despite Bute's influence and offer of substantial financial support towards any restoration, his efforts to save the west range failed. The marquis of Bute was not alone in condemning the determined efforts of Paisley Town Council to pull down the west cloistral range as Dr Richmond's

letter, and those letters written to newspapers of the day show.[226]

Bute was not just interested in saving the west range; he was anxious that a complete restoration of the remaining abbey buildings be combined with a further restoration of the church [227] [fig 78]. For example, he believed that the church could be further enhanced by the commemoration, in a very special way, of those very important historical characters who had been closely connected with Paisley Abbey.

In furtherance of this scheme Bute wrote for advice to Abbot Hunter-Blair of Fort Augustus Abbey, enclosing a very detailed plan of no less than fifty figures to be depicted in stained glass (together with their Coats-of-Arms), who he thought had played (and would continue to play) an important part in the abbey's history, if they occupied the clerestory windows.[228] The marquis had obviously put a great deal of research into his plan for each figure was carefully chosen, as the abbot remarked, even down to a very detailed descriptions of the dress he thought suitable to each individual character's station in life. The abbot considered (rightly so) that Bute's plan was complete and thorough. Unfortunately, for the abbey, and the country's heritage, neither of Bute's schemes was ever carried out.

On 24 July, 1873, in a last vain attempt to stop the demolition of the west range, a booklet[229] was published in Paisley outlining the arguments in favour of preserving it. Despite the arguments presented in the booklet, for the saving of west range at Paisley, it was demolished - just to straighten a roadway. The demolition of the west range began on the 13 January, 1874.[230] The roof of the west range was found to have had oak joists 9

ins thick, no doubt similar to those in The Place, the roof couples being made from larch trees. This fact helped Semple decide the building was not medieval for he was of the opinion that larch fir was not used as elements in medieval buildings.[231] The flooring of the upper flat was fixed to oak joists 4 inches thick.[232]

Unfortunately, Semple was unable to separate his antiquarian interests from the reality of a medieval building in the form of the west range at the abbey. He was more concerned with the Picturesque approach to such buildings, in that he expected medieval buildings to fulfil his perception of them, rather than the reality. The most important discovery for Semple, resulting from the destruction of the west range, was the reappearance of the south turret at the west front, and the wall behind the base course of the newly destroyed range.[233] Certainly, mouldings are integral parts of any medieval building, but nevertheless of relative importance. He also suffered from the belief that medieval builders were superior to those of his own time. Steel Maitland, who restored the attic in The Place, would have disagreed with Semple for he noted that

> "its restoration has not been easy and has revealed many faults of construction and sometimes shocking bad building; never believe that they built better in those days than now, there is hardly a wall that is plumb and hardly an angle that is a right angle in the whole of The Place of Paisley."[234]

Anderson's report may not have saved the west range, but in the long term it provided him with a unique knowledge of the abbey which would be shown to be distinctly advantageous to the abbey church in the future, for, whilst studying Paisley Abbey, on behalf of the marquis of Bute, Anderson formed the opinion that the abbey church itself was not beyond redemption, and should

the opportunity arise, its ruined choir, transepts and tower could be restored to their former glory (and preferably by himself).

Although the west range was not saved, the continuing renovation and preservation of Paisley Abbey remained to the fore, as can be illustrated by the meeting of the Superintending Committee of Heritors held on 11 June 1874. Salmon's conjectural restoration of the west front of the abbey[235] [fig 79] included the building of a turret over the south-west corner, to match that over the north-west corner. It appears that the Committee had agreed in principle to carry this out. The final decision was (unfortunately) placed in the hands of the Heritors or their Committee, who did nothing about it. Despite the readiness of the builders to carry on with the building of the new turret, they were left with no alternative but to build a roof over the south-west stairwell and remove the scaffolding. This was accomplished by 20 August, 1874.[236] Thus, contrary to the Superintending Committee's initial decision, the new turret over the south-west stair well was never built. The addition of a second tower at the south-west corner would no doubt have balanced the west front of the church in the absence of the west range [compare figs 6 & 79]. Whether a matching turret at the south-west corner would have been practical is open to question, for the overhang of the gable at this south-west corner has been a constant problem for some time.[237]

Yet, thirteen years after the successful completion of Salmon's restoration, Paisley Abbey was having to face another major crisis; extensive dry rot was discovered in the abbey. Dry rot could easily have destroyed the abbey as it has destroyed many important buildings. The evidence of the dry rot was reported to the

Superintending Committee in October 1875[238], which formed a sub-committee to look into the matter.[239]

That same month Charles Davidson, Clerk of Works, and Mr Bryce, a joiner, were commissioned to carry out a full inspection of the whole woodwork of the church, particularly at the east end; and in the south-east corner.[240] As was reported to the sub-committee on 16 October[241], the extent of the damage was more serious than was first anticipated.[242] Indeed, "the only portions of the floor that (were) really clear of dry rot, (were) four of the sections in the south aisle, and the sections on each side of and under the pulpit, and the north division under the organ gallery." The other woodwork was clear.

The probable cause was the wet soil at the east end, which was three feet to three feet six inches above floor level, together with that above floor level at the transepts. Although Salmon had removed soil from the west front and north and south aisles, he appears not to have had the choir and transepts cleared out. Davidson suggested that the problem could perhaps be solved by the introduction of an eighteen inch drain below floor level along the outside of the north and east walls and filled with rubble; the replacement of Salmon's wooden floor with a pavement; and any evidence of growth on the walls treated with sulphuric acid.

Davidson was invited to get estimates[243] for the work of laying the floor with Arbroath pavement, except where the pulpit stood, and for foot-boards under the pews as well as replacing the present flooring and joists with redwood timber. It was agreed to secure the woodwork of the west gallery to the stonework with malleable iron straps.[244] In view of the extent of the

dry-rot, and the cost of eradicating this, the sub-committee decided to recommend the replacement of the wooden floor with Arbroath pavement at a cost of £446,[245] but not the introduction of drains outside the north and south aisles, which would have interfered with future interments.[246]

The eradication of the dry rot was completed by 14 June, 1877.[247] A second report was read from Mr James Gillespie, on the state of the walls and roofs, who estimated that the work would cost £183[248], but no firm decision was taken on Gillespie's report apart from putting it into the hands of another sub-committee.[249] Charles Davidson, now described as an architect[250], was commissioned to inspect the church in the light of Mr Gillespie's report.[251] Final approval for the work was given at the meeting of the Superintending Committee on 12 July, 1877.[252] Estimates were received by Davidson, from William Gillespie & Son, for £116.16s[253], but the eventual cost was a staggering £325.3s.[254], largely due to the fact that the state of the building was not quite as sound as was supposed. Despite the expenditure, further work was required.[255]

In 1882 Rowand Anderson was still advocating a complete restoration of the abbey church, as witnessed by his lecture to the Glasgow Archaeological Society on 16 March of that year.[256] Once again he criticized David Semple for the considerable part he had played in the destruction of the west range at Paisley. After all it was Semple, he said, who had maintained (quite wrongly) that no part of the west range at Paisley belonged to the original medieval plan of the abbey. Anderson again repeated the error that the marquis of Bute had been prepared to offer £10000[257] towards a restoration of the

abbey, rather than £1000 (a considerable sum in those days). Bute's generous offer contrasts with the £100 sent by the Prince of Wales towards Salmon's restoration.

Despite Rowand Anderson's acknowledged reputation as an architect, and in particular one who was accomplished and experienced in the restoration of medieval churches (already noted), there were those who disagreed with him and wrote to the Editor of *THE GLASGOW HERALD*.[258] Anderson knew what he was talking about, whereas the correspondent to *THE GLASGOW HERALD* was still promoting the myth that Semple was not just an antiquarian, but someone who also knew about architecture (which was not so).

Of course, Anderson may have had other motives for criticizing Semple, for in the course of the lecture he suggested that some rich Son of Paisley should, as an expiation, undertake the completion of the abbey. Without a doubt, Rowand Anderson[259], believed that he was the architect best qualified and most experienced for such an important task! Yet he had to wait a considerable time to hear the call from Dr Gentles[260], minister of the abbey. It finally came on 22 December, 1878. Gentles commissioned Rowand Anderson to report on what might be achieved, but a further ten years were to pass before anything tangible came of it.

Although Gentles had decided that Rowand Anderson should restore the abbey in 1887, another three years passed before a Restoration Committee was formed (in March, 1890), out of which was formed a Building Committee chaired by Sir John Stirling Maxwell.[261] On the 26 December, 1897, Dr Gentles finally made an appeal from

the pulpit of the abbey, for funds for the restoration of the choir, crossing and transepts, though another seven years had passed since the forming of the Restoration Committee.

1888 was the year of Paisley Burgh's fourth Centenary, and in honour of the occasion, Queen Victoria visited the Burgh on 23 August, of that year. Shortly afterwards Victoria decided to commemorate her visit to the town in a very special way by erecting a monument to the Stewarts, from whom she claimed descent. The Edinburgh sculptor, John Hutchison, RSA., was commissioned to design and sculpt the monument, as well as plan the site itself.[262] In November, 1889, Hutchison advised the Superintending Committee that the monument was ready to be placed in the choir.[263] (It was later removed for safe keeping to St Mirren's Aisle.[264]) With the complete restoration of the church in 1926, this fine monument of gleaming white Italian marble was again moved to the choir, to re-occupy its place of honour.

By 1874-1876 Anderson, who had successfully completed restoration work at Iona Abbey for the duke of Argyll[265], was renowned within the profession. But, compared with what he was to accomplish later at Dunblane, and then Paisley, his work at Iona was relatively low key.[266] In all of his restoration work he exhibited that same understanding of Gothic architecture he had displayed at St Vigean's, Arbroath, so that all his restorations were a safe balance between the old and the new. Nevertheless, up to that point in time, none of them could be classed as major restorations in a scale compared with what would be required at Paisley Abbey.

It was his very sensitive restoration of Dunblane Cathedral in 1890-1893[267] which finally proved that if any man was capable of restoring Paisley Abbey, it was Anderson. Here he again exhibited that profound knowledge of Gothic architecture in Scotland which he had build up over the years from an assiduous study of all aspects of medieval buildings. Unfortunately, because of the interference of some members of the Board of Manufactures on the final work of the restoration at Dunblane was not completed as he would have wished.[268]

It was twenty-four years since he had first reported on Paisley for the marquis of Bute and now Anderson's ideas for a complete restoration of Paisley Abbey was soon to become a reality. Whether Anderson had actually drawn up plans for Dr Gentles in 1887 is unclear, but what is certain is that he duly advised Dr Gentles that £30,900 might complete this final chapter in the restoration of the abbey, the choir, transepts and tower.[269] On 21 January, 1898, as Paisley Abbey Records illustrate, Anderson presented Gentles with a detailed estimate for the restoration, which he had received from Brown & Walker, Surveyors:-

<u>Abstract of amounts for transepts and choir.</u>

Amount for mason work inclusive of £7500 tower and spire above main wallheads	£22,	200.
Do. wright and steel works inclusive of £200 for the scaffolding for tower and spire	2,	595.
Do. for slater work		300.
Do. plumber work		495.
Do. gas pipings and fittings		350.
Do. glazier work		280.
Do. stone and tile paving and marble steps	1,	030.
Do. heating chamber and heating including pipe channels	1,	200.
Do. staining and varnishing woodwork of ceilings		100.
Do. 600 cathedral chairs		150.

Taking down and re-erecting memorial tablets and iron enclosures 200.

total probable cost £28,900.

Of the above sum of £28, 900 - £14, £250 is applicable to the choir, £6050 to the transepts and £7, 700 to the tower and spire. The cost of renewing the roof of the nave and slating the same with Westmorland slates will be about two thousand pounds sterling (£2000).

At Paisley, Rowand Anderson intended to use stone from Prudham, Blackpasture Grange and Polmaise, and other quarries so as to get varied colouring.[270]

In his lecture to the Glasgow Archaeological Society in March 1882, Anderson had already suggested his method of working, for by a detailed study of Dunblane, Dunkeld, Dundrennan, Inchmahome, New Abbey and Whithorn as models, the restoration of Paisley's long aisleless choir [plate 229] was clearly possible.[271] Indeed, his conjectural drawing of the completed restoration [plates 175a & b] illustrates that (unlike James Salmon's plan), his followed the lines of the ruined aisleless choir. Anderson also intended building his new choir to the same height as the transepts [plate 176], even though they would have been moderate in height in comparison with the nave, and quite contrary to medieval practice. It could be said that his decision to do this was was very typical of his method of working, for in his modern churches he was inclined to design the roof of the chancel, or choir, lower than the height of the nave roof.

At Paisley the situation was quite different. Anderson was not designing a new church, but restoring a medieval one, which had an extant nave with transepts. Faced with this situation it could be said that in the interior, he had no alternative but to have the four

arches of the crossing rise to the same height as the choir, otherwise the whole thing would have been unbalanced [fig 80]. There is no doubt that had Anderson restored the roof of the choir at a lower pitch than the nave, when viewed from afar, it would have been distinctly odd.

The fenestration of the choir, as planned by Anderson, [plate 175a] would have reflected that of the north aisle, their large single windows filling the bays formed by prominent stepped buttresses decorated with niches for statues. The choir windows would have been filled with tracery similar to what he had used in his restoration at Dunblane [plate 177a & b and figs 80b, c & d].

Rowand Anderson's first major task at Paisley in 1895 was to take down the sixteenth century walls built seven feet thick at the east end, and across the arcading of St Mirren's Aisle.[272] When Anderson had taken down these walls he proceeded to rebuild the four crossing piers, those to the east being completely new. The transepts were rebuilt with wooden waggon roofs, and St Mirren's Aisle was reopened and, once again, incorporated into the body of the church. A temporary wall enclosing an apse was then built between the north and south transepts closing off the empty choir from the newly built crossing.

Anderson's thoroughness in his approach to his work meant that the work progressed slowly, for it was his intention that his tower should be secure, at all cost. Therefore, during excavations at the base of the tower (to investigate the reasons for the fall of the previous one), the evidence was quite clear that it was the north-eastern pier which had collapsed because it had been

built on sand, and in falling had twisted the others[273] [plate 178a & b]. Indeed, all the ground to the east of the tower is fine sand, which MacGregor Chalmers was to have problems later.[274]

During the excavations at the crossing, the foundations of the south-east and north-east piers of the central tower were discovered. This certainly proves that the eastern piers of the tower and crossing had in fact existed; and McGibbon and Ross were wrong on this point.[275] In 1900, the foundations of the south-east, the north-west and south-west piers were discovered thirteen feet down, but that to the north-east was only five feet down and rested not upon gravel but upon clay. There was distinct evidence that it had sunk five inches[276], more than likely caused, or at least contributed to, the fall of the tower.[277] If the north-east pier was as weak as the evidence suggests, then the central tower probably fell across the north transept and choir rather than westwards. This was Professor Gourlay's opinion, which challenges that of MacGregor Chalmers. Chalmers' view was that the tower and crossing had collapsed on to the north transept and north aisle, yet these were still intact after the fall of the tower.[278]

Gourlay wrote that there were seven feet of waterlogged peat under the tower, which must not be touched. He drew attention to "Salisbury Cathedral (which stands) in the centre of a subterranean lake, and when the water was pumped out, settlement perhaps, forced the authorities to pump it back again."[279] In a lecture to the *PAISLEY PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY*, James Salmon had previously explained how, during his excavation work, he discovered that immediately under the fine bed of gravel, on which the abbey rests, there were the remains of an ancient forest in the form of a spongy moss.[280] Although

Salmon considered that this caused the tower to fall, he emphasised that the interments may also have been responsible for the insecurity of the building in earlier times.

Sculptured funerary slabs [fig 81a & B] are said to have been found during the laying of the foundations for Anderson's tower. Gourlay believed they came from St Mirren's Aisle. They were lying face down and were presumed to have been used for the foundations of the south-west pier of the central tower.[281] It is more than likely that these sculptured stones came from the choir, rather than St Mirren's Aisle which was largely still intact. Perhaps the weight of falling stone helped bury them beneath the level of the choir.

The tremendous scale of the excavation work carried out by Rowand Anderson was essential to secure the building, particularly with the unexpected discovery of the weak north-east crossing pier. Had he not done so, his tower and spire, had they been built, could have come crashing down not long after their completion, as Archbishop Hamilton's had done in the sixteenth century. Since all this unexpected work had not been estimated for, it meant that most of the money collected by Dr Gentles for a complete restoration, was spent on securing the crossing piers.

Unlike Salmon, and later MacGregor Chalmers, Rowand Anderson planned to have his tower surmounted by a crowstepped cap-house [plate 176], with triple lancets to the east and west [also plates 175a & b]. Although there were medieval Scottish monasteries like Sweetheart, Jedburgh and Melrose (to mention only a few), which had similar cap-houses, they appear not to have been as prominent as Anderson's.

Irrespective of the form of the medieval tower, and in the light of its unfortunate history, Rowand Anderson may have decided to play safe and design his proposed tower of Paisley without a spire. If that was his reasoning, he was proved right by the later unexpected trouble he had with the foundations of the crossing piers. The crossing between the central tower of Paisley is larger in area than that of Glasgow Cathedral by some inches.[282] Unfortunately, there is no evidence extant of the original tower. Rowand Anderson's tower would have had single openings to each side, and have been filled with broad louvres surmounted by tracery [plate 176].

In Professor Gourlay's opinion, in the interior, Anderson should have carried his tower arch to the nave much higher than he did in the interior of the abbey [plate 179a], and so have continued the medieval practice as at Glasgow Cathedral[plate 180], and elsewhere. Gourlay is technically correct, for a brief survey of medieval cathedrals, and greater monastic churches, will illustrate that the tower arches usually spring from the height of the clerestory, as at Glasgow. Gourlay has failed to take into account the lower level of the transepts which Rowand Anderson did not, and plate 179a proves his point; and since he was the architect (and an extremely capable one at that), it is more than likely that he would have considered this problem from every angle. Gourlay suggests that Rowand Anderson, by placing his capitals just above the triforium spring makes the work look very awkward and patchy.[283] If Rowand Anderson had raised his crossing arch in the nave to the same height as the clerestory [plate 179b] it would have appeared rather awkward, for the western crossing arch would have stood much higher than the transepts, and higher than his intended choir arch. In any case, in the choir arch at Dunblane Cathedral Anderson had a

precedent, even though it is a two-storey nave. At Dunblane the springers for the choir arch rise from the capitals of the nave arcades rather than from triforium level, and since there is no evidence to the contrary, this may have been the situation at Paisley too.[See plate 172. Here is the nave looking east after Salmon's restoration, yet there is no evidence of the crossing arch.]

Gourlay may be correct, though Rowand Anderson's solution when viewed from the nave, appears to be unbalanced to the critical eye of the former who was an expert in building construction. Yet when viewed from the choir, where all four arcades are of equal height, it becomes an important unifying element to the four separate parts of the abbey church [fig 80]. In one sense he is creating an illusion, for from this viewpoint the observer is confronted with a "unified church". In this his illusion is successful. Furthermore, none can deny that Rowand Anderson's reconstructed crossing is certainly a very dignified one. Besides, in doing so, Anderson in effect restricted any successor (like Peter MacGregor Chalmers for example), from having complete artistic freedom, for any successor had to design a choir whose interior height had to match Anderson's choir arch.

Anderson's reconstructed crossing was intended to lead into his restored choir. A notable feature in most of Anderson's modern churches was the timber roof, and considering what he had achieved at Dunblane [plate 181a & b] there can be little doubt that the timber roof planned for Paisley's choir would have been worthy of its restored setting. In doing so, he was again following historical precedents, for most large medieval Scottish churches, like Glasgow Cathedral and St Machar's, Aberdeen, do have timber roofs, so Paisley choir would

also have had a timber one; and there would have been a corresponding one in the nave, to harmonise with that of the new choir.[284]

According to Professor Gourlay, Anderson had intended to vault the new choir of Paisley in stone, for he states that Anderson started the vault at the west end next the tower, leaving the springer stones in position, though he concluded that Anderson may never have intended taking the stone vault the whole length of the choir.[285] This is most unlikely, for by designing a stone vault for Paisley he would have gone against his avowed practice of designing wooden ceilings for all of his churches. A likely explanation is that Anderson's springers were for his window arches. It also seems illogical to begin the building of a stone vault, and then finish it off in wood, so Gourlay is probably wrong in suggesting this. Anderson intended laying the floors of the crossing and the choir with stone and encaustic tiles.

As part of his restoration work, Anderson built the wall, supported by the arcading of St Mirren's Aisle, up to the eaves of the south transept, and inserted triple lancets. It is more than likely that a wall should not have been built on the arcading of the south transept, but left open (as at Ely and Winchester). Rowand Anderson did not handle this aspect of the restoration properly.

Chalmers' view that it should have had a chapel above, with the upper part screened from the church, is also incorrect as Gourlay points out[286], for Chalmers ignored the fact that in the roof space over the Aisle is a little room [plate 182], a strong room perhaps, but one so often thought of as being specifically for the chaplain to St Mirren's Aisle. Architecturally, there is no real justification for altering the divided south

transept, as Rowand Anderson did and as MacGregor Chalmers would have liked to do.

Unfortunately, unforeseen problems prevented the progress of the restoration of the abbey under Rowand Anderson, so that by the turn of the century it was obvious to the Restoration Committee that the restoration would have to be abandoned. Thus, by March 1904 Anderson's restoration work at Paisley Abbey was more or less complete, though work continued until sometime in 1907.

When Anderson's work was done, for the first time in over three hundred years, the crossing and transepts were once again added to the body of the church. Also, the great central tower was carried up above the ridge of the roof of the nave [plates 183a & b]. The pulpit and Communion Table occupied the crossing, as did the pews for the Elders, and perhaps those for the choir. He also built a small chancel [plate 183c], as an extension to his new east wall to contain the organ. This may have been a compromise, for to build part of the choir just to accommodate the organ loft would have been an extravagance.

What Rowand Anderson had accomplished was no mean achievement, but unfortunately Dr Gentles did not really understand the engineering problems which the architect had to face, so he personally blamed Anderson for not completing the restoration. More importantly, Gentles never forgave Anderson for spending the bulk of the money, which he believed had been collected for a complete restoration of the abbey. In Gentles' eyes it would never be completed.

Anderson had certainly spent most of the money, but not squandered it, as Gentles stated.[287] Gentles did not really understand how important the work was if Paisley Abbey were not to come crashing down, as it had done in the past. Perhaps Rowand Anderson can be criticized for being extra-cautious, and not putting across his point of view in a more comprehensible manner. After all, both of his successors, MacGregor Chalmers and Lorimer, had to do further work to the foundations at the crossing, which shows that Rowand Anderson's caution was to be commended. Unfortunately, Dr Gentles' misunderstanding of the situation was the seed which grew out of all proportions when the next, and final stage of the restoration was reached.

No doubt, many people in Paisley must have been disappointed and also prepared to lay the blame at Anderson's door. Yet, much had been achieved, which some critics failed to take into account, for when comparing it with what had yet to be done, the balance appeared not to be in Anderson's favour, so the Restoration Committee lost all sympathy for him.

Dr Gentles was not the only one who had raised questions regarding Rowand Anderson's ability to fulfil his professional obligations. Between 1904 and 1906 Anderson had built a church for Lord Blythswood at Inchinnan.[288] Blythswood, failing to understand why the building costs of the church kept rising, began to miscall him "*Ruin Anderson.*"[289] Gentles was obviously of like mind too, for he had patiently watched "*with his own eyes*" the rebuilding of the crossing piers for five years, when at the end of that time he was expecting to see a fully restored and completed church, for which he believed he had collected the full sum.

On 14 March, 1904, Robert Slevin[290] wrote to Anderson on behalf of the Restoration Committee.[291] An agreement was made with him that should the opportunity arise, to complete the restoration, he and his partners or successors should bind themselves *to act if required*[292]; and that the plans should become the property of the minister of the First Charge. Rowand Anderson accepted the terms, based, rather tenuously perhaps on the fact that his plans for the completed restoration had been accepted and paid for.[293]

It was this "*gentleman's agreement*" which was to prove very troublesome prior to the next and final stage of the restoration of the abbey. Both Sir John Stirling Maxwell and Anderson took the view that a gentleman's agreement was a binding agreement, and one binding on both parties, despite the "*differences*" Anderson had experienced with Dr Gentles and the Restoration Committee.[294] Even though he did upset a few people at Paisley[295], the major point of criticism still held against him was that he had failed to live up to his promise - to complete the restoration of the abbey in a reasonable time, and at the estimated cost.

From 1910 Rev A M Mclean was the minister of the abbey. He took the opposite view, that nothing was binding and under no circumstances was Rowand Anderson to be offered the commission, and with it the honour of completing the final phase of the restoration of Paisley Abbey. Despite his failure to complete the full restoration at that time, Rowand Anderson's work at Paisley showed that the complete and final restoration of Paisley Abbey was more than a probability.

While Paisley Abbey was undergoing restoration under Rowand Anderson, the work of maintaining it continued.

The Heritors' Superintending Committee, which met on 20 February, 1902, invited the architect, T Graham Abercrombie to inspect and report on the overall state of the nave.[296] His report of 23 May was read out when the Committee met on 6 June.[297]

The Committee decided that it would recommend to the Heritors that work be carried out, as well as putting forward the suggestion that the 1s 3d in the £1 be assessed from each member to pay for the work, as well as providing a fund for future repairs.

At the Heritors' meeting held on 31 July, 1902, Abercrombie stated that he had carried out the work he had said was necessary in his report of 23 May. By 27 April 1903, the repairs which Abercrombie suggested were necessary to keep the nave safe from the elements, had been carried out at a cost of £542.2s.3d + £31.7s.6d to the Clerk of Works and £42 to the architect.[298] Abercrombie provided the Heritors with a certificate that the work had been carried out to his satisfaction.[299] He advised the Heritors that in his professional opinion the abbey should be surveyed once a year. Abercrombie, like most of his predecessors, found, that on inspecting the abbey church of Paisley, more work was required than he had first anticipated, which his certificate verifies.

In November 1905 the Heritors agreed to purchase St Mirren's Aisle from the duke of Abercorn.[300] Also, the temporary composite roof, covering the new tower, as left by Rowand Anderson, was found to be no longer water-tight, and was replaced by a lead roof at a cost of £66.0s.1d.[301]

CHAPTER V

The Twentieth Century Restorations

In 1910 Dr Gentles died[1], and the Rev A M Maclean was appointed minister of the First Charge. Within a year or so of his appointment he had revived interest in Dr Gentles' uncompleted restoration. Originally, the Session had contemplated a restoration of part of the cloister and The Place of Paisley.[2] In April 1910 the Kirk Session decided to consult an architect on the condition of The Place, but nothing happened until November when Peter MacGregor Chalmers was appointed to draw up plans for its restoration.[3]

The Kirk Session eventually invited Chalmers to draw up tentative plans for a complete restoration of the choir and tower in anticipation of its being given the go-ahead. Indeed, his first rough sketches had such an effect on the minister and Kirk Session that benefactors (namely Michael Stewart Clark, A F Craig, and Robert Allison) stepped forward and offered to finance the proposed restoration. The minister and the Session did not hesitate to take advantage of the generous offers of financial help and in 1911 appointed Chalmers architect for the final phase of the restoration of Paisley Abbey.[4] Unknown to the Kirk Session at the time, the appointment of Chalmers as architect was to have considerable repercussions.

The story behind MacGregor Chalmers' appointment as architect began on 7 January, 1911, when the Rev A M Maclean wrote confidentially to Sir John Stirling Maxwell, before any public appeal for funds or the announcement of the impending restoration of the abbey was made.[5] Maclean reminded Sir John that he knew of Chalmers' appointment to restore The Place and cloisters, but wanted his advice on the next step to be taken. He questioned the practicalities of restoring the choir for

an estimated £30,000, but even at this early stage in the proceedings Maclean was adamant that the entire scheme of restoration should be concluded satisfactorily.[6]

He also politely reminded Stirling Maxwell of how valuable his previous experience would be as Chairman of the previous Building Committee. As he emphasised, Sir John was seen as being well versed in the day-to-day problems envisaged in a job of such importance as the restoration of the choir and tower.

It is not surprising therefore that in a letter of the 11 January, in reply to Stirling Maxwell's letter of the 10th (not extant), Maclean had by then formally invited Sir John to offer his services as Chairman of the Building Committee. The minister also intimated to him that besides the £30,000 promised by Stewart Clark and his sisters for the restoration of the choir[7], another £8000 had been gifted by Robert Allison for the restoration of the tower[8]; and A F Craig had also gifted £2000 for the restoration of the cloister.[9] Indeed, Maclean was later to say that at the completion of Rowand Anderson's work, £18,000 was still available.[10] But more importantly, Maclean informed Sir John, in the strictest confidence (and prior to the formal decision being taken by the Kirk Session), that the work of restoration had been entrusted to Peter MacGregor Chalmers.

On 19 February, 1911, Dr Cameron Lees[11] inaugurated a public appeal for funds for the completion of the restoration begun during the incumbency of Dr Gentles.[12] Within the next year, on the 7 January to be exact, Maclean announced publicly that he had received gifts amounting to £40,000 towards the restoration of the choir, tower and cloisters.[13] Before the announcement of such benefactions, it is known from his correspondence

with Sir John Stirling Maxwell, that Maclean had been aware for many months of the intending munificent gifts from the donors.

Therefore, Stirling Maxwell should not really have been surprised when the Kirk Session unanimously decided at its meeting on 15 January, 1912, to appoint MacGregor Chalmers as architect for the final phase of the restoration of the abbey.[14] Yet as late as 17 May, 1912, Sir John was to express surprise at the appointment of MacGregor Chalmers in a letter to Thomas Dunlop Laird, Clerk to the Heritors. T D Laird[15], as he was known, was a partner in the Paisley Law firm of T & W Walker and Laird.[16] Sir John wrote to Laird,

> "that the Restoration Committee and Kirk Session will not commit themselves to any architect till the Heritors have been consulted. In spite of what you said they have been so unwise as to do so."[17]

It is difficult to explain Stirling Maxwell's behaviour considering that Maclean had been honest with him from the very beginning, telling him in confidence just what he and the Kirk Session were about. Despite Sir John's desire for caution, Chalmers had already presented the following estimates to the Session by letter on the 5 January:-

choir block	£10,889.
sacristy block	950.
buttresses to choir	1,800.
stone carving	3,020.
stone vaulting of choir	4,000.
extra copper roofing on slates	850.
marble floor	550.
furniture	2,500.
heating	200.
electric Lighting	250.
	£25,009.
add. for contingencies	2,000.
fees. arch., measurer & C.o.W	2,970.
	£29,979.[18]

The Kirk Session had no difficulty whatsoever in accepting Chalmers' estimates and plans.

As Maclean was to repeat time after time, it was these plans which had secured the necessary finance from the donors, and on that basis the decision was made to appoint him architect. However, the final agreement between Chalmers and the abbey ministers (Maclean and Fulton) and the Kirk Session was not signed until early April 1912.[19]

The agreement included the necessary approval by the Restoration Committee (yet to be formed) of designs for the stone and wood carving in the choir, the proviso that the Restoration Committee, or any delegated party, had the right to say what was meant by "elaborate stone and wood carvings in the choir"; instructions to the architect to visit the site once a week and prepare monthly reports; and lastly, a clause that the Dean of the Faculty of Advocates would be invited to arbitrate should any disputes or differences of opinion arise.[20]

The newspapers now reported that Paisley Abbey Kirk Session was in a position to proceed with the restoration of the building[21], the plans being drawn up by the Glasgow architect Peter MacGregor Chalmers. However, much was to happen between this initial announcement of Chalmers' appointment as architect for the final scheme to restore the abbey, and the approval of his plans by the Heritors' Superintending Committee[22] in December 1912.[23]

Even though the Kirk Session noted on 19 January, that they would require permission from the Heritors[24] to carry out the restoration, no approach had as yet been made officially to them, or their Superintending

Committee. It was assumed that the Heritors would no doubt grant their approval, subject to certain conditions.[25] This was only part of the problem, the other part (perhaps even more important), concerned the question of whether the approval of the abbey Heritors, who were responsible for the fabric of the building, should have been sought prior to the appointment of MacGregor Chalmers as architect of the restoration.

At the previous restoration, a general approval[26] had been given for the restoration, subject to the submission of the plans, and prior to any work being carried out.[27] A similar procedure would require to be carried out for the proposed restoration[28], but at this point in time not only had the minister and the Session approved of the plans for the restoration, they had also appointed Chalmers as architect.

The first formal notification to the Heritors occurred when MacGregor Chalmers announced that he wanted to carry out excavations in and around the choir. On this subject he wrote to Maclean[29] asking him to approach the Heritors on his behalf. The Session approved his request[30] and Maclean wrote a detailed letter to Laird, on 25 March. Maclean requested Laird to inform the Heritors that Chalmers had drawn up plans for the restoration of the choir, cloister, tower of the abbey and The Place of Paisley, and that the donors had instructed him to proceed with the proposed restoration scheme. In all of this, Maclean conveyed a sense of urgency which the Heritors would be seen not to share.

The minister also drew attention to the fact that the donors were "naturally desirous of proceeding with the scheme as rapidly as possible."[31] On 5 August, 1912, the Heritors' Committee granted approval for the

excavation of the choir and cloister area.[32] The Heritors reserved any decision until the final plans were submitted for their consideration and approval.[33]

On 25 May, 1912, T D Laird wrote to each of the Heritors, advising them that some of their colleagues did not consider MacGregor Chalmers capable of restoring the abbey. George Houston, of Johnstone Castle, as one of the Heritors, immediately responded by scribbling on the back of the letter (sent to him two days previously) that "The Kirk Session cannot appoint (an) architect, (they) must have their actions sanctioned by (the) Heritors."[34] Houston was correct; the Kirk Session could not lawfully appoint an architect, for Heritors were legally liable for the repairs of the church[35], as well as the building and rebuilding of parish churches, where there was a need.[36] Since the restoration of Paisley Abbey was a rebuild then the Heritors could have been held legally liable had anything gone wrong.

Even though it was the duty of the Heritors to provide premises "fit to accommodate all the parishioners"[37], there is nothing to suggest the style the church should take. Nor is there any mention of who was liable for the appointment of an architect, yet the Paisley Heritors regarded this as their right, which in effect, meant that they could dictate the design of the church. This is indeed a big question and must surely be on open one. On those points perhaps the Kirk Session could have argued, indeed they may well have done so. Nevertheless, it is clear that Maclean and the Kirk Session should have consulted with the Heritors prior to any important decision being taken.

This was to become a bone of contention. In 1906, the Heritors' Superintending Committee came to an

agreement with the Kirk Session that the Heritors would be responsible for the restored portion of the abbey church, namely the crossing, the unfinished tower and transepts, as they were at present bound to maintain the nave of the church.[38] Understandably, in 1912 they were worried, because once the choir was restored they would also be responsible for the upkeep of that too, but were very anxious that it would not be a building with structural problems. It could be argued that even though they may have been responsible for the upkeep of the fabric of the abbey, they were not necessarily the best people to decide on the merits of the plans drawn up by the architect for the restoration. It was this question which prompted Sir John Stirling Maxwell to suggest that the Heritors seek expert guidance. However, it must be pointed out that the Heritors were not being asked to bear the financial burden of the restoration, which was the responsibility of the major donors and other subscribers. For the Heritors it was the principle that was important.

In one sense Sir John was right. The donors were not responsible for the appointment of the architect, though it appears that even though the Heritors' approval was sought for Rowand Anderson's restoration, their approval was seen as a formality and had thus created a precedent. What this meant, in effect, was that the Kirk Session assumed the Heritors did not have any powers of veto over any executive decision arrived at by those actually involved in appointing the architect.

Stirling Maxwell wrote to Rev A M Maclean on 14 February insisting that the decision to employ, or not to employ Rowand Anderson (rather than MacGregor Chalmers) should have been taken formally by the Heritors' Superintending Committee.[39] Indeed, in a further letter

to Maclean (on 29 March, 1912) Sir John explained just what he meant by a "formal decision".[40]

Stirling Maxwell insisted that for Rowand Anderson's restoration, a committee had been set up with the Lord Lieutenant of the County as Convener, and the whole project was carefully gone into before an architect was decided on. This may explain the formalities, but the decision to appoint an architect had more or less been taken by Dr Gentles, ten years before anything ever happened. At the Heritors meeting held on 6 July, 1899, their approval merely formalised the existing arrangement between Gentles and Rowand Anderson.[41] At that meeting Rowand Anderson laid the already completed plans before the members, who accepted them. Yet, in 1904 the members of the Building Committee took it upon themselves to make an arrangement with Rowand Anderson.[42]

It was this arrangement which prompted Sir John to write (on 23 February, 1912) to Maclean that in 1904 everything had been left in order, as the Building Committee supposed, for a resumption of the work at the first opportunity.[43] It was because Rowand Anderson was not automatically appointed, when funds were available for the continuation of the work, that Sir John would not accept the position as Chairman of the Building Committee.

The question whether the previous Building Committee had the authority, and the legal right, to speak for any later Restoration Committee is an important one. It could be said that its tentative "arrangement" restricted the freedom of any future Restoration Committee to adjudicate in matters pertaining to the completion of the abbey's restoration. Moreover, it is unlikely that Stirling Maxwell, or anyone else, could have ensured

Anderson's appointment, or "arranged" to have a Building Committee formed from those who wanted Anderson for the next phase of the restoration.

Maclean had already replied to Sir John (on 10 February, 1912)[44] when he acknowledged that he understood why he was reluctant to stand against Sir Rowand Anderson, with whom he had been associated and whose work he admired so much. It is not too difficult to see why Sir John was one of his admirers. He knew him well, for Anderson had built the pavilions and terrace at Pollok House between 1896 and 1905.[45] Also, Sir John had worked closely with Rowand Anderson during the previous restoration, as Chairman of the Building Committee. Thus, it may well have been due to Sir John's influence that the 1904 agreement was made between Anderson and the Restoration Committee, and which led to Anderson's drawings being tentatively accepted for the final chapter in the restoration of the abbey.

Considering the experiences of the last restoration, Maclean hoped that Sir John would appreciate their predicament, for he was very anxious that it should all conclude satisfactorily. Moreover, Anderson was not young so Maclean was obviously worried that they could be made to look foolish, were anything to happen to him, with the restoration unfinished. Perhaps in an attempt at a compromise, Maclean suggested that had Sir John accepted the Chairmanship of the Building Committee he might have managed to secure the services of both Rowand Anderson and MacGregor Chalmers for the final restoration. Sir John alone, could have achieved this, he insisted. Maclean's understanding of the situation was that a successful restoration depended on a first rate architect with a free hand, or Anderson's design in the hands of a second rate architect. Since execution is as vital as

design, the latter was impossible to contemplate - too great a risk - so it could only be the former, unless Sir John were to take the chair.[46]

This was a rather misleading proposition indeed, and raises many a spectre; for either Maclean considered Chalmers was up to the job, or he did not, there could be no in-between situation. It is most improbable that either architect would have agreed to such a suggestion, for the question would always be raised, "*whose work was it?*" Understandably, Sir John disagreed with such an idea, for it was his considered opinion that whoever was appointed should have the professional freedom to carry out his own ideas and not those of others.[47]

In the meantime, Rowand Anderson had become aware that funds were now available for the continuing of the restoration of the abbey. He was not the kind of man to back off from a fight, especially when his professional reputation was at stake, for as he stated later, he regarded his restoration work "at least equal to that of any other architect in Scotland." He knew that his work at the abbey was considered more than satisfactory, and that the proposed restoration could never have taken place without his successful restoration of the crossing and transepts.[48]

Therefore, Anderson wrote to Maclean on the 9 January. The minister was later to denounce it as a "threatening" letter. Although Anderson's letter is no longer extant, if it matched the tone of the letters sent later in the year, Maclean's assessment was correct.[49] No doubt Anderson would have reminded Maclean that in 1904 the Restoration Committee had accepted his plans for the final restoration. Yet MacGregor Chalmers was being

spoken of as the architect who would complete the restoration of Paisley Abbey.

Anderson considered this more than a slight to his professionalism, and also to his high-standing within the architectural community.[50] As long ago as 1873, when he surveyed the abbey for the marquis of Bute he had perceived the distinct possibility of its complete restoration, which shows him to have been a man of vision, to which his achievements at Paisley testify. Because he was prepared to fight for his professionalism, and the right to complete the restoration, he decided to canvass certain influential people whom he considered might further his cause.

The first person he approached was Sir John Stirling Maxwell, to whom he wrote on 9 January 1912. Anderson reminded Sir John of what had been agreed, and hoped that there would "*be no doubt this time about employing me to do the work.*"[51] On the same day Anderson wrote to Maclean, who replied advising him in a rather matter-of-fact manner, that the Restoration Scheme, which had been inaugurated by himself in 1911, was to be carried out according to the designs drawn up by MacGregor Chalmers, at an estimated cost of £50,000.[52] Maclean replied by stating that before MacGregor Chalmers was appointed Rowand Anderson's name had been carefully considered. Unfortunately, Anderson's response to Maclean is no longer extant.

On 12 January, Anderson also wrote to John Stewart Clark, the major benefactor. He put it to him, whether his promised handsome donation of £30000 was conditional on the appointment of a particular architect, and more to the point, when it was not Anderson himself.[53] Clark replied by return, rather disappointingly, that he was

taking nothing to do with the appointment of the architect for the restoration, but that he would bring up Anderson's name. He suggested that it would be best if Anderson were to write to the Building Committee himself.[54]

In what may have been an attempt to bring matters to a head, Anderson again wrote to Sir John on 15 January, 1912, suggesting that the appointment of another architect would be more expensive as the cost of the new plans would have added to the eventual cost, when his plans had already been partly paid for.[55]

There is every likelihood that Sir John now wrote to Maclean stating that Rowand Anderson was being deliberately overlooked as a serious candidate for the restoration. Maclean in a lengthy reply to Sir John on the 16 January[56], strongly emphasised that there were sound reasons for passing over Sir Rowand Anderson as architect for the restoration. He reminded Sir John that he was not the only one experiencing "tiresomeness"- Sir John's word to him - for the exasperating experiences of the Dr Gentles, the previous minister of the abbey, at the hands of Anderson during the past restoration were generally known.

Indeed, what appears to have convinced Maclean that he had a lucky escape was the "threatening letter" Anderson had written to him on January 9th. In any case, Maclean was to remind Sir John, in a letter of 10 February, that Sir Rowand Anderson was now seventy-eight and that the restoration would take six to eight years. Furthermore, he was convinced - even though he was not qualified to make such a judgement - that Rowand Anderson's younger partner - Arthur F Balfour Paul - was not really up to the job.[57]

There is another factor which cannot be ignored. Had Rowand Anderson been appointed as architect, and if he had become incapacitated, there was no guarantee that Paisley would have been completed as he had designed it.(For instance, when John Oldrid Scott succeeded his father as architect at Glasgow University he changed his father's design for the spire over the main block.[58])

MacGregor Chalmers, after all, had been selected "*after most careful consideration*", and Maclean reckoned, that the man, who had so successfully restored Holy Trinity, St Andrews, was more than fitted to the task in front of him. Indeed, by admitting that Chalmers was the obvious heir to Rowand Anderson, Maclean appears to have acknowledged Anderson's esteemed position in Scottish architectural circles; and when Anderson died, Chalmers was seen as "indisputably the most distinguished of Scottish restorers of ancient architecture."[59]

In his reply to the minister on 14 February, 1912[60], Sir John was honest enough to admit that employing Rowand Anderson as architect for the restoration would be problematical, but was emphatic about the competence of his staff (a point raised by Maclean on 16, January, 1912)[61] when he questioned the qualifications of Paul. In any case, Rowand Anderson was in good health, said Sir John, so despite his advanced age could live for some years. Moreover, Anderson's designs were complete and work could have begun at once.

In his letter of 16 January, 1912, Maclean insisted that the restoration scheme, as devised by MacGregor Chalmers, was a very bold one, which Chalmers had estimated would cost £50000 - and was to include the restoration of The Place - whereas Rowand Anderson's was to have cost £40000, of which £22000 was already spent on

the restoration of the transepts, crossing and part of the tower.[62] Maclean, by describing MacGregor Chalmers' scheme as a very bold one could be laying an implied criticism against Anderson's - he certainly did not favour Anderson's tower and spire. Maclean wrote that he had given much consideration to the situation, and had sought the advice of many, most of whom thought MacGregor Chalmers' scheme admirable.

Maclean also wrote that he would have preferred to wait before appointing an architect[63], which seems a rather strange statement, considering that by then he had already been promised funding for the restoration of the choir and tower. Even though he blamed Rowand Anderson's actions for making him take the decision to support Chalmers, the decision to appoint him had been taken in January 1911, a year before Anderson had written to him.

If, as Maclean said on 16 January, 1912, he were to convince possible benefactors and the general public, of the distinct possibility of the complete restoration of the choir, he could not have approached anyone without having a definite plan, otherwise, he could have been accused of "*talking with his head in the clouds*". Therefore, Maclean wrote that he was compelled to use Chalmers' plans and estimates, and on the strength of these, he was promised the money he was so anxious to receive.[64]

The fact is that Anderson was just not wanted. Maclean put it another way when he reminded Sir John that Anderson had no real claim as architect for the final restoration, for Maclean and the Kirk Session had not been parties to the 1904 agreement.[65] Therefore, Maclean did not feel bound by it, which the Heritors ought to have considered could be a distinct possibility.

Despite Stirling Maxwell's determination not to have anything to do with what was going on, Maclean was still trying to convince him to accept the chairmanship of the Building Committee. Maclean was sure, he said, that Sir John would agree that only the best architect was good enough for the restoration. Maclean concluded his letter to Sir John by suggesting confidently that he would also deduce impartially that MacGregor Chalmers' plans were not inferior to any which had previously been prepared.[66]

Indeed, in a letter to Maclean (on 18 March, 1912) MacGregor Chalmers wrote that

> "the restoration of Paisley Abbey *is the most important and most responsible work of the kind that has been undertaken in Scotland since the Reformation*. It is not a case of merely repairing an ancient structure, or of roofing a building that is otherwise intact. It is *a re-creation from the foundations, in form and spirit of a great medieval abbey church*."[67]

Sir John could have said these words himself, and it was this approach which would have helped convince Maclean that Chalmers would prove to be the best man for the job.

From what is known about Rowand Anderson's plans for the choir at Paisley there is little between them, and those of Chalmers [plates 175a & 184a]. Certainly, the north and south elevations of both designs for the choir would have been similar, consisting of six bays defined by buttresses in the Decorated Style. Also, like Anderson, Chalmers' designed his with niches for statues, as at Melrose, and his large windows fill the bays. Anderson's tracery would appear to be similar to his work at Dunblane [plate 177a], but quite distinct from Chalmers. From his conjectural drawing Anderson intended

that his east end would have been filled by a large traceried window. Also, unlike the choirs planned by Salmon and Chalmers, Anderson's proposed choir roof (as already noted) would have reached up to the height of the transepts and not the nave.

Although some nineteenth century prints and early photographs appear to give credence to the suggestion that the old choir walls had been built without buttresses [plate 185], such a structure would certainly have been unstable. Indeed, at one stage Gourlay appears to have considered that this was the situation at Paisley's choir, for he noted that the walls were not strong enough to stand to a great height, existing as they did without buttresses. Later he was to correct himself, noting that Anderson had been right: that the original buttresses had been clawed off the choir walls.[68]

Photographs taken during the Chalmers' restoration of the choir provide us with the archaeological evidence, that Paisley's late medieval choir followed the traditional practice of being buttressed [plate 185], In plate 185, there is evidence of the westmost buttress(es) on the south wall of the choir near the crossing, the existence of the other buttress being suggested by vertical markings on the face of the wall. These markings are more than likely to be the remnants of the buttresses after they had been clawed off the wall. There is further evidence which supports this argument. The base course is broken below each of these markings, where it would have joined with, and then gone round the buttress, suggesting that the base course was also removed for its ashlar. The old buttresses were 2 ft 5 ins broad at most (according to Gourlay), from the marks

on the wall,[69] and similar in proportion to those on the south wall of the nave.

The finding of traces of buttresses on the choir walls by Mr Taylor, the builder, substantiates the photographic evidence. Yet when he measured them they found to be only 2 ft 3 ins broad[70], whilst MacGregor Chalmers' new buttresses were to be 3 ft broad to give greater stability to the new choir.

Although Anderson's insistence on having the choir walls reach up to the same height as the transepts, could simply be a reworking of what had become a common element in many of his churches, at Paisley he may have designed his choir roof to take cognisance of the remnants of the original shallow buttresses. Such buttresses would not have supported a high roof, but Chalmers' broader and thicker buttresses were planned specifically to support such a roof. In the interior, the main difference between the two designs was the open timbered roof planned by Rowand Anderson, whereas Chalmers planned a stone vault. There is no doubt that Anderson's timber ceiling would have been as dignified as those which he had previously executed at Dunblane [plate 181a], and elsewhere. Of course, Anderson was correct historically and architecturally, for in all probability the medieval choir at Paisley would have had a wooden ceiling.

However at Paisley, considering the great difference in height between the transepts and the nave on the exterior, Anderson's choir roof when compared with Chalmers' would certainly have appeared unusual. Anderson wrote in his original report to Dr Gentles' that

> "As there is no record of what the original Tower and Spire were like, I propose treating this feature in a manner which would declare itself

> frankly *to be modern work*, but of course designed in the spirit of the old. I have designed the height of the tower to be about 112 feet having a Spire about 100 feet high".[71]

Even though Anderson considered his tower and spire to be modern in design they are more in the spirit of the later ornate and heavy Baronial Style, prevalent towards the end of the Victorian period, than of the early twentieth century. Also, it should be remembered that fourteen years or more would have passed since Anderson had drawn up his plans for Paisley. Although Anderson's tower and spire, or rather cap-house, have recently been described as possessing greater visual interest than those of Chalmers[72], there is no doubt that Anderson's overtly heavy, and rather over-worked design just lacks the simple dignity of Chalmers' tower and spire.

After MacGregor Chalmers' appointment in 1912, it is suggested that he prepared new plans for the choir, tower and cloisters as his original plans were apparently more or less of the nature of sketches and quite useless for carrying out the work.[73] In his letter to Sir John on 10 February, Maclean accused Stirling Maxwell of comparing Chalmers' rough first draft designs to Anderson's completed drawings. Lorimer appears to have done likewise when he prepared plans for The Place. In any case, this was common practice since William Burn's day (1789-1870).

Sir John did not share Maclean's sentiments regarding the suitability of either MacGregor Chalmers, or his plans for the restoration. After reconsidering both sets of plans, he wrote to Maclean on 3 February that Rowand Anderson's designs [plate 175a & b] for the restoration were excellent, whereas MacGregor Chalmers' [plates 184a & b, and 186] were just adequate, but again he was not specific about what he meant by that.[74] In

another letter to Maclean[75] Stirling Maxwell may well have given his real reason for not wanting Chalmers. In his judgement, since Maclean and the Kirk Session did not want Anderson, the best compromise was to employ Sir Robert Lorimer who "possessed just that quality of distinction which seems to be wanting in that of Mr MacGregor Chalmers."

The question then was whether Lorimer had so established himself as supreme in the sphere of ecclesiastical architecture, that the Kirk Session would be justified in dispensing with the services of MacGregor Chalmers, who had guided them for a year, and more. This could only be so if Chalmers' restoration seemed to be that of an incompetent architect, but Maclean was convinced that was not the case. He questioned Lorimer's accepted superiority over Chalmers in the matter of ecclesiastical architecture, pointing out that up till then Lorimer had only one successful ecclesiastical commission to date - namely the Thistle Chapel. Lorimer had made his reputation as a domestic architect, whereas Chalmers was an accomplished and successful ecclesiastical architect.[76] Chalmers' restoration work at Bowden, Iona and Holy Trinity St Andrews [plate 187a & b], earned Chalmers a reputation as a restorer of note, whereas Lorimer had no experience of church restoration, which Maclean regarded as a distinct disadvantage.[77] Lorimer's Thistle Chapel was only completed in 1911 (while Chalmers was already employed at Paisley). The Thistle Chapel is certainly graced with a magnificent vaulted ceiling [plate 188] and choir stalls. Chalmers had also intended having choir stalls in the choir at Paisley [plate 186], though different in style from Lorimer's.

In the Gothic period, a groin vault was seen as one of the highest marks of architectural achievement, as

seen in the vaulted ceilings of the great cathedrals of England and France; and since MacGregor Chalmers wanted only the best for his restoration of Paisley, then logically it could only be a vaulted ceiling [plate 186].

On the other hand, Chalmers was regarded as being quarrelsome by his peers, but perhaps Sir John Stirling Maxwell, like Professor Gourlay, was aware of Chalmers' boast that he could build churches cheaper than any other architect[78], so was wary of him. The suggestion of a *cheap* restoration at Paisley could well have been the cause of the apprehension expressed by Sir John and some of the Heritors. After all, the success of Paisley's restoration would depend on the quality of building, as well as its architectural design, but a cheap re-build could prove disastrous.

On the 28 February, 1912[79], Maclean replied to Sir John's letter of the 14th, and politely reminded him that he had known of Peter MacGregor Chalmers' appointment as architect before it was made. Now it seemed that he and other Heritors were questioning Chalmers' appointment. Sir John insisted that if Chalmers was chosen, then Maclean would probably have to face a great deal of criticism, even though he finally admitted that Chalmers was a very competent and scholarly architect; and if chosen to restore the abbey, his restoration would btle above the average that they were accustomed to in those days, though only in interest; and only if he excelled himself, otherwise, it would be below the level which their generation could produce. This is a harsh judgement, for it impugns Chalmers' qualities as a restorer, when he had many supporters who considered his restoration work, at Holy Trinity, St Andrews, not only as of a very high quality architecturally, but also based on sound archaeological precepts.[80]

Maclean (on 28 February, 1912)[81] deferred to Stirling Maxwell's opinion, and those of his friends, but reminded him that he too had conferred with those in the know, who said that MacGregor Chalmers' work at Holy Trinity, St Andrews [1907-1909], and his St Luke's Edinburgh [1909], showed him to be a better ecclesiastical architect than Lorimer. Even though the latter "was a builder of great country houses" Chalmers had also designed some notable houses such as Dargarvel House, Renfrewshire and Kinnaird Castle, Perthshire.[82] Maclean accepted that even though the Thistle Chapel had certainly enhanced Lorimer's reputation, the glamour of Royal favour which he enjoyed - shown by his being Knighted at Holyrood[83] - could not be overlooked.

Still, Maclean insisted that Chalmers had shown genius in advance of Lorimer's work at the Thistle Chapel, and now that his chance had come, Chalmers would surpass himself, though he would probably be criticised. Maclean then wondered just how Sir John was able to convince the previous Building Committee to accept and approve Rowand Anderson's universally disliked design for the tower, and trusted that the criticism he had already heard of the Thistle Chapel would not be half as bad as that of the abbey.[84]

Sir John had already written to Maclean (on 14 February, 1912)[85] that he was certain the proposed restoration would be considered a profound mistake by those most competent to judge (in other words, people who shared his views). Sir John, as chairman of the previous Building Committee, concluded that since the abbey was a national monument there should be no element of risk whatever. Indeed, Professor Gourlay was to note that both H E Clifford and J Keppie, (two of Glasgow's leading

architects), considered that it was a national calamity for MacGregor Chalmers to be appointed architect of the final phase of the restoration of Paisley Abbey[86], but, as with so many of his comments, he did not elaborate.

Sir John stated that he was not going to be involved in any controversy, regarding either the appointing of the architect, or his refusal to accept the chairmanship of the Building Committee. However, despite his insistence that he did not wish to be involved in controversy, in January 1912, he had already written privately to Schomberg McDonnell[87], of the Office of Works, on the question of who was best fitted to carry out the work of restoration at Paisley. In February 1912[88], McDonnell had replied that he did not think well of MacGregor Chalmers, and would prefer either Lorimer or Rowand Anderson. Anderson, he suggested, was too old to undertake such a big work, (this was one of Maclean's main objections). It could be construed that McDonnell's opinion of Lorimer was biased, since it was he who had appointed Lorimer as architect of the Thistle Chapel.

Lord Balcarres[89] had also been consulted by Sir John. Balcarres wrote from the south of France, on the very same day as McDonnell. Balcarres considered that Chalmers' work at Holy Trinity, St Andrews, although showing solidity and stability "was not quite that of a gentleman."[90] Indeed, it would be difficult to reach an understanding of this rather enigmatic statement. Perhaps by this, Balcarres meant that it was a little too down to earth, and so not quite as ethereal as Lorimer's recently completed Thistle Chapel [plate 189].

However, Sir John also received a letter from M R James, the Provost of King's College Cambridge.[91] James considered that Chalmers was more than qualified for the

proposed restoration of Paisley Abbey, because of his work at Holy Trinity.[92] At such a late time in the day, the official announcement of MacGregor Chalmers as architect of the restoration having been made the previous January, this was certainly not the kind of reply anticipated by Stirling Maxwell because it was very favourable to Chalmers; and this from someone who could not be described as an interested party.

Sir John also received further testimonials in favour of Chalmers from Sir Thomas Glen Coats.[93] Coats was not afraid to seek the opinions of others, whom he thought were knowledgeable in church architecture. Thus, he felt obliged to intimate to Sir John, the opinions of Lady Frances Balfour who thought highly of Chalmers, considering he "had saved the situation" at Iona[94]; and the Rev Dr Fleming, minister of St Columba's, Pont Street, London, who regarded him as the best man in Scotland.[95]

Nevertheless, Stirling Maxwell was still determined to oppose Chalmers' appointment. He suggested to Maclean that a formal approach be made to the Office of Works (McDonnell, in other words) on the question of a suitable architect for the restoration. When he already knew the outcome, having personally contacted McDonnell, this appears to be an attempt to undermine the decision already made by the minister and the Kirk Session, a decision with which the Heritors were totally dissatisfied.

However, Maclean in his letter of 26 April, 1912,[96] had been quick to point out to Stirling Maxwell that the Office of Works had not been consulted because it had never had anything to do with the abbey before. He insisted that any consultation with it, which in any case

was seen as being an English body, could have led to opposition both locally, and within the Church. In any case, during James Salmon's restoration, appeals were made to the Office of Works for financial help towards his restoration, but none was forthcoming.[97] Maclean was aware that Sir John would have favoured him contacting McDonnell, but emphasised that "that in some things they were very strong Home Rulers in Scotland."[98] Indeed Maclean was right.[99]

On 1st May, 1912[100] Sir John wrote again to Maclean insisting that he was not hostile to the restoration. He explained that the reason why he could not accept being Chairman of the Building Committee - was because of the element of risk (in his opinion an unnecessary one) in employing MacGregor Chalmers. In a postscript, longer than the letter, he defended the Office of Works insisting that it could hardly be described as an English Department, and listed its past good deeds in Scotland, especially the building of the Thistle Chapel, and concluded that if it were seen to be competent in the matter of these buildings, then surely it was competent to give an opinion on Paisley.

However, as far as Maclean was concerned, Chalmers had been judged favourably by those whom he described as the "most competent to judge." Also, there was no doubt that Chalmers was not only in the first rank of ecclesiastical architects, but was actively engaged in the development of Scottish church architecture.[101]

On the advice of Sir John Stirling Maxwell himself, Maclean had sought the advice of W T Oldrieve, the Chief Government Architect in Scotland, and head of the Office of Works. Oldrieve said

> "that in view of the constructional skill displayed by Mr Chalmers at St Andrews, his learned research at Iona, and the marked growth of his powers, he must now be considered as *competent to undertake the restoration of Paisley Abbey*."[102]

Oldrieve was simply less sensitive to criticism than McDonnell, so was not afraid to speak favourably on Chalmers' qualities as an architect.

Maclean had also sought affidavits from Sir Donald MacAlister, Principal of the University of Glasgow, Rev Prof Cooper and others.[103] Sir Donald was a Trustee of Iona and spoke highly of MacGregor Chalmers' work there, while Professor Cooper, who had been a prime mover in the founding of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society (later to become the Scottish Ecclesiological Society), said that Chalmers was the equal, if not superior to those other architects eminently suited to the task.

Maclean also enquired of the earl of Dalkeith[104], Custodian of Melrose Abbey. Dalkeith wrote that, after he himself had made enquiries from those qualified to make such a value judgement, he came to the conclusion that MacGregor Chalmers was the best architect to offer advice on Melrose Abbey. Even though none of these gentlemen appears to have been either an architect, architectural historian or archaeologist, they were learned men and so probably knowledgeable of what was happening in the current ecclesiological climate. It is highly unlikely, though, that those Iona Trustees would have spoken favourably of Chalmers had they been unhappy with his work, for unlike the Office of Works, the Trustees did not really have any vested interest in the choice of architect for the restoration of Paisley's choir.

It is obvious that opinions on MacGregor Chalmers, as an architect, differed greatly (and still do). In 1911, there were those who would have agreed with Sir John Stirling Maxwell that Chalmers was just not up to the job, while there were others who would have agreed with the St Andrews Presbytery that it was not just his artistic genius which inspired his restoration of Holy Trinity Church, but the reverent religious spirit which pervaded it. These were qualities which would have made him an admirable candidate to restore Paisley Abbey[105], and certainly would have influenced Maclean.

The minister wrote on 10 February, 1912[106], that he was working to the best of his ability, for the good of the abbey, aware of the national importance of the work in which they were all engaged. Because he was obviously surprised at Sir John's lack of sympathy and support, he asked him for specific criticisms of MacGregor Chalmers, which he hoped would help him form an opinion. Although there is no record of any reply to Maclean, Sir John may have written to the minister as he did to A H Spiers, one of the Heritors, on 27 April, 1912.[107]

The reasons he gave Spiers for the continued employment of Rowand Anderson were as follows: he had already been paid £800 for his plans; his partner could capably continue with the work if anything were to happen to Anderson; his so-called over-spending on the tower and crossing was due to Dr Gentles' ignorance of the problem. Even though he was also ignorant of the science of architecture, Maclean like his predecessor, Dr Gentles, shared the view that because Anderson had used most of the money on rebuilding the crossing and transepts proved that he could not be trusted with the restoration.[108] However, there were other reasons.

Rowand Anderson's personality and temperament did not work in his favour. The fact that Anderson was later to produce a hand-out[109], explaining (rather intemperately some might say), his side of the story is perhaps proof that Maclean could well have been right. As Maclean so often emphasised, had the decision been made in favour of Anderson, there would have been no restoration scheme and that not one penny would have been donated towards the work. It is indeed sad that such an important decision should have been based solely on expenditure, but, Maclean could well have been right about there being no restoration had Anderson been chosen.

Although Sir Rowand Anderson's standing in Scottish architectural circles was second to none, he was, nonetheless, a rather crusty character and perhaps by 1912, past his best. The fact that Anderson's name had been brought up before the Kirk Session, which had decided unanimously against him, meant that they had no alternative but to consider other architects. Maclean insisted that he did not put forward MacGregor Chalmers' name, but on making enquiries he was convinced that he was the best man for such a specialised job.[110]

Anderson's letter, canvassing one of the donors, was discussed by the Kirk Session[111], but as noted above, the decision went against him. Apart from other reasons, Maclean said, that he could not have justified appointing Rowand Anderson at the age of seventy-eight. The donors had confidence in the Kirk Session, and so were quite content to leave everything to it and were happy with the appointment of MacGregor Chalmers. Maclean emphasised that the Heritors had no voice in the selection of the architect on the last occasion. This is a very important point and one which the Heritors could not contradict,

yet they were practically demanding a say in the appointment of the architect for the final phase in the restoration of the abbey church of Paisley.

A H Spiers also sat on the Superintending Committee. As a supporter of Stirling Maxwell, he wrote to Sir John on the 23 April 1912[112], on the matter of the appointment of an architect for the restoration. He criticized Maclean for contacting an architect, other than Rowand Anderson of course, on his own initiative. Spier's approach was more conciliatory than Sir John's, in that he did not want to lose Stewart Clark's rather magnanimous donation of £30000 (later to be increased by a further £10000) towards the complete restoration of the choir. Although he may have been suggesting caution, he was convinced that the Heritors should definitely consult with Anderson.

In a detailed reply to Spiers (27 April, 1912)[113] Sir John reiterated why he could not accept the Chair of the Building Committee, and amongst other matters gave reasons for his acceptance of Rowand Anderson's plans. "*I dare-say*" he wrote that "*Maclean is right in thinking that Rowand Anderson is impossible,*" but he felt sure that MacGregor Chalmers was not the right man, as there was no guarantee that he would give the best. On the other hand, as far as he was concerned, Lorimer's ability was proved beyond doubt, and was seen as the first of the younger generation.

Again Sir John was rather condescending towards Chalmers, saying that he should come next after Anderson and Lorimer, though he admitted that a restoration by Chalmers would be better than nothing at all. He insisted that Chalmers would design a dull but scholarly building, and that he had no wish to be responsible for

his employment. However, it is unlikely that the visitor looking up to admire the vaulted choir at Paisley today would accept that his criticism of Chalmers' choir (even though completed by Lorimer) as dull and scholarly was justified. There is no doubt the Sir John wanted the best, but even *the best* must be a relative term.

Stirling Maxwell is here demanding the unattainable, for it must be remembered that Rowand Anderson had given a guarantee that he would restore the choir, transepts, crossing and tower at a stated price, but never completed his planned scheme of restoration. Factors outwith his control resulted in his underestimating the cost, and so he was prevented from giving of his best. Similarly, the outbreak of war, in 1914, was an unforeseen event which was to prevent Chalmers himself from completing his work.

The Heritors felt obliged to contact the Office of Works for advice, in order to discover who was the best man for the job. Sir John, as noted earlier, was worried that unless the best architect was appointed it might prove to be a bad restoration, such as had so often happened in the past elsewhere.

> "At all events," he said "it would relieve them (the Heritors) from the responsibility for the employment of a doubtful architect on the abbey while Sir Rowand Anderson's admirable plans are in existence and Sir Robert Lorimer is at his zenith."[114]

Although Sir John's integrity is not in question (for it is likely that he genuinely admired Rowand Anderson's plans), it must be emphasized that as Chairman of the previous Building Committee, he had accepted Anderson's plans, for the restoration of the choir.

Spiers replied (30 April, 1912) agreeing with the tone of Sir John's letter, that it might be impossible for any of the old committee to serve on the new one. Spiers was against the idea of contacting the Office of Works, as it might give that Government Department the opportunity to take over the abbey. Spiers considered this quite unnecessary, as there was a good body of Heritors who took an interest in the place. He found Sir John's opinion that MacGregor Chalmers was safe, a great consolation, but was adamant that the Heritors must not let the chance of having a complete restoration slip away. Indeed, he even went so far as to suggest a "*watching committee.*"[115]

Despite the fact that Sir John knew just how determined Maclean was that Chalmers was the best man for the job, he was just as determined to have an architect other than Chalmers restore the abbey, so he decided to enlist the help of the other Heritors, through T D Laird, their clerk. He wrote to Laird (17 May, 1912)[116] enclosing a memorandum on the restoration of the abbey, which more or less laid down the ground rules which the Heritors were to follow in their opposition to the appointment of Chalmers.

In his letter, he said that for the Heritors

> "the question which confronts them is one for experts, and since the Heritors are not experts themselves, it appears to be their wisest course to entrench themselves behind expert advice."[117]

He advised Laird not to approach the architectural institutions, but rather the Office of Works, which he had visited whilst in London, to obtain independent objective judgements of Chalmers' qualifications as an architect. Maxwell insisted that the Board appeared to

be willing "to help the Heritors in any way it could provided it was not put in the position of having to veto the proposed restoration."[118] As well as giving Laird an insight into how the Board might reply, Sir John also advised him, in any approach, to seek advice on competent architects, rather on the merits of any particular architect.

In his memorandum, he suggested that if the Office of Works were to recommend MacGregor Chalmers then well and good, but

> "if the name of Mr Chalmers were not among (those Scots architects most competent to undertake the important task at hand) it is unlikely that the donors of the funds for this restoration, or the Kirk Session or any other sensible person would press for his employment."[119]

Sir John's assessment of the situation avoids the fact that in a letter to him on 26 April, 1912, Maclean wrote: "I went to the donors with Mr Chalmers' designs and estimates and they gave their gifts in accordance therewith."[120] This appears to be quite unambiguous, yet here Sir John Stirling Maxwell is suggesting that everyone involved in the restoration would be quite happy to go along with the Office of Works.

In the meantime, Laird had written to Sir John on 20 May, 1912, advising him (five months after the fact), that

> "it was now admitted that Mr Chalmers had been appointed by the Kirk Session, and when the Restoration Committee was formed it would have to take up the matter with Mr Chalmers as architect, as the appointment would already have been made."[121]

He added that the Superintending Committee was about to meet and would have to decide whether to sanction the

restoration under Chalmers or seek expert advice, and on this matter he would like Sir John's suggestions. Of course, Sir John had already offered suggestions in his memo of 17 May.[122] In his reply to Laird, the Heritors' Clerk, on 23 May, Sir John suggested that if the Heritors were to follow his earlier memorandum, it would clearly explain their position to the minister and the Kirk Session. Indeed, it may be said that it was this second letter which encouraged the Heritors, through T D Laird, to use every delaying tactic possible, in the hope that they would prevent MacGregor Chalmers from actually rebuilding the long lost choir, the final and most important part of the restoration of Paisley Abbey.[123]

Laird wrote to Maclean again, on 29 May. He intimated to the minister that the Heritors were very pleased at the generous gifts promised for the completion of the restoration of the abbey, but that they were rather surprised not to have been consulted before the appointment of an architect, since they would be responsible for the fabric of the building once completed. Laird then said (just as Sir John had advised him on 23 May), that, as it was a matter for experts, expert advice ought to be taken, though he did not advise Maclean at this stage that he was actually writing to the Office of Works on behalf of the Heritors.[124]

Laird's first letter to the Office of Works was written the same day he had written to Maclean (29 May).[125] He asked the Board's opinion on whom they thought was the architect best qualified to carry out the final act of the restoration of Paisley Abbey. Also, he put the tentative suggestion to the Office of Works that they might be prepared to examine and report on the plans, and afterwards supervise the work.

The Office of Works replied to the Heritors on 6 June. The tone of the letter was such that they assumed that the final decision, on who would receive the commission to complete the restoration of the abbey, would be taken by the Heritors. The Office of Works naturally replied that the architects best qualified to restore the abbey would be either Sir Robert Lorimer or Sir Rowand Anderson. They insisted, that they could not accept the responsibility of examining and reporting upon the plans, or of supervising the work. The letter was signed by Schomberg McDonnell.[126]

On the 7 June, 1912, Laird wrote to Sir John enclosing the letter, referred to, from the Office of Works. Laird still maintained that the reply from the Office of Works:

> "would not, of course, prevent (the Board) from naming an architect whom the Heritors could consult regarding the plans or who might advise them regarding the execution of the work."[127]

Laird obviously misinterpreted the Office of Works' statement, that they could not accept the responsibility of examining and reporting upon the plans, or inspecting the work. In other words, the Board was not prepared to become embroiled in the obvious infighting taking place amongst the different parties involved in the restoration of Paisley Abbey.

As an aside to Sir John, Laird added that he understood the donors were annoyed with the Heritors' stance, and because of it, they might withdraw their gifts, so they would have to handle matters very carefully.[128] By now, six months had passed since the donors had made their generous promises of funding for the restoration, and as yet not even the first sod had

been cut. In the meantime, Stirling Maxwell advised Laird that the Heritors should be for withholding granting permission for any preliminary investigations in the choir.[129]

So armed with the letter from the Office of Works, Laird approached the donors on behalf of the Heritors. He believed that he was in possession of the evidence, or proof, that the Heritors' argument - that the employment of Peter MacGregor Chalmers was far too risky. Therefore, Laird wrote to the donors on 15 June, 1912[130] advising them that he had consulted the Office of Works.[131] The Board, he insisted, suggested only Sir Robert Lorimer or Sir Rowand Anderson, as architects suitably qualified to undertake the restoration of the abbey. If the donors and the Kirk Session were not prepared to accept Anderson, then perhaps they would be prepared to consider Lorimer rather than Chalmers. Laird then eulogised on Lorimer's work at the Thistle Chapel! Since the Board had not mentioned MacGregor Chalmers, Laird then put the question to the donors, "Were their gifts dependant on him as architect of the restoration, and if so why did they prefer him to any other architect?"[132]

The Heritors' letter shows that they were in a quandary. Even though they considered that either Rowand Anderson or Robert Lorimer was the best architect for the restoration, against their better judgement MacGregor Chalmers had been appointed by the Kirk Session. Since the Heritors were not really making any headway against the sustained arguments, and determination of Maclean, they may well have lost their way.

The donors replied on 20 June, 1912 and said that they did not wish to enter into any controversy or discussion with the Heritors, that they entrusted their

interests to the Kirk Session and had been cognisant of the Kirk Session's actions. Rather unexpectedly, they assured the Heritors that their

> "donations were given in accordance with the scheme prepared by the Session and they had full confidence in the architect Mr MacGregor Chalmers who was recommended by *one who ought to know*."

They added that they fully appreciated that the Heritors wanted the best, but they were confident that Chalmers would achieve just that. Finally, they closed, by stating that the Kirk Session had made the agreement with Chalmers with their full knowledge.[133] Stirling Maxwell might well have been disappointed by their response, for it is clear that that is not the response he had anticipated in his letter to Laird of 17 May.[134]

The donors' response was not what the Heritors had expected either. Nevertheless Laird, in a letter to Stirling Maxwell on 25 June, was to state, rather conspiratorially, that the enclosed letter from the donors had

> "evidently been got up by the Kirk Session. It practically puts the whole matter on their shoulders, and I understand they are having a meeting in a day or two to decide what line they are going to take. I am to have a copy from them before the end of the week in time for our meeting on Monday. As you will notice, the present letter (from the donors) is of a non-committal character."[135]

Considering that the donors, in their letter to the Heritors, had said quite definitely that the Kirk Session had made the agreement with MacGregor Chalmers with their full knowledge, it was totally misleading for Laird to even suggest that the donors' response was non-committal. So, despite the donors' obvious determination, not to be dissuaded from their approval of the Kirk Session's

endorsement of MacGregor Chalmers' plans for the restoration of the choir at Paisley, T D Laird was still as determined as Sir John Stirling Maxwell, to try another course of action.

Again he wrote to Maclean on behalf of the Heritors. The minister replied with a long detailed letter on 28 June[136] reminding him again that Rowand Anderson had been employed for ten years prior to his formal appointment as architect by the Restoration Committee, just as the Kirk Session had employed Chalmers for eighteen months to prepare a tentative scheme with careful estimates of probable cost. Since the Heritors appeared not to have taken part in the decision to appoint the architect for the previous restoration, the Kirk Session assumed that the Heritors would not wish to be involved in the appointment of the architect for that now proposed. Maclean stressed that the appointment of an architect, other than MacGregor Chalmers, would have been controversial, since the donations were promised on account of the donors having approved his plans and in accordance with his proposals, which had elicited such notable gifts that it was only logical that these be followed through. Moreover, in view of Chalmers' reputation, the Kirk Session considered it unlikely that the Heritors could reject his plans either on structural, artistic or historical grounds.

In July 1912[137] Laird replied, almost contradicting what the minister had said. Although he wrote, that at the previous Restoration the Heritors were not approached until after Rowand Anderson's appointment, Laird insisted that the question of the architect was an open one, which appears to be the opposite of what the minister wrote on Anderson's employment for ten years as adviser to Gentles, prior to any formal appointment as architect.

Indeed, if Anderson had been employed for ten years as adviser to Dr Gentles, Laird wrongly described the decision to appoint him for the restoration as "*open*" when it is highly unlikely that anyone other than Anderson would have been appointed.

Not to be beaten, Laird wrote to the donors again in July 1912, on the vexed question of whom they wanted as architect for the restoration.[138] When Laird said that the Heritors had no preference for one architect or another, this was a distortion of the facts. As we have seen, Anderson and Lorimer were regarded as the only two architects experienced enough to produce the best for Paisley Abbey, an opinion held by Sir John Stirling Maxwell, A H Spiers and other Heritors. The donors responded (24 July, 1912) as they had done previously, and again gave the same reasons for preferring MacGregor Chalmers to either Sir Robert Rowand Anderson or Sir Robert Lorimer.[139]

Laird sent Sir John a rather detailed memo on behalf of the Heritors on 4 July, 1912, stating their position in this important matter. It was almost a word for word copy of the letters and reports Sir John had sent him in May, 1912. Indeed, as he pointed out, the Heritors saw their position as one where they were denied the right "to participate or cooperate in that work (of restoration), but simply by one act of consent to adopt all that has been done," whereas they were the ones responsible for the fabric of the abbey so should have been taking all the important decisions.[140]

In the accompanying letter of 4 July, 1912, which is rather emotive in parts, Laird makes it clear "that the matter is at rather a critical point", which it was. Despite the considerable correspondence between the major

characters in the drama, the position of Maclean, the Kirk Session and the donors was unchanged. But, it should be emphasised that Sir Charles Bine Renshaw, later Convener of the Building Committee, in a letter to Sir John, remarked that

> "Maclean was quite clear on the point that the last word, as to the acceptance or rejection of any plans, must and would rest with the Heritors and that it would be of course in their power to consult anyone they liked to approach."[141]

Although this appears to contradict Maclean's actions, the Heritors appear never to have taken the opportunity of providing any alternative solution. But, whether or not they would have managed to acquire the considerable funding necessary for an alternative scheme (including Rowand Anderson's) is another matter. There is no doubt that the Heritors were still in a quandary. Laird may have insisted that the Heritors would "be anxious not to be compelled to block the scheme, (but)...they cannot be asked for that reason to forego their proper function."[142]

Perhaps that was their problem. Over the years the influence of these hereditary and, no doubt at times, absent landlords may have declined to such an extent that they were no longer seen as relevant, particularly in the early twentieth century. Indeed, in the past, as the Heritors' records show, this group of men had maintained a controlling influence, near to interference, in the life of the abbey. Yet it appears to have been the parish ministers who were more concerned with the fabric of the abbey church than the Heritors.

In 1788 the Heritors proposed demolishing the nave, and it was Dr Boog who saved it. In 1862, the guiding

light was Rev Andrew Wilson, minister of the First Charge[143], and in 1898 Dr Gentles provided the inspiration for the restoration under Rowand Anderson. But in 1912, despite the history of the abbey's restoration, the Heritors expected Maclean to be influenced by them, when it was he who was providing all the energy towards achieving the complete restoration of the Abbey of Paisley. Also, after the restoration by James Salmon, the Heritors' Superintending Committee appears to have taken its responsibilities rather more seriously than in the past.[144]

It looks as though their reaction to Chalmers' appointment to complete the restoration was similar to how they reacted when a donor wished a stained glass window installed in the church, which they neither liked nor approved of, they bluntly refused permission. However, Chalmers was an acknowledged and experienced restorer of churches. Sir John Stirling Maxwell had to admit that the Heritors knew absolutely nothing about church restoration, yet they did not think Chalmers was quite good enough, although not one shred of evidence has been recorded which proves their case. "They always did their best", wrote Spiers to Sir John on 23 April, 1912[145] and Sir Hugh Shaw Stewart, another of the Heritors, had referred to "*our abbey choir*" being only restored by the most competent hands of this generation.[146] Despite their claim to have the abbey's interest at heart, as noted above, there is no doubt that they would not have wished to be held financially responsible for the restoration themselves. Therefore,the Heritors had been put in an unenviable situation, because they could not afford to be seen to actually block the scheme, for as Laird said:

> "I do not think that the donors will ever state that their gift is conditional on the employment of Mr Chalmers, and then the question comes, who takes direct responsibility?"[147]

The responsibility would surely have to be Maclean's and the Kirk Session's, who had made the decision in the first place; and had the donors agreed that their gifts were conditional on the appointment of Chalmers, they would have presented the Heritors with the escape clause they so anxiously sought.

Despite Laird's determination to thwart Maclean, the Kirk Session and the donors were determined not to be outmanoeuvred. By July 1912, the Heritors had still not agreed to the appointment of MacGregor Chalmers, nor produced a practical solution to the situation. Thus, Chalmers' appointment had become a "*fait accompli*" by default, and once the Heritors granted permission for preliminary excavations at the site, they had really no alternative but to accept that they had in fact been outmanoeuvred.

Also, by July, Rowand Anderson had no doubt heard much of what had been going on, but also much that had been said and written about himself. He was angry. True to character he finally lost all patience with Maclean, and wrote an open letter on 31 July, to justify himself and clarify his side of the argument.[148] He circulated this letter, together with copies of others he had written to the minister in the past, to influential men like the Heritors and members of the Restoration Committee.

In one of the attached letters (29 May, 1912)[149] Anderson had written that Maclean had failed to give him a categorical explanation of his insinuations against his employment at Paisley. As Maclean's reply is not extant there is no indication what these insinuations were, but they may well refer to the statements that his methods of

working were largely responsible for the mis-management of the funds gathered for a full-restoration, rather than the restoration of the crossing and transepts. This was justifiably a sore point with Anderson, and he refuted this accusation by stating that he had advised Gentles, and all concerned, of the unexpected and expensive problems, which had absorbed all the money, as they were encountered during his work at Paisley.

This was the first time, he complained, that he had experienced such treatment from any honourable or fairminded man in the whole course of his career. Thus, he felt he had to take steps to retrieve this very important commission. In the same letter, he insisted that the previous Restoration Committee had agreed to employ him or his firm, but he was ignoring two important facts. Firstly, the 1904 agreement stated that he or his firm would be requested "*to act if required*", which does not appear to be quite as binding as he had suggested; and secondly, there was no guarantee that any future Restoration Committee would have supported him. Then he implied that the whole business was engineered to be rid of him, and to employ another architect. He finished the letter, in a threatening manner, giving Maclean one week to justify himself, or he would take further steps.

In another letter (19 June, 1912)[150], Anderson's reaction to Chalmers' appointment was that it was "commonly believed from the very first, an architect having friends at court was to get the job" in his stead. Again Rowand Anderson was ignoring the fact that he too had been a "*court architect*" for ten years under Dr Gentles, and that there had been opposition to his appointment. Indeed, on 20 June, 1900, Gentles had written to Sir John Stirling Maxwell that Mr Cowan of Rosshall, who had promised £500 towards the Restoration

Fund, had refused to pay his subscription, because, as far as he was concerned, Anderson's appointment had been "*pre-arranged.*"[151] Gentles, obviously then still confident in Anderson's ability to successfully complete the restoration, had tried to explain away Cowan's criticism by saying: firstly, that Cowan was under medical supervision, and secondly, was not open to argument. Gentles then suggested to Stirling Maxwell that Cowan might react favourably to Sir John's own "*sweet reasonableness*", if he were to approach Cowan himself.

In the meantime, as Gentles remarked to Stirling Maxwell, Colonel King, Honorary Treasurer, had written to Cowan asking why he had not objected at the meeting called to appoint the architect; and being present, he could easily have put forward an architect of his choosing. Given the circumstances, it is quite obvious that Cowan's criticism had indeed been valid, for Rowand Anderson had been appointed, but not elected.[152] By July 1900 Cowan was the only major subscriber not to have contributed.[153] Thus, it appears that despite the claims of Sir John Stirling Maxwell and others, criticisms were made about the method of appointing Rowand Anderson as architect by Gentles.

Anderson's letters could be interpreted as him overstating his case, and there is no doubt that by 31 July, 1912, if Anderson had any hopes of further employment at Paisley, then his circulating of these letters would have prevented it. They would have cost him some support, though others might have concluded that he was just living up to his reputation.

By 5 August, 1912, Maclean had also won the argument for the Heritors were prepared to allow Chalmers to

excavate the choir (actually requested on 25 March) providing it was done under the supervision of an Inspector or Clerk of Works.[154] Thus, it was only a matter of time before the Heritors would have to officially acknowledge MacGregor Chalmers' appointment as architect for the final act of restoration of the choir and tower of Paisley Abbey. Before any building work could begin, Chalmers' first act was the excavation of the cloister, choir and crossing. As his letter of 18 March, 1912, to the minister shows it was his original intention to excavate the site:-

1. to examine the foundations of the choir.
2. to ascertain if the east gable of the choir had angled buttresses or if there were two buttresses at each corner.
3. to trace the foundations of the ancient altar.
4. to trace the foundations of the sacristy on the south side of the choir.
5. to trace any part of foundations of the twelfth century choir, and of the original side aisles of the choir.
6. to trace the foundations of the eastern part of the chapter house, and
7. to trace the foundations of the cloister walls.[155]

Unfortunately, there appear to be no written record of the extent to which Mr Murray, the Clerk of Works, excavated the choir and cloister, which task occupied several months. Though the workmen may have dug down as deep as twelve feet in parts, it is probable that any deep excavation of the choir site would have been hampered by the fact that the site was virtually a graveyard. Photographs taken at the time do not provide us with a clear picture either (see vol II, photograph appendix ii, photo 82), and apart from the fragments of the cloister arcades, there is no record of any

foundations being found belonging to the medieval cloister, the sacristy or earlier choir(s).[156]

In February 1913, the Restoration Committee accepted MacGregor Chalmers' plans which had been laid before them. In view of the intention of the Building Committee (in accordance with Chalmers' plans) to erect a stone-groined roof, the Heritors resolved to submit the architect's plans to an eminent firm of civil engineers. In time, they received a report from Professor Henry Adamson of London, which declared that the margin of safety was ample.[157] Moreover, because of the bad history of the crossing and tower (see chapter 2 part ii), the Heritors considered that an immediate investigation by Chalmers into the stability of the four crossings piers was imperative. On investigating, Chalmers decided to strengthen the crossing piers further. The workmen dug down twelve feet to the gravel, and the foundations of the four piers were then widened and strengthened with steel.[158] Special 3/4" diameter chain, brought from Birmingham, was also applied round the base of the eastmost piers to bind the new concrete with the old.[159]

The Restoration Committee met in October to discuss the fact that the original estimates for the restoration had already been shown to be inadequate as work progressed[160], just as had been the case during the previous restoration.

Stewart Clark wrote to Maclean on 8 November (on behalf of himself and his sisters), advising him that they were prepared to increase the amount of their donation by £10,000, thus making it £40,000.[161] Mr Allison was also prepared to increase his donation to

£8,000, even to as much as £10,000, to meet the anticipated increased cost of the tower.

> "It is of course a condition" he wrote" that no alterations be allowed either of the existing approved plans and schedules of work without the same having been first submitted to and approved by me in writing."[162]

These unexpected increases in expenditure, due perhaps to the nine month delay caused partly by the delaying tactics of the Heritors, meant that the new estimated cost of the complete restoration had already risen to £54000. At this meeting, Mr J Murray was reappointed Clerk of Works, a position he had also held under Rowand Anderson.

As reported in the newspapers of 16 October, 1913[163], the Rev A M Maclean, in a statement, said that they now had the grand sum of £57000 which would restore the church, tower and cloister, but that another £20000 was needed if a total restoration was to be accomplished. This figure included the restoration of The Place, a new organ, a new roof to the nave, with copper exterior and oak interior[164], together with minor alterations to St Mirren's Aisle. Although the nave has a modern timber ceiling, Chalmers' plans for a copper roof, to match that of the choir, has yet to be achieved. It was also reported that the Paisley Dean of Guild Court had passed Chalmers' plans without any complaint.[165]

It goes without saying, that an important element in any building of stone is the quality of the stonework. Chalmers' choice of stone for the restoration of the choir and tower at Paisley Abbey was from Cullaloe, which Gourlay considered was

"the best white stone in Scotland, next to Craigleith and Birnie, neither of which was obtainable at the time. Cullaloe stone varied a great deal, some is very hard, some very soft. The Paisley Abbey restoration should not have been dependant on one quarry (insisted Gourlay) because adverse weather conditions at times prevented access to the Cullaloe quarry. Perhaps, another like Auchenheath should have been permitted, which was a more expensive stone but easier to work; and since transport costs would have been a little less, the eventual cost would have been about the same as Cullaloe. The pink colour and streaks disappear entirely and it mellows beautifully with age."[166]

Yet Chalmers, as Gourlay noted, would only allow Cullaloe stone to be used.[167]

In May, 1913, when the north portion of the old Paisley prison was being demolished the Restoration Committee, in an effort to reduce costs, offered to purchase some of the stone for use in the restoration of the church.[168] In June, Paisley Town Council considered the Restoration Committee's offer for the stone[169], but by July it was realised that to recut and refurbish the old stones from the prison would be much too costly, and so the Restoration Committee withdrew its offer to purchase.[170]

The final restoration of Paisley Abbey was inaugurated on Sunday, 30th October, 1913, when James Stewart Clark cut the first sod. Many members of the abbey congregation and local gentry being present, as reported in the newspapers.[171]

Also, notice was given of the successful tenders to carry out the work[172] (which did not include specialised work like stone and wood carving) :

mason work - A & J Taylor, Glas.	£37,692	12s. 5d.
wright work - Wylie & Lochhead,	758	7s.11d.
plumber work - A Forsyth & Son, Pais.	1,634	9s. 1d.
glazier work - W Meikle & Sons, Glas.	339	6s. 1d.

Chalmers, in his original report of 17 December, 1910[173], indicated how he intended restoring the cloister [plate 190a]. The reconstructed cloister [plate 190b] would also allow the reopening of both processional doors from the nave. The entrance at the west end would be formed in part by the door joint which still existed, whereas at the east end a new oak door would afford access to The Place from the east cloister walk for the first time since the Reformation. The date of building of this door, 1914 AD, is cut into the lintel.

August 1914 unfortunately witnessed the outbreak of the Great War. At first, work continued as usual on the restoration of the cloister and choir.

During his excavations in the cloister Chalmers found several twin waterleaf capitals, which he considered were part of the original twelfth century cloister [plate 190c]. Howell was to state that Rowand Anderson found these cloistral remnants among the rubble used to build the pre-Reformation wall at the east end of the nave.[174] Since they were more than likely to have come from cloister finding them among the rubble of the east wall is quite problematical. As cloistral remnants they could only be found among those of the choir, if the cloister arcading had not been extant immediately prior to the Reformation.

Deciding that these capitals should form part of the new work, MacGregor Chalmers designed the new cloister around them, the new work being carved by James Young.[175] It was suggested much later that when money was available Chalmers had changed his original design.[176] The more

likely explanation is that Chalmers did so when he discovered the twin capitals during excavation of the cloister garth.

As restored by him, the cloister is not unlike those original parts extant at Iona [plate 190d], in the form of the capitals and twin arcading, but Iona has twin polygonal columns whereas Paisley has rounded columns to the exterior and polygonal to the interior. At Paisley the twin water-leaf capitals contrast with the original capitals at Iona, which appear to be more Romanesque in character. Even though there is really no connection between the two abbeys, Iona may have influenced Chalmers' perception of how the cloister at Paisley should be restored, for it must be remembered that he had restored the choir at Iona between 1908 and 1909.

Indeed, the cloister at the Cistercian Abbey of Newminster, in Northumberland [plate 190e], could perhaps provide a closer model for Paisley, for both were probably built in the late twelfth century[177], as seen in their waterleaf capitals [plate 190f], but the carving and moulding of those at Paisley are certainly finer [plate 190c].

Like Newminster [plate 190e], and Iona [plate 190d], the twin arcading at Paisley could also have been lancet arched rather than rounded, as Chalmers finished them. At Newminster, the remaining extant columns are all rounded, which indicates that they were all alike, and very typical of the period. At Paisley, a careful observation of the original capitals in the cloister, will show that the round columns alternated with the polygonal [178] [plate 94]. It can only be assumed that the manner in which MacGegor Chalmers has restored the twin

cloister colonnade at Paisley is in keeping with the original.

Gourlay considered the two original twin capitals of the cloister arcading at Paisley as Transitional, and so owed more to the Romanesque and southern France. In the south of France (especially in Gascony, Provence, and Languedoc), churches often have cloisters where the twin arcades support rounded arches, as at St-Trophime, Arles [plate 191]. This is the form preferred by Chalmers in his restored cloister at Paisley [plate 190c], rather than the English form, with lancet arches.

The columns in the new work at Paisley's cloister, as designed by Chalmers, have entasis[179], and according to Professor Gourlay, Chalmers showed Murray, the Clerk of Works, photographs which proved that columns in Gothic work did have entasis. Indeed, the original columns at Iona [plate 190d] illustrate that this was the case. Gourlay considered that there was too much entasis on the columns of Chalmers' new cloister arcade, for the tops and bottoms of the columns appeared to be broader than the diameter of the original capitals.[180] In any case, the finding of an old base, whose diameter was smaller than those of Chalmers, suggests that Gourlay may have been correct.[181] Since the double corbels for the wall plates of the roof at Paisley Abbey cloisters were all original, the restored roof actually follows the lines of the original medieval one, and old photographs illustrate this [plate 192].[182] The exterior of the cloister roof is covered with copper.

When renewing the cloister of Paisley Abbey, Mr Campbell told Professor Gourlay that Chalmers had found three graves, one of which contained a stone coffin of what may have been an important person. The places where

these were found were to have been marked by a cross, but there is no evidence that this was ever done.[183]

By the summer of 1915 the cloister was completed and the garth levelled. It was officially opened on 30 July, 1915.[184] The offical party consisted of members of the Restoration Committee. Mr A F Craig, who had donated the money to rebuild the cloister, was also invited. He was presented with an oak chair, built from the remnants of the oak used in the building of the roof.

By July 1915 when the cloisters were completed, work was progressing on the choir as Professor Gourlay's notes indicate, but work did not begin on the tower until 4 May, 1916 [185] (see vol II appendix iii plates 82 & 83). Obviously, the newly built walls of the choir would have been needed to support the building when construction of the tower commenced. The rebuilding of the choir, especially with a stone vault, was a daunting proposition. The extreme length of the choir, 123 ft 9 ins (and 32 ft wide), is exceptional among the great medieval churches of the British Isles.[186]

During the excavation of the choir, one unexpected discovery was made. The north wall of the choir was found to follow the line of a dried up tributary of the River Cart. In making this discovery Chalmers had inadvertently stumbled upon the probable reason for the fall of the tower, for the medieval masons had built the north wall of the choir directly on this silt.[187] The existence of the sand also caused delays and major problems for Chalmers. The original foundations of the north wall of the choir - in particular those of the western half - were found to be so poor that they would not have carried the proposed new work. He had assumed that the original choir foundations would have carried the new walls, but

this was not the case, for although the core of the choir walls was perfectly good, the external ashlar of the north wall in particular, was greatly decayed. Although weathering would have had a hand in it, the reason Gourlay gives for the decay of the ashlar here was the existence of burial plots up close to the north wall.[188] The most likely reason for the condition of the north wall was the fact that the rubble, of which the original foundations were composed, was only bedded in clay, which did not provide the necessary support. Since the south wall was not built on any silt it was in much better shape.[189]

Rather unfairly, Professor Gourlay may have accepted the criticism of Chalmers by Mr Campbell, the Church Officer, that Chalmers had made a serious blunder in saying that the old foundations would do for the new choir.[190] Yet, before his restoration Rowand Anderson appears to have made the same assumption, as reported in the *CONTRACT REPORTER*, of 24 September, 1898.[191] If this report is what Rowand Anderson had conveyed to Gentles and the Restoration Committee, it is hardly surprising at the extent of the anger at Anderson's delays, and failure to complete the restoration successfully. Incidentally, Gourlay must have read this particular report, yet made no mention of it when criticizing Chalmers.

Because the old choir walls had been exposed for so long, Chalmers had literally to take the wall down to the rubble, and in most parts to the actual underlying gravel [see vol II, photo appendix ii, photos 82 & 83]. The walls, four feet eight ins thick, had then to be rebuilt from the foundations up. Thus the workmen had to go down twelve feet to the gravel and lay the new foundations on that[192], which consisted of lime and ashlar walling, with

rubble infilling.[193] To ensure the stability of the new foundations of the choir, and to support the new buttresses, where all the rubble was not taken away, concrete piers were sunk and steel joists placed over the rubble founds.[194] [See photo vol II, photo appendix ii, photo 84. A steel beam is visible against the interior of the south wall of the choir.]

The medieval sedilia were still extant [plate 193]. Chalmers considered (and rightly so), that he had no alternative but to ensure that they were preserved intact for posterity. And, because they were very delicate, graceful and very beautiful, Chalmers' intention was to disturb them as little as possible during the work of rebuilding the choir walls. Therefore, they were underpinned and untouched, except where necessary to replace the stones. But, the outer face of the wall behind the sedilia had to be taken down and rebuilt[195], as can be seen by an inspection of the south wall of the choir where the original stonework supporting the sedilia is surrounded by Chalmers' new work [plate 194]. The situation is similar in the interior of the choir.

On the exterior of Chalmers' new choir the buttresses divided the flanks into bays. This division is matched in the interior, at window level, by vaulting-shafts which spring from twelve large carved and moulded angel corbels, each carrying a shield bearing a symbol of an Apostle.

The windows of the new choir fill the bays [figs 82a & 82b] and would have been built simultaneously with the walls, though the tracery of the westmost window, in the north wall, was not inserted whilst work continued on the tower. There is no window in the south bay opposite, because it contained the organ pipes, originally built in

1872 by Cavaille-Cole, Paris, and rebuilt in 1928 by W Hill & Son and Norman & Beard. Chalmers did not build the sacristy, which, like the choir, was completed by Lorimer [fig 82c]. The vault of the roof is supported by a central column [see plate 195]. The Cathcart Aisle, immediately behind the organ, was completed with the choir by Lorimer in 1926 [fig 83].

The Decorated character of the choir windows [plates 196a & b] is in keeping with the two eastmost windows of the north aisle [plate 56a]. Gourlay noted, during a visit, that the windows were in one depth of tracery and mullions, yet, the great east window, "was in two planes, the two central mullions being heavier than the others (though) the sloping string above avoids heaviness."[196]

The design of the great east window of Paisley Abbey [plate 197a] is very similar to that at Carlisle Cathedral [plate 197b], in proportion and tracery, so Chalmers may have used that as his model. Indeed, it is known that Lorimer and Lochhead, his assistant, went down to Carlisle to examine the great east window there, and study it before considering whether to redesign Chalmers' east gable and vault (even though the east end at Paisley was complete, apart from the glass). The centre light at Paisley, however, is broader than its counterpart at Carlisle, where all the lights are of equal width.

Professor Gourlay criticised MacGregor Chalmers' design for the east window by suggesting that it was really too big, and was going to be ill proportioned, because the centre light was too wide at 2 ft 9 ins while the others were 1 ft 11 ins. The tradition has always been that the centre light should equal the others. Gourlay's criticism appears to be weak, for MacGregor

Chalmers brought down the lines of the mullions in panels to help give it height[197], and the result is very impressive. In any case, the broad central light provided Douglas Strachan, the artist, with adequate space for his majestic figure of Christ in his "*Christ Enthroned : His Universal Dominion*". Naturally, Christ is the centre of this wonderful pictorial scheme which fills the great east window.

By May 1916, the re-building of the choir was well advanced, but work only began on the tower when the choir walls had more or less reached their full height, thus they acted as a buttress for the new tower, the first stone of which was laid on 5 May, 1916, as reported in the *PAISLEY DAILY EXPRESS*, of that day.

Despite Sir John Stirling Maxwell's knowledge in such matters, his preference for Rowand Anderson's rather overworked tower, with that heavy and ungainly cap-house [plate 176a], is difficult to explain, when compared to the simple grandeur of MacGregor Chalmers' tower surmounted by a spire [plate 184a; see fig 84a]. Although Chalmers' spire would have resembled Glasgow Cathedral's [plate 174] (and even James Salmon's projected tower - plate 171), it is more than likely to have been inspired by his own work at Holy Trinity Church, St Andrews [plate 187a], where the spire bears a strong resemblance to that of the nearby College of St Salvator [plate 194].

As the First World War progressed, the Building Committee had to face up to many problems, in particular, increased wages and cost of material. Unfortunately, by the summer of 1916 just as progress on the tower was perceptible the cost of materials began to rise rapidly, and worse still the introduction of the "*call-up*" meant

that many workmen were conscripted into the armed forces. Inevitably, an Act of Parliament was passed restricting such work, and the Ministry of Munitions sent a prominent architect to inspect the progress of the restoration.[198] Work on the tower was stopped, but was allowed to continue on the choir until such times as it was secured.

On 30 October, 1917, the fourth anniversary of the cutting of the first sod, a decorated finial cross was placed on the apex of the east gable of the choir, by the Rev A M Maclean, now a military chaplain.[199] The cross was balanced by the two carved and moulded pinnacles which surmounted the stepped and angled buttresses at the north and south corners of the east front. This action more or less heralded the end of the work: the outer shell of the choir rose to its full height, the windows filled with tracery, the springers for the vault in place in the interior, leaving the inner vault, the roof and the internal fittings to be completed when time would allow. Two months later the tracery of the great east window was completed, after which, work finally ceased by December 1917[200] [fig 84b], and by then very little of the tower had been built.

With the ending of hostilities on 11 November, 1918, there is no doubt that those involved in the work of restoration would have hoped for a resumption of work as soon as it was convenient. In the meantime, other duties had priority, the terrible sacrifice of lives, for example, had to be commemorated. Early in December 1921 the Kirk Session had invited MacGregor Chalmers to design a war memorial to the Fallen of the abbey parish.[201] By 9 January, 1923, Chalmers had designed a memorial cross to be built of Cullaloe stone, at a cost of £280.[202] The bronze swords decorating both faces of the cross were to be executed by Holmes & Jackson for £23, and with the

architects, fees of £30, the completed memorial would cost £333.[203]

Unfortunately for Chalmers, his memorial cross was virtually identical to that designed by Sir Reginald Blomfield. Blomfield had been invited by the Imperial War Graves Commission to design a memorial cross, which would eventually play a prominent part in the layout of all British Military cemeteries. Sir Reginald, in a letter to the Kirk Session of 27 September 1922 [204], politely pointed out that Chalmers was wrong to believe that his design for the memorial cross was not copyright (to which effect an announcement had been made in *THE TIMES*). Thus, the memorial cross erected at Paisley could only be carried out in accordance with Blomfield's design, and it was he who suggested one of 24 feet. Instead of Cullaloe stone, suggested by Chalmers, Sir Reginald insisted that it be executed in Portland stone.

With the unveiling of the memorial cross in the cloister, on 10 June, 1923, by Field Marshall Earl Haig, the cloister more or less became a Garden of Remembrance [see plate 91]. The work was supervised by J J Waddell, Mrs Chalmers' nephew and Chalmers' assistant. The design of the memorial cross to "*The Fallen*" was to be Dr MacGregor Chalmers'[205] last major work at Paisley Abbey, for his untimely death on 15 March, 1922, meant that he never saw his greatest work of restoration brought to a successful conclusion. On 19 March Rev A R Howell, Minister of the Second Charge of the abbey, delivered a panegyric.[206]

The choir still stood empty, just as Chalmers had left it in 1917, the scaffolding in place in expectation of better times [plate 199]. Indeed it took another six years for better times to arrive. In February 1923 it

was again announced that Paisley Abbey restoration was to be completed, with £30,210 14s. 3d still in hand.[207] In the meantime, Sir Charles Bine Renshaw, Chairman of the Building Committee had also died, and ironically Sir John Stirling Maxwell became chairman in Bine Renshaw's place.[208] Also, on 23 August, 1922, Sir Robert Lorimer, Chalmers' chief rival for the commission, was appointed as his successor.

Sir Robert Lorimer's main task was to complete the tower and choir, and then to furnish the interior in a style befitting its surroundings. However, before beginning the new vault Lorimer had to finish the tower.

At first, Mrs Chalmers believed that both she and Jeffrey Waddell would be allowed to complete the restoration, and because of this it is said that Mrs Chalmers refused to hand over her late husband's drawings for the completion of the choir. After some legal wrangling she did so. On 19 January, 1924, Lorimer wrote to the Kirk Session stating that all drawings had been handed over to him[209] pertaining to the vault and tower, as they were the property of the Session.[210] However, the drawings specifically showing the internal furnishings, heating, lighting, carving, marble floor, and statuary, perhaps for the exterior of the choir[211], had not been transferred. The refusal by Mrs Chalmers to hand these drawings over was problematical for Lorimer, in that he could not understand what Chalmers' intentions were for the vault, by the way the springers were set.

Robert Allison, who had originally donated £8,000 in 1912 for the building of the tower, now offered a further £6,000 to finance its completion[212], but he was anxious that the design of the tower remain unchanged [see n.170]. Chalmers' tower was to have had two large unglazed

traceried windows in each side, the tracery similar to that in the choir below. Although these large windows are English in character, and the antithesis of all that Chalmers held dear, there may be a good explanation why he chose this form. Such large openings meant that a great amount of weight was saved, and the wind, rather than buffeting the tower would go through it unfettered. If such is the case, it is a brilliant solution to a potentially dangerous situation, a church tower with uncertain foundations.[213] Unfortunately, Chalmers marred his wonderful achievement by designing his spire such that it was to have been attached to a concrete and steel platform, rather than being built into the tower itself. It was quite ingenious, to say the least. Sir John Stirling Maxwell, who was very knowledgeable in architectural matters, would have had reservations about such an idea, and this may help to explain why he had misgivings about Chalmers as the best architect for the restoration.

Before any work began, Lorimer produced a report on Chalmers' tower. He reported on 29 March, 1923, that he had

> "carefully examined the drawings for the completion of the tower and spire of Paisley...[which]...shewed the spire erected on the top of a concrete flat roof.... supported by steel joists. There was no connection between the masonry of the spire and the masonry of the tower."[214]

He also thoroughly examined the work Chalmers did in strengthening the piers, as well as every item of information on the matter; and after careful calculation it was found that the proposed weight on each pier "is very much in excess of what is considered a safe load." It was in fact "over twenty-five tons per superficial foot" whereas Glasgow, with a similar spire,

PAGE

NUMBERING

AS ORIGINAL

was "only eighteen tons per superficial foot" which was also calculated not to be a safe load.[215] He concluded by saying that even though the tower did exceed

> "the weight that theoretically ought not to be carried by the piers, if the work is carefully done and the concrete roof put on before the winter in order to tie the walls together"

he did not believe that they would be running any serious risk.[216]

Lorimer contemplated the design of the tower, but to have done so would have meant dismantling the upper stages of Anderson's tower. In June 1922 he sketched a tower with cap-house [fig 85] for Paisley, which looked rather heavy, and not unlike the tower at Dysart Church, with single louvres to each side, and so much more Scottish in character. The following December Lorimer designed a second tower, again in the Scottish manner, with twin traceried louvres and a spire, perhaps inspired by St John's, Perth, where he was working [fig 86].

According to Gourlay, Mr John Taylor, who had taken over responsibility for the building work at Paisley Abbey on his father William's death in 1920, drew Lorimer's attention to the area of the pillars which had to support the tower and proposed cap-house. He explained about the enlarging of the foundations under MacGregor Chalmers. Lorimer consulted his civil engineer who surveyed the problem on site with Taylor. The engineer calculated the weight, and showed that it would not stand the load of the proposed cap-house or spire.

Lorimer therefore decided to build neither, and just have a simple 6 ft 6 in. high parapet, as executed, and pierced with trellis work [plate 200;

fig 87], as Chalmers had intended. In any case, since so much work had already been done, he concluded that it was best to follow Chalmers' design, but omit the spire. There is no evidence to suggest that Lorimer's decision to follow Chalmers' tower design was influenced by Allison's stipulations[see n.170], though it may have been a factor. He did suggest reducing the height of the windows by two feet, thus reducing the weight of the mason work in the tower even more, as well as simplifying and strengthening "the mouldings carrying the parapet and also the design of the parapet itself."[217] In reducing the height of the windows, Lorimer changed the style of Chalmers' tracery [fig 82a & 84a]. Lorimer's tracery consists of daggers and mouchettes [fig 88b], quite different from Chalmers'. Lorimer's belfry, like Chalmers', has just two types of traceried windows, without louvres, repeated on all four sides. At the top of the tower, in the north-east corner, is the pinnacled octagonal angle stair turret, begun by Rowand Anderson [fig 88c]. The tower was completed towards the end of 1924, but not dedicated until 11 April, 1926.

It was the intention of both Rowand Anderson and MacGregor Chalmers to install a peal of bells in their completed towers, which they had allowed for in their designs. Lorimer, after his appointment as architect, advised Rev A M Maclean that in his opinion, the installation of a peal of bells would be dangerous to the stability of the tower. The Kirk Session instructed Maclean to make further enquiries into this matter, for funds had been laid aside for the purpose of installing the peal of bells.[218]

In a letter [of 29 January, 1924] to Taylor & Co., Bell Founders, Loughborough, Lorimer advised them, that to hang the carillon of bells designed by them for Chalmers - they had sent Maclean photographs of the

bells - would be unwise, even though they would not be swung. Lorimer's alternative suggestion was for one large bell "of the deepest possible tone" and rung by a lever clapper.[219] In view of the fact that Lorimer had advised the bell founders that "the load on the piers [was] still considerably more than it ought to be" the Kirk Session reluctantly decided to abandon the idea of having even one bell in the tower.[220]

With the completion of the tower, the next important task for Lorimer was the building of the stone vault of the choir [plate 201]. It is ironic that he had to complete MacGregor Chalmers' vaulted roof, when it was Rowand Anderson's wooden roof which had been preferred by Sir John Stirling Maxwell, and others. The building of the new vault did not begin until the spring of 1925.[221] The scaffolding, built to support the building of the vault, was of red pine. [Plate 201 shows the ribs and bosses of the vault in place, and cradled on a wooden scaffold.]

No evidence has ever been found that Paisley Abbey choir was ever vaulted, for the simple reason that it never was. There is no doubt that Chalmers intended building a vaulted ceiling from the very beginning, as seen in his estimates of 5 January, 1912, which included £4,000 for the stone vaulting of the choir.[222] Chalmers had told Gourlay that when completed, it would be the widest vaulted medieval building in Scotland[223], (but its height was certainly dictated by the height of Rowand Anderson's crossing piers).

At some point, MacGregor Chalmers must have changed his original design for the roof[224], for in 1916 Gourlay noted that "a perspective of the new design for the vault of the choir does not compare favourably with that of the former design."[225] This suggests that an original design had been supplanted by

the one planned, the rumour being that it was necessary in order to cut costs.[226] This may have been the design for the vault which Jeffrey Waddell said resembled that at Tewkesbury Abbey [227] [plates 202a & b]. A comparison with the vaults in both Tewkesbury's presbytery and nave will show that these vaults do not bear any resemblance to the vault executed at Paisley.

One major problem was that Chalmers had no real experience in building a stone vaulted ceiling, for he seemed to prefer barrel vaults in his churches. His total inexperience of working with vaulted ceilings could have been another factor which formed that "*unnecessary element of risk*", which Stirling Maxwell constantly mentioned. This could easily have led to questions being raised about his ability to successfully execute his plans for a vaulted ceiling. It was Murray, Clerk of Works, who first said that MacGregor Chalmers did not know what to do about the vault of the sacristy.[228] If this is correct it suggests that Chalmers may not have known how a stone vault was constructed. Indeed, such criticisms were also made by Gourlay.

Gourlay in a hand-written note (complete with diagram[229]), suggested that Chalmers may not have understood the basic principle of building a ribbed vault: which is that if the arches of a vault are equal sided then the ridge will not be straight. This was how Murray, the Clerk of Works, intended to build the sacristy vault. Gourlay made further observations on 14 April, 1915.[230] This appears to have been borne out when Lorimer, and his assistant A G Lochhead, surveyed the work only to discover that the springers for the vaulted ceiling of the choir were wrongly set. After Lochhead redesigned the whole roof, Chalmers' springers were replaced with those to take Lorimer's new vault.[231]

It should be emphasised that even though Chalmers had already built the choir walls in readiness for a vaulted roof, there is no contractual evidence to suggest that Lorimer's contract included his using Chalmers' designs. Lorimer not only redesigned Chalmers' vault, he also increased the size of the bosses. Gourlay's note of 18 August, 1924, provides clear evidence that Lorimer did so for stylistic reasons. Lorimer, he noted, preferred huge bosses, with spontaneously drawn details[232], whereas Chalmers preferred smaller bosses with fine mouldings, and tight in detail.[233] The bosses, as redesigned by Lorimer, were three feet six ins across, and he even increased the depth to two feet six ins, thus the scale of the carving was very large [plate 203]. Gourlay may have considered, at first, that the scale of Lorimer's vault was too big, for in his opinion the bosses came down very near to the onlooker. Yet, his understanding that everything could be read clearly from the ground[234] is hardly a criticism. It is undoubtedly a point in Lorimer's favour, and it may well be the reason why Lorimer changed the scale of the vault in the first place.

Gourlay suggested that Maclean wanted a Decorated English vault, perhaps in the style of Exeter [plate 204], but whether MacGregor Chalmers designed his vault along those lines is uncertain[235] (certainly not if it had ever resembled Tewkesbury), for Gourlay suggested that Lorimer changed the rib vaulting from the English Decorated to the Scottish type on the ellipse. The ribs as planned by Chalmers would have been eleven inches deep, but Lorimer increased their depth to eighteen inches, and sometimes twenty.[236] Gourlay considered this a great mistake, for the difference between the two would be seen when the vaulting was completed.[237] Yet, as Professor Gourlay commented later, by the time Lorimer had completed the roof, it had taken on the

appearance of the English Decorated period. Gourlay observed that

> "the lines of the ribs are all perfectly straight in plan although they are ellipses in true elevation. The joints of infilling in every case [are] right angles to [the] line bisecting the angle, [thus] they give the effect of English rib vaulting."[238] [plate 204].

So the vault as completed by Lorimer is more English than Scottish in character, which is what Maclean wanted.

Professor Gourlay also noted that Lorimer had designed his vault to appear more like a barrel vault, the transverse ribs actually forming a barrel[239], and that specifically on the ellipse it is quite typical of the old "*Scotch work*," where "the ribs did the work, the infilling forming the vault, the ribs only appearing on the outside of the vault."[240] Although Gourlay wrote that the ribbing was more characteristic of the English Decorated[241], in doing so he forgot the vaulted aisles in the lower church, Glasgow Cathedral [plate 205], which are a good comparison with Paisley's groin roof.

Professor Gourlay considered the vault, as completed by Lorimer about 1926, to be of a very high quality. "It is very beautiful in every sense, the effect is very fine," remarked Gourlay, "(and) just like old work"[242], a remark which contradicts his earlier assessment. The infilling of the vault, between the ribs of the choir vault, is varied in colour and texture. Lorimer achieved this by using different coloured stone from different quarries. Lorimer instructed the masons to chisel the stone very roughly[243], which is even more visible in the sacristy vault.[244] Thus, the vault was completed as Lorimer wanted it.

Ironically, Gourlay had originally said that

> "the vaulting of the choir of Paisley Abbey is to my mind a serious blunder, for it should have had a wooden roof in keeping with the nave and transepts, and will never appear harmonious with these." [245]

Its being so heavy in type will accentuate this. Although he was both historically and architecturally correct, in that the roof of Paisley's choir should have been of wood (the traditional Scottish method), latterly he must have changed his mind. There are excellent examples of wooden roofs in great Scottish churches, notably Glasgow Cathedral [plate 206]; and there were Scottish churches with fine examples of stone vaulted ceilings: Melrose choir vault for example [plate 207a]; and both Trinity College, Chalmers Close, Edinburgh [plate 208b] and Holyrood Abbey had vaulted roofs, but unfortunately neither is extant.

The mason in charge of the carving in the choir and on the tower (which was even larger in scale) was James Young, whilst the master mason in charge of the site was Lancelot Harrison.[246] Professor Gourlay inspected the stones in the masons' bankers and their tools, in 1924[247]; and noted that the crockets were finished by the mason, and not by the carver. Photographs were published in *THE BULLETIN* at the time, of the masons at work [plate 208].

At the east end of the choir, the central eon of bosses consisted of the Life of Christ, Christ in Glory: and the Crucifixion. Old Testament figures are to be found in the row of bosses on each side of the central eon, but the wall rib bosses were in a different theme. Indeed, in October 1913 Chalmers sent Maclean a letter in which he discussed his proposed scheme for the bosses of the new choir.[248] The central theme was the Life of Christ, which Lorimer executed in the choir at Paisley. This means that although Lorimer increased the size of the bosses, it was really

Chalmers' scheme he was completing. In any case, the carving of the stonework had been going on since 1913.

In the latter stages of the work, the carving in the choir was the work of C d'O Pilkington Jackson[249] (who was eventually to find even greater fame, with his huge bronze equestrian statue depicting Robert Bruce at the Battle of Bannockburn, unveiled in 1964). He carved the corbels and foliage in the interior of the choir, the carving in the sacristy and on the frontal of the communion table in Donnington stone. The panoply of Christian symbols is indeed beautifully carved. It was Sir John Stirling Maxwell who was later to propose that the background of the carvings on the Communion Table be gilded and painted as they are today.[250]

By December 1925, now that the stone vault was completed, preparations began for the construction of the roof. The pitch of the roof is about sixty feet, supported by steel joists, covered by pine rafters of 5 ins x 3 ins [fig 89]. The form of the rafters is similar to that planned by MacGregor Chalmers. The rafters were then covered by copper sheets [plate 209]. Alex Forsyth & Sons, plumbers, Broomlands, were responsible for the copper work, and Robert Girdwood & Sons, joiners, Broomlands, did the woodwork. The general design of the roof was by Lorimer's manager J F Matthew (but Redpath Brown did all the details).[251] The completion of the roof meant that the interior of the choir could be furnished and completed.

As noted above, Lorimer completed the new sacristy to the south of the choir [see plate 195 & fig 90]. The doorway into the sacristy was built by Chalmers from the remnants of the late medieval one; and where stone was missing, new stone was cut in the same fashion as the original [see plate 193].

On 6 July, 1926, Sir John Stirling Maxwell, as chairman of the Building Committee, received a letter from Miss Robina Clark on behalf of her sisters. They were the sisters of Stewart Clark, who had died on 2 March, 1924. Miss Robina reminded Sir John that Lorimer had been

> "asked to write [them] a letter describing the financial position and to state separately the amount of money required (1) to complete the necessary structural work, heating, lighting etc; and (2) the further amount required to complete the choir stalls and organ case."[252]

Lorimer went to visit the sisters. On considering all that Lorimer had said, and shown them in the way of plans, they advised him that they were prepared to give a further sum of £12,000 to complete the choir "to enable the abbey to be opened up from end to end and used for public worship."[253] The Kirk Session was astounded at the continued generosity of the Clark family. But, there were conditions: (1) all the money was to be spent in finishing and furnishing the interior of the choir, (2) the choir stalls and organ case were to be built according to the designs Lorimer had shown them. Miss Robina also suggested that the choir windows should not be filled with dark unsuitable stained glass.[254]

The choir stalls in the interior are of oak, as is all the woodwork. It was intended that Renfrewshire oak be used for the choir furnishings, and as reported in the *PAISLEY DAILY EXPRESS*, of 30 May, 1918, enough oak had been gathered in the county for that purpose.[255] Whether this was the oak used by Lorimer in his choir stalls and the woodwork of the choir is unknown, though what we see today was probably completed according to the designs he had shown the Clark sisters. Two rows of choir stalls [plate 210a & b] and elders' stalls, occupy each side of the choir [plate 210c & d]. Lorimer's Paisley stalls are very reminiscent of those

at Dunblane Cathedral [plate 211a & b]. At Paisley, Lorimer went back to nature for his motifs, as he had done at Dunblane, but they are all stylised in a way to enhance the mellow oak from which they are carved. The reredos occupies part of the site of former high altar [plate 212], and is decorated with carved eucharistic and spiritual symbols.

It was usual for the Clow Brothers to execute Lorimer's designs; they did so at Dunblane[256], and also carved those exquisite stalls in the Thistle Chapel. Therefore, it is more than likely that the Clows also carved the choir stalls, reredos, organ case and ministers' desks at Paisley. The carving throughout Paisley choir is, of course, of the same very high quality expected of the Clow Brothers.

Although Lorimer cannot be said to have surpassed his designs for the Thistle Chapel or Dunblane, at Paisley he has produced designs of such quiet dignity and beauty that the observer passes them without a second glance, taking them for granted. The Clark sisters, when shown the plans, would no doubt have decided unhesitatingly that woodwork of such grandeur was more than fitting for Paisley choir. Indeed, not only does the woodwork enhance the choir, it also provides an excellent contrast to the wonderful stone vault above.

Like his work at Dunblane, Lorimer was inspired by medieval choir stalls, and he has certainly captured their spirit. There is no evidence of the stalls, or other interior fittings designed by MacGregor Chalmers, though they were also to have been of oak, but perhaps more antiquarian when compared with Lorimer's twentieth century creations in the style of the Arts and Crafts Movement. It appears that Chalmers intended flooring the choir floor with marble, which somehow might have

been incongruous in the setting of Paisley's choir. Lorimer's more suitable flooring consists of four inch paving stones from the former Hamilton Palace, interspersed with stone from Doddington Hill Quarry, and more in keeping with its surroundings.

Sadly, Dr A M Maclean died in 1925 without seeing his restoration completed (plate 213). The new choir was dedicated on 1 December, 1928. The ministers, Rev Dr W Main and Rev A R Howell; assisted the Moderator of the General Assembly, the Rt Rev Dr J Montgomery Campbell, who presided at the service of dedication.[257]

Paisley's monastic choir would no doubt have had its share of funereal monuments. It is only right and fitting that that that which is seen as the monument to Princess Marjory [plate 214], daughter of Robert I, should be housed there. Its removal from St Mirren's Aisle was suggested in 1936. In a letter to Rev A R Howell[258] Sir John Stirling Maxwell stated that Lorimer, when he was working in the abbey, said he would not wish to be responsible for moving it. Lorimer suspected that it was "*a made up affair*"[259] [which it is] and would be afraid to take it to pieces. Nothing was to come of these earlier investigations until the 1950s.

In 1954, a small committee recommended to the Kirk Session that the monument be moved, and Mr John Bryce, builder, Paisley, was called in as consultant.[260] After much correspondence between the minister, Mr Rogan, and the Kirk Session, the Trustees gave their approval on 1 March, 1955. By January 1956 it was dismantled, awaiting inspection by S H Cruden, Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments. On 6 February, it was decided to re-erect the monument minus the base and canopy [plate 214] which once sat behind the head of the figure [261] [see plate 80a]. By March, an experienced stone mason

was putting the monument together again,[262] the final cost being £131 15s. 6d.[263]

The interior of the choir is certainly enhanced by the presence of the monument, as is the crossing, by the beautiful carved lectern - a memorial to Rev Dr A M Maclean.[264] In 1902, J Craig-Barr, architect, Paisley, designed the baptismal font, of pristine white Carrara marble. The elegant pulpit[265] is based on the pre-Reformation pulpit at Fotheringay Church, and was the work of another Paisley architect, T G Abercrombie in 1904.

Although Rowand Anderson had re-incorporated St Mirren's Aisle into the church, it had been left untouched. In 1930, it was suggested that the cloister door into the Aisle be altered by the addition of new moulded jambs, capitals, arches[266], in the fashion of the Gothic doors in the abbey. The estimated cost was £300[267], but this work was never carried out. In 1932, when A R Howell was minister, alterations were made to St Mirren's Aisle by J Wilson Paterson, architect, Edinburgh, at a cost of over £200.[268] The work was carried out in the Aisle, and the liturgical layout, with its furnishings, was also re-arranged. The monument to Robert III was moved to a more fitting site in the choir, near the sacristy doorway. New iron gates and railings were also suggested for the Aisle, but nothing was done until 1957.

The rather interesting wrought iron gates and railings were erected between the arcading of the Aisle. They were gifted by Mr Begbie in 1956, in memory of his wife. They effectively separate St Mirren's Aisle from the south transept.[269] In 1932, gates in the style of an old Scots yett, had been erected at the entrance to the cloister, and at James Salmon's porch.

The original dedication of St Mirren's Aisle was to the two saints, Mirren and Columba. In 1936 double doors of oak, adorned with the figures of the two saints (designed by Meredith Williams), were erected at the entrance to the Aisle [plate 215].

> "As I would like this door to be an outstandingly fine piece of work in every respect," wrote J F Matthew of Lorimer & Matthew, architects Edinburgh, "I want to give Meredith Williams all the time he requires to ensure perfection of line and accuracy in detail."[270]

This he has surely achieved, for as these fine doorways form the entrance into the abbey their artistic beauty, enhanced by the calm serenity of the figures, inform the visitor that he is entering a building whose Christian traditions are said to go back to these two saints. The carvers from Scott Morton & Co worked direct from the full-size drawings.[271]

In 1982 a new wooden raftered roof [plate 216a] was erected in place of Dr Boog's plaster ceiling. The new roof caused much controversy at the time, but Boog's ceiling was becoming dangerous so required replacing. However, it has precedents, for it closely resembles the wooden roof in the nave at Glasgow Cathedral, erected in 1911. It is now more or less accepted as an important feature in the abbey. The roof is supported on Tervas's fifteenth century vaulting shafts.

Today the abbey stands uncluttered by buildings unlike some of the great French cathedrals. The person really responsible for this is the late Dr Gentles, for the formation of the Abbey Surroundings Committee in 1887 was his inspiration. Through his efforts the committee was to obtain the cooperation of the Town Council in its plan to clear and eventually landscape the area surrounding the abbey.[272]

Plans were drawn up in 1900 [fig 90], but the work of the Abbey Surroundings Committee was not brought to a successful conclusion until 1933 [plate 216b]. In the meantime three complete streets of houses had been demolished [plates 216c & d]. Thus for the first time ever, the passer-by could stand and admire the fine proportions of the ancient abbey [plate 216a]. More recently, later developments have resulted in its being slowly isolated from traffic. Traffic has always been seen as a definite threat to the leaning south-west buttress at the west front, but it is to be hoped that the land surrounding the abbey will, like Glasgow Cathedral, become a pedestrian precinct where visitors can appreciate even more the fine proportions of Paisley Abbey.

With the completion of the restoration and the clearing away of the unsightly properties surrounding it, it could be said that its former glory had once again returned. But, there was one part of the abbey which had yet to be fully restored, namely The Place. The Place had been purchased by the Kirk Session at Whitsunday 1904 for £1700, on the advice of Dr Gentles,[273] but only when the old lease expired on Whitsunday 1910 did The Place finally belong to the Kirk Session.

In its past The Place had seen better days, especially when it was the mansion house of the Hamiltons, the Dundonalds, and the Hamiltons again. Yet when the Kirk Session acquired The Place it was a tenement property[274], and rents were still being collected.[275] The ground floor had even been a public house for a while. In 1911 The Place still had a tenant, for in that year the Session Clerk was authorised to get Mr Adams moved out of his house at Whitsunday, and then it was to be re-let to him but on a monthly basis.[276]

On acquiring The Place in 1904 the Property Committee examined it and found it to be structurally in good condition.[277] On 11 April, 1910, the Kirk Session appointed a Committee with powers to call in an expert to consider how best to use The Place for church purposes.[278] On 14 November, the new minister, Rev A M Maclean (Gentles' successor), reported that the Committee had called on the services of Peter MacGregor Chalmers. Chalmers had been instructed to furnish them with a report on the building, though Maclean was of the opinion that Robert Lorimer might be better to advise them because of his considerable reputation in domestic restorations.[279] By 17 December, Chalmers had produced a written report and two sets of drawings; the first of The Place as it stood, while the second set of plans was of his suggested alterations to the buildings [figs 91-92 & 94]. Lorimer was later to produce his own set of plans for the Place [see figs 95a-95e].

Chalmers' first intention was to preserve the ancient character of The Place. In the interior this meant preserving all the wood panelling, the old furnishings, locks, handles, hinges and fitments. On the elevations he intended blocking up the modern shop door on the west front of the south block [fig 91] with stone; blocking up the door and window (in the southmost block), returning the windows on the south front to their original form, and replacing the wooden lintels of the dormer windows with stone. These all appear to have been done, (perhaps by Lorimer).

On the east front [fig 92] Chalmers proposed building

> "a fine open stone staircase and balcony giving access to the principal entrance on the first floor in accordance with a sketch of the ancient staircase and balcony [fig 93] which was recently shown [to him] in Paisley."[280]

The stairway then extant was eventually replaced but not in the fine manner of that proposed by Chalmers [plate 184b]. Other improvements were also envisaged.[281]

Chalmers did not intend to interfere with the oak roof of St Mirren's Aisle, as it appeared to be sound, but the roof of the north block required a new roof to replace the decayed one, although the roof over the projecting staircase could be saved. It was his intention that "all the old window sashes, and beautiful old window glass will be carefully preserved."[282]

The interior of The Place required the minimum of alterations for adaptation to church purposes. Chalmers proposed forming a waiting room (now the abbey shop - plate 217a) on the ground floor of the north block, and entered from the north by the "*1914 door* " [fig 61]. An archway [on the right in plate 217a], was to be made on the south wall, opposite the north door, which would provide access to the three large rooms on the ground floor of the south block, which could be used for the Sunday school. The largest of these rooms [plate 217b] is now the choirboys' practice room, the others form ladies' and gent's lavatory accommodation, originally planned by MacGregor Chalmers.

In anticipation of the Dean of Guild's request, Chalmers had planned for "a new stone staircase, not less than four feet wide and leading from the ground floor to the first floor." He did drawings for Maclean's book, *PAISLEY ABBEY 1913* - though Professor Gourlay attributed them to Jeffrey Waddell[283] - one of which [fig 94] shows the cloister with an external stair leading up to the first floor. This may represent the stair planned by Chalmers. A similar stair is featured in Lorimer's drawings [fig 95b].

Apart from preserving the wood panelling on the walls of the three large rooms and gallery on the first floor [plates 218a & b], Chalmers planned few changes here. The three large rooms [fig 96a] he would leave as he found them, but would build two new vestries on the first floor of the north block (still extant), and above these he planned a caretaker's flat. Indeed, there is such accommodation, but it was part of the residence formed in the attic area of The Place for the minister by James Steel Maitland 1957 x 1960. On the second floor [fig 96b], Chalmers intended taking away the modern partitions, and restoring the two rooms to their original state. A new stone stair was to be built leading to these two rooms, which Chalmers hoped would become an abbey museum, and as these rooms connect with the room over St Mirren's Aisle[284] [see plate 182]; he proposed to lay the floor with large square tiles, repair the stone vault, and glaze the windows.

The flooring throughout the building was badly decayed and so required replacing. Fireproof flooring together with oak planking would be used, except for pine flooring in the caretaker's flat. The ground floor would be of concrete and asphalt, whilst the gallery would be laid with tiles. Lastly, electric light would be introduced into the building together with central heating.

On considering Chalmers' plans the Committee recommended their general approval, and decided to seek approval from the Kirk Session to proceed with the work.[285] MacGegor Chalmers' estimate for the work was £8,450.[286] In view of his skilful plans, the Committee decided (on 9 October, 1911) to appoint MacGregor Chalmers architect for the restoration of the cloister and Place of Paisley.[287]

With the successful completion of the abbey restoration by Lorimer in 1926, it was now time to consider The Place again, for remedial work was certainly needed. The Committee decided, after the death of Chalmers, that Sir Robert Lorimer was the best man to approach.[288] Subsequently, he was invited to draw up a report on the state of the building.[289] Between 1921 and 1922 (and prior to any restoration work being done on The Place by Lorimer), some members of the Historical Section of the Abbey Club, with the blessing of the Kirk Session, set out to clear up the interior of The Place. No less than ten cartloads of rubbish were taken away in anticipation of Sir Robert beginning the work of restoration. Their report provides us with a rather interesting picture of the interior of The Place at that time.[290] When Lorimer's report was ready he wrote to Rev A M Maclean on 12 June, 1923. He suggested several modifications in his new set of plans [see figs 95a - 95e], and intimated that were it restored as he proposed, it would be an artistic and interesting building when completed.[291]

On the ground floor, Lorimer suggested the cloister would lead into a memorial hall with a complete new newel staircase to the first floor from the cloister, which would be the only new addition and alteration to the exterior. In the interior, all the woodwork and any detail of interest would be recorded first then removed and carefully stored. Furthermore, the existing woodwork would provide the model for anything new required. On the second floor, he would form a new long gallery [fig 95bi], which would not only be an interesting apartment but would be very characteristic of Scots houses of the period, perhaps the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries. The complete restoration he estimated would cost £25,000.[292]

Maclean wrote to Sir Robert in October 1923, telling him that even though no funds were available to restore The Place, a skilled architect would be necessary if any progress was to be made.[293] The minister concluded by saying that the matter would be left open at present.[294] Sir Robert replied [1 November, 1923] that if a donor was found "the whole thing would of course have to be gone into afresh and most careful and elaborate drawings prepared for every portion of the work."[295]

In January 1928, it was proposed to transform the two rooms below the Session House into cloakrooms, but the Works Committee wished that these improvements should form part of a general restoration scheme, thus an architect would have to be consulted and invited to prepare drawings accordingly. It was decided that since Lorimer had already drawn up rough sketches for a restoration, he should be invited to produce more detailed drawings, largely because the Committee felt he may already have a claim.[296] Sir Robert presented the committee with drawings for the two cloakrooms on 24 February, 1928, drawings which would not interfere with any general restoration plan, and they were approved [297] [see fig 96a]. Not only were the cloakrooms formed, but Lorimer's work in the rooms and gallery of the first floor of the south range is noticeable by his use of the natural stonework as an essential element in his restoration [298] [plates 218c & D].

Lorimer supervised and laid down the lines on which the work of restoration should be carried out. He also designed the mouldings for the window frames and details thereof, as well as the style for all the interior doors, and generally speaking, fixed the lines on which the committee should proceed. His idea was to render the structure absolutely secure in all portions

of the building, and leave the question of the interior treatment of walls and ceilings and floors, to be decided at some time when money was available for that purpose.[299]

Lorimer had the same idea as Chalmers as how to secure the building, by binding the walls together with ferroconcrete floors, thus giving a safe floor and ceiling to the Session House, vestry, lavatory and upper floor passage.[300] At the outset Melville Dundas and Whitson, specialists in ferroconcrete, were consulted. Mr Melville assured those concerned that his firm was more interested in seeing The Place restored in a fitting manner (considering its history), rather than in making a profit, so were prepared to do the ferroconcrete work at cost price.[301] A letter from the Surveyors, Binnie, Murray and Hutton, advised Sir Robert that the officious behaviour of Mr Henry S Brown, Secretary of the sub-Committee, was causing unnecessary delays which they were afraid would result in Melville Dundas and Whitson withdrawing their generous offer to do the ferroconcrete flooring at cost price. Four days later, on 27 October, 1928, the decision was taken to accept Melville, Dundas and Whitson's favourable offer.[302]

So ferroconcrete flooring was laid in the first floor of the east and south blocks, but American oak block flooring was laid on top of the concrete floor in the Session House, vestry and lavatory.[303] Lorimer also re-introduced the newel stair - affording access to the first floor.[304] He also built the parapet wall, with iron grating, around the old well in the forecourt of The Place.[305]

The final cost of the work done by Lorimer was £1997 1s. 9d.[306] Sir Robert Lorimer died in September 1929[307], but it appears that not all he had planned at

that time was carried out, in particular the dormers on the upper floor of The Place facing into the cloister [see fig 95b]. Whether Lorimer's plans were acted upon by the Kirk Session is uncertain, when the work of restoring The Place was continued in the early 1930s.

In any case, as part of the 1930s work, and as suggested by Lorimer, ferroconcrete flooring was also laid in the first floor gallery and upper rooms, the stonework of the windows and doors on the ground and first floor were repaired with ferroconcrete lintels, and where necessary with stonework. The doorway to the south-west of the ground floor was blocked up in masonry and a new window formed.[308] Bruce American Oak was laid in the two panelled rooms on the first floor, and central heating was also installed, at a total cost of £256. 10s.[309] Oak window replacements were made to the ground floor (south front) and the mid and west rooms of the first floor, and similar to those previously installed by Lorimer.[310] The roofs were re-slated and the chimneys made good; the external plumbing was also repaired and renewed where necessary. The external staircase, affording access to The Place on the east front, was repaired and the ugly handrail replaced by a stone parapet. The final total, including painter work, was £1245.[311]

The two panelled rooms on the first floor were also restored, the benefactor being Sir John Stirling Maxwell.[312] It was his intention that the rooms be restored as near as possible to their original seventeenth-eighteenth century appearance. All the original fixtures and fittings, including some of the plaster cornices, were removed and safely stored. Ferroconcrete flooring was then introduced, and covered, where necessary, with oak flooring. Three new sash-and-case windows of Austrian oak, again in the

style of those already inserted by Lorimer, replaced the existing ones.[313] The rooms were thus returned to their "original" appearance. New tiles were also laid in the gallery. The final account for the restoration work on The Place carried out at the behest of Sir John, was £686.14s.9d.[314]

This chapter in the restoration of The Place of Paisley was now complete, with the upper floor, and attic area, left in a safe condition in anticipation of future restoration work being carried out.

It was not until the 1950s that the attic of The Place, as yet unrestored, was renovated. A special committee of the Presbytery had been set up to consider the possibility of forming a manse in The Place.[315] The minister, Rev W H Rogan, was much in favour of the idea. Indeed Dr Rogan[316] said,

> "when I first came to Paisley to take up this charge, and saw these buildings in the condition they were in then, I was shocked. I determined to do all in my power to have them restored to rights and preserved as the valuable piece of historic architecture they undoubtedly are."

The Property Committee of the abbey met later to discuss the condition of some of the floors in The Place and report.[317] Woodworm was discovered and instructions were given to eradicate it.[318]

By September 1957 James Steel Maitland, architect, Paisley, had been commissioned to transform the upper storey of The Place into a residence for the minister. Steel Maitland produced drawings of the elevation of The Place which included his changes, but none of the north front, as he had no intentions of making any changes there.[figs 97a - 97c] Steel Maitland appealed for groups of volunteers to prepare the woodwork for treatment, this was done. When the plaster covering the original oak beams was removed, he

realised they were the original beams which still supported the roof of what had been the monks' frater. These were thus exposed for the first time in almost four hundred years.[319] [plate 219; fig 70]. A year later on 19 November, 1958, Steel Maitland was given permission by the Kirk Session to proceed with the making of working drawings, so that tenders could be sought, and also to obtain approval of the Dean of Guild.[320] The Dean of Guild passed the plans, but planning permission had not yet been given by Paisley Burgh Planning Department[321] for a change in use from offices to a Manse.

Work began on the final restoration of The Place, as funds were available. Unconditional planning permission was finally granted by Paisley Planning Department. Steel Maitland made no alterations to the ground and first floors apart from introducing a new doorway into each. In the attic area, Steel Maitland transformed a dismal "*barn*" [plate 220] into a rather stylish and pleasant home [plates 221a & b]. Before this came about, apart from the fact that the whole attic area was a shambles, partitions had to be taken away in the two floors of the south-east block. Here the flooring had to be stripped and the sagging joints reinforced with steel.

The minister's new flat eventually consisted of lounge, dining room, study, three bedrooms, bathroom, kitchen, scullery, hall, cloak room, and other offices, with another three bedrooms and bathroom in the third floor of the south-east block.[322] The study, with a fine ornate plaster ceiling, was actually part of the seventeenth century additions to The Place [plate 222]. Steel Maitland used the existing stair at the south west corner as a service stair, but created a new tower and stair at the north west corner. As part of his plans for the new flat, he designed all the internal

fixtures and fittings in an Arts and Crafts style, including the wrought iron hearth for the open fireplace in the lounge[323]. Above the fireplace he mounted the Royal Arms of James IV King of Scots, which are said to have lain for so long in the precincts of the abbey [see plate 88].

For his new tower on the north-west corner of the south block [plate 223], Steel Maitland adapted an existing single storey extension at its west front, adding another two storeys to it, forming a tower. His work here is strangely reminiscent of MacGregor Chalmers' sketch for the west end of The Place, though reversed [fig 98]. A new ground floor entrance was reconstructed from fragments of an archway of, perhaps, the west range of the abbey. This entrance then afforded access to the upper floor, using a half-turn stairway. Steel Maitland designed a lamp, still in-situ, which hangs from a chain and lights the stairwell.

New elegant double doors of oak, in an Arts and Crafts Style, were also erected at the west front, north porch, and the east and west processional doorways. They were designed by James Steel Maitland.

Steel Maitland's restoration work was the last major restoration to be completed in the interior of The Place, and though normal maintenance of the church continues, occasionally major restoration work is required. Indeed, since 1989 restoration work has been ongoing, the mullions in the choir windows being replaced. After that a major refurbishment of the masonwork of the abbey was begun in 1993, and though work on the abbey church is near completion, work has now begun on the refurbishment of The Place.

CHAPTER VI

Conclusions

Despite the success of the Reformation in 1560 the history of Paisley Abbey as a place of worship, unlike so many of its contemporaries, continued. Since the eighteenth century its history has consisted of a series of major events almost as important as its foundation in 1163. These events are such that Paisley, as an architectural entity, can best be described as a bridgehead between Medieval and Revival Gothic, for the twentieth century choir has become a perfect complement to the late medieval nave. Another important aspect of Paisley Abbey is that its architectural history covers the medieval period from the twelfth century to the demise of the Roman Church, as the National Church, in 1560, such that architecturally Paisley displays within and on its walls, examples of Gothic architecture from the twelfth century on. The eighteenth to twentieth century restorations of Paisley Abbey played an important part in the architectural movements of that period. This is important, because Paisley's restorers made every effort to maintain and enhance the spirit of Medieval Gothic in their restorations. Their success can be seen as an inspiration; or used as a model by others.

Paisley Abbey's history not only includes the building and restoration of the abbey, but also the constant strenuous efforts made to maintain it, for without these efforts, Paisley Abbey would perhaps be just another lost church. All of this plays an irrevocable part in its recorded history, because the building themselves, and the changes made to them, have become part of that recorded history. Since the history of Paisley is ongoing, then its foundation as a Cluniac monastery has become an important part of its twentieth century history and vice-versa, for without the foundation, Paisley Abbey would not exist today.

Paisley's monastic buildings are therefore as important to its building history as is the twentieth century restoration of the choir. Like all Cluniac and Benedictine monastic houses, from the twelfth century onwards, the layout of Paisley's domestic buildings had antecedents in the ground plan of Cluny II, and in the plan of St Gall. Also, in the true spirit of medieval monasticism, Paisley's cloister, like those of her contemporaries, not only controlled the lives of the monks but made its religious community a viable proposition, while the site made it a reality. Although the frater has become the nucleus of The Place, it probably followed the Scottish tradition of being two storeys high. The west, or cellarer's range was extant until 1874 when it was demolished. The destruction of this building meant that the very last cloistral range extant in mainland Scotland disappeared, and for all the wrong reasons.

In the context of its building history, the architecture of the abbey church of Paisley naturally falls within periods of architecture which are common in northern Europe, as seen in the tracery of the two eastmost windows of the north aisle; and in Britain, for the first choir/church would have been of the Transitional period. This is borne out by the evidence of the east processional door together with the remnants of the earlier church in the restored cloister. The erection of this first church would probably have been sanctioned by the acting superior of the first Cluniac monks to arrive from Wenlock. Their first home was on the Inch at Renfrew, prior to any temporary buildings being erected on the chosen site by the River Cart.

The west front is still largely Early English, despite the later changes in the fenestration. In

reconstructing the west front I have considered it from different aspects. The evidence of the twin west windows, divided into three lights, suggests that Lithgow I had the extant intersecting tracery with circlets inserted as replacements, the form of the windows being basically unchanged. In the reconstruction of these west windows I have added tracery akin to Glasgow's north transept. The west front with a wheel window in the gable, rather than a group of five lancets, is much more dramatic. In placing the turrets over the newel stairs, contained in the buttresses, I have followed medieval tradition. Thomas Ross took the same view when he drew up a conjectural restoration of the west front at St Andrews.[1]

Whatever the reason for the demolition of the Early English church in the fourteenth century, any record of its nave was lost for ever, apart from the few remnants in the westmost bays of the triforium. These remnants, despite their scarcity, have helped towards a conjectural reconstruction of the bay system in the nave, which may have resembled Glasgow and Holyrood. Glasgow choir, helped by the triforium remnants at Paisley, provided the model for the reconstructed triforium. Thus, the bay system in Paisley's nave would have consisted of triple vaulting shafts rising from the triforium to roof level. In my conjectural reconstruction, I have not attempted to recreate two bays of Paisley's nave, rather I have tried to show, given the evidence, the form the bays could have taken. I have considered Glasgow Cathedral the best comparison with Paisley Abbey because of the distinct possibility of a connection between them, together with the fact that Glasgow is the nearest important medieval church comparable with Paisley.

Indeed, if the stiff-leaf capitals at the north porch door were completed by the early 1240s, and by the

masons working at Glasgow, then it is likely that Paisley would have been completed shortly afterwards, and earlier than Glasgow. If this dating can be shown to be correct it raises many questions. In the first instance, the building of Paisley's Early English nave would have been advanced before the beginning of Glasgow's choir, such that Paisley could have been the model for Glasgow rather than vice-versa. Also, it could mean that the masons began working at the Cluniac abbey of Paisley, and then moved to begin working on Glasgow Cathedral. If 1240 is the date of the completion of Paisley's Early English nave, then it would have been completed, as suggested by Gourlay, in the time of Abbot William. Even though there is no documentary evidence to confirm this date, the building of the Early English nave is consistent with Abbot William's time in office; and there is nothing to suggest that the Early English nave would not have been attached to an earlier Transitional choir.

The late fourteenth/early fifteenth century nave is in a form of the Decorated period. The plan of the nave, north aisle and north transept all belong to the same building programme, so were drawn up by the same master mason or architect, as shown by the archaeological evidence, and masons' marks. The division of the south transept is certainly thirteenth century, and the bell bases of the arcading were probably the models for those in Glasgow's lower church. Since this division of the south transept was practical - it was the sacristy - there would no need to divide the north transept likewise. However, there is no real evidence as to when the barrel vault was built, or when St Mirren's Aisle was extended east by one bay, though the form of the ribbing suggests that it may have been inserted during the time of Thomas de Tervas. There is no evidence in the south transept which would suggest the existence of a night

stair, and since there is no such evidence at any of the major Cluniac sites visited, it is likely that Paisley would have followed this tradition.

The overall plan of the nave probably included the triforium, a clerestory and new roof, as well as a new window in the west gable. Abbot John de Lithgow I is the person most likely to be responsible for this work. There is no evidence to suggest just how far the rebuilding had progressed by the time of his death, though it is likely that the nave, and aisles, had been built up as far as (and including) the triforium, as the archaeological evidence suggests. The new clerestory and slated roof was certainly the work of Abbot Thomas de Tervas. Since the form and elements used in the nave of Paisley are extant in later churches, Paisley's nave may have provided the model for these churches. Indeed, Paisley may well be the herald of, what some architectural historians call a *National Style.*

The present west gable window probably replaced the Early English fenestration in the second half of the fourteenth century. The method of building this window, with sloped reveals, is certainly reminiscent of the north aisle windows, so even if Tervas was responsible for the tracery in the north European fashion, the window design was probably laid down and begun during Lithgow's building campaign, as part of his renovation of the west front.

The two eastmost windows of the north aisle are the work of John Morrow, as seen in the archaeological evidence at Lincluden, Melrose, as well as Paisley. Whether these two windows represent a building campaign to replace the neighbouring windows with intersecting tracery, is uncertain. Nor is there any evidence to

suggest that Morrow's north aisle windows were drawn up as part of an overall plan for the nave.

We now know why the tower and spire collapsed in the sixteenth century. The north crossing pier had been built on sand, and the weight of the new tower and spire was the cause of the pier's collapse. The date of the fall of John Hamilton's tower is still uncertain, but if it were closer in date to 1560, this would explain why the choir was never repaired and probably demolished.

Up till now, most commentators have accepted the argument that the falling tower and spire destroyed the choir completely. This is untenable, unless the choir roof was vaulted, which is most unlikely. A more likely explanation is that the collapsing tower destroyed only two bays of the choir, and most of the east wall of the north transept, which can be verified by nineteenth century prints. An unwanted choir, which was already damaged, would have been at greater risk and so provided those wishing to demolish it with the excuse to do so, and salvage the stone for re-use. In any case, building the great wall across the west side of the crossing would have been quite unnecessary if the choir was reparable, but the demolition of the choir would better explain the building of the east wall, indicating that it was irreversible. The nave would then have reverted to its original status as the parish kirk, which is what actually happened once the wall was built at the crossing.

Although there is nothing to suggest this, the demolition of the choir (because it was monastic), may have followed the practice in England where to this day monastic choirs still stand open to the elements while the nave behind is still in use as the parish church.

Bolton Priory is a good example. Since the nave of the abbey was effectively the parish church of Paisley, there would have been no better reason for keeping it, but not the choir, especially if it had been damaged by the fall of the tower.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the advent of the religious troubles in the early sixteenth century, which led to the success of the Reformation by 1560, effectively dissolved the monasteries. This meant that there would have been no need to repair the damaged choir. A subsequent partial demolition to build the wall at the crossing may have led to the complete demolition of the choir. The lack of any substantial evidence of the choir makes a reconstruction virtually impossible, though it is more than likely that the choir bays would have been filled with large single windows, as was the custom by the thirteenth century.

As yet, there is only evidence of two choirs, the Transitional choir, whose form is still a mystery, and a later one. There is no recorded date when this second choir was begun, though it is assumed that building began in 1371, on the accession of Robert the High Steward, as Robert II. There is certainly no real evidence that a third choir was ever built, but as happened in many churches in the Middle Ages, the new choir could in fact be just a remodelling of the old, and could have included new fenestration. The form of the buttresses in the photograph suggest that this may be the case.

Old photographs always showed the north wall of the choir, which gave the impression that the old choir walls had stood without buttresses. Professor Charles Gourlay also believed that this was the case. However, Rowand Anderson's findings, together with photographs taken

before MacGregor Chalmers' restoration, confirm that the south wall of the choir had been buttressed, otherwise it would have been insecure. Gourlay had to change his mind on this one, when confronted by the evidence. The buildings which fronted Abbey Street/Cotton Street closed the abbey in, hiding the south wall in the process. The buttresses, as the archaeological evidence illustrates, had more in common with those of the south aisle than the aisle to the north, where they are stepped like those of Chalmers' choir. Also, this new evidence contradicts McGibbon and Ross.

They rightly severely criticised MacGregor Chalmers for his rather fanciful interpretations of John Morrow's lineage. Chalmers appears to have ignored the evidence against his own argument, as well as exaggerating what little evidence there was available at the sites supposedly connected with Morrow. Similarly, McGibbon and Ross based their opinion on negative evidence. Their assumption that the walls of the choir represented an incomplete building campaign, appears to be largely based on pre-conceived ideas. The apparent lack of any evidence of the two eastern crossing piers was certainly problematical. However, this problem would have been easily solved had McGibbon and Ross carried out a preliminary excavation of the site.

The discovery of the remnants of the two eastern piers illustrates just how wrong they were. Their assessment of the situation failed to appreciate that the eastmost crossing piers would have been built simultaneously with the choir walls. More importantly, the importance of the crossing piers as internal buttresses for the crossing and the tower above, would have necessitated their construction with the walls. As suggested earlier, the most likely explanation for the

disappearance of the choir and crossing (including the piers), would have been their demolition for the ashlar and the wood from the choir roof; and by leaving the choir walls nine feet high (all round), a parish graveyard was conveniently formed.

If a new choir was being built, or the Early English one being remodelled after 1371, then it could have formed a major part of Abbot John de Lithgow I's building campaign, which included the north transept. According to monastic custom, the choir was always built before the nave. So if work on the choir followed its medieval chronology, then it is only to be expected that it would have been completed before the rebuilding of the nave. The completion of this work on the choir could perhaps explain why the nave was never completed by Lithgow I.

Another contributory factor, to the nave being completed late, was the trouble within the monastery which occurred after the death of John de Lithgow I. The eventual appointment of John de Lithgow II as abbot in 1415 led to a period of uncertainty within the abbey.

Even though Lithgow II had his appointment re-affirmed after the end of the Great Schism by Pope Martin V, Pope Martin later repudiated him in preference for Thomas Morow who was procurator and ambassador of James I. Once abbot, Morow appears to have neglected the fabric of the church, for it was still incomplete on the election of Thomas de Tervas. Tervas set about completing the church, building first the clerestory and then putting on the roof, as the Chronicler reported.

Why the nave had to be rebuilt, and in the form we know today, is still a mystery. There is no doubt that the burning of 1307 did not destroy the church. However,

if the north aisle stood on the same silt as that of the north wall of the choir, the fire together with falling masonry and roof timbers, could have dislodged the nave arcades, thus calling for a complete rebuilding of the nave. On the other hand, the fire may have been the excuse which led to a complete rebuilding of the nave.

The post-Reformation history of the monastic buildings is also uncertain, as well as the damage to the abbey church by the reformers. What is certain, is that the choir stalls, if then extant, statues as well as vestments, altars, altar vessels and furniture would all have been destroyed. This is borne out by the complete lack of evidence of church furniture and furnishings, plus the fragments of figures in the cloister. The nave altars would also have been destroyed.

The cloistral buildings, and those outwith the cloister may have continued to be used, once the abbey and its lands became a private estate, to provide accommodation and shelter. The complete disappearance of these buildings apart from the frater and the west range cannot be accounted for. In the first hundred years after the Reformation, the frater was altered and added to substantially, until it became the nucleus of a great mansion known as The Place. The frater or Place and west range were refenestrated in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by which time the external appearance of The Place was more or less as it is today. Semple's description of the apartments on the upper floor of the west range indicates that they had been transformed into accommodation for the post-Reformation mansion. The destruction of the west range in 1874 was an unfortunate planning decision.

One hundred years earlier, the earl of Dundonald demolished the monastic gateway along with George Schaw's great wall, selling the ashlar as building material. He simultaneously offered as feus for building land the abbey precinct and gardens. Abercorn continued this practice when he re-purchased The Place. When the feus were eventually built on, the building line of the domestic and other buildings closely followed the line of George Schaw's wall. Unfortunately, apart from those buildings already mentioned, there is certainly no record if other buildings belonging to the monastic complex were demolished at this time. If either Dundonald or Abercorn did so, then they would have destroyed the last vestiges of Paisley Abbey, leading the way for its abandonment by the Abercorns, and its eventual decline from a grand mansion into a tenement and public house.

In 1788 the Rev Robert Boog prevented the nave's demolition so that the stones could be used to build a new kirk. The abbey records of the period provide us with much information on Boog's restoration, in particular the tradesmen who did the work (and later records provide us with the names of architects and tradesmen who worked on the abbey before James Salmon). Before any work was carried out in Boog's time, a suggestion was put forward that the roof be lowered, but thankfully this was never carried out. Boog's restoration was certainly a very important and successful event in the abbey's building history. At this time the medieval turrets over the west buttresses were lowered to the level of the buttresses, however there is no evidence of their appearance.

By the time of James Salmon's restoration the nave was again in danger, largely because of the dangerous soil levels within and surrounding the church. Salmon's

restoration was a tremendous success, and by sweeping away the eighteenth century galleries and box pews he laid out the church according to the dictates of the growing ecclesiological movement, west-to-east. He is the man responsible for showing the way forward towards a complete restoration of the church, for by presenting Paisley with a drawing of a completed abbey church he fired the imagination of the certain influential citizens who perceived the abbey could be restored to its former glory.

Sadly, Salmon did not take away as much soil as was needed to secure the building from further damage. This resulted in extensive dry rot, but this was eventually overcome.

The next major restoration work was that carried out by Rowand Anderson. He rebuilt the later medieval crossing piers, as well as building new piers at the east side of the crossing, and re-opened the transepts. He also raised the tower above the ridge of the roof of the nave. His failure to complete the restoration resulted in much controversy for the eastern crossing piers required much stronger foundations than he or anyone could have anticipated. Even though the restoration of Paisley had reached an impasse, Anderson's work paved the way (after a necessary breathing space) for the successful restoration of the choir. Indeed, the discovery that the north side of the choir was built on silt explains why the tower collapsed in the sixteenth century, and why Chalmers had to take the walls of the choir down to their foundations before he could do any building work.

The wranglings surrounding the appointment of Peter MacGregor Chalmers represent a dark chapter in the

history of Paisley. Evidence from different quarters shows just how complicated the situation was, though the Rev A M Maclean, and the Kirk Session, saw it as straight-forward. The Heritors, however, failed to see it that way, and on the advice of Sir John Stirling Maxwell, attempted to ensure that either Sir Rowand Anderson or Sir Robert Lorimer would receive the commission to complete the restoration. This is unfortunate, for their obduracy could have *killed off* the restoration, and in any case their failure to provide a compromise architect, given the situation, meant that they would inevitably lose out to Maclean. In the end, the minister, who could be said to have "controlled the purse strings" (the benefactors having promised large sums of money to him on the basis that Chalmers and not Anderson would complete the work), won the argument.

The decision to appoint Chalmers was a controversial one, and opinions on his qualities as an architect differ to this day. Maclean thought otherwise, for his support for Chalmers rather than for Anderson was, in his eyes, crucial to the success or failure of the restoration, for it was his intention that what happened during Gentles' restoration would not happen during his. Although Anderson was difficult to work with, and had failed to complete his commission, the evidence suggests that the reason why he lost the commission to Chalmers was because his plans were considered inferior to those of Chalmers. Anderson's plans were known to the donors, so it would have been difficult for them to reject the offer of a vaulted ceiling by Chalmers, in favour of a wooden one by Anderson. Sir John thought Anderson's plans admirable. On the contrary, Maclean certainly did not like Anderson's proposed treatment of the tower, and so may not have been too happy with Anderson's plans for the choir itself. Therefore, it was illogical of Maclean

to suggest at one point that Anderson and Chalmers could perhaps have worked together on the restoration. However, if Anderson's plans had been as much admired as Sir John suggested, I believe there is little doubt that they would have been accepted by the minister and Kirk Session, for the Restoration Committee had paid a considerable sum for them. Indeed, that was one of Sir John's reasons for accepting Anderson's plans.

The restored cloister was completed by Chalmers in 1915, and is more French in character than English. He built the choir walls up to their full height, but died before his work was complete. Despite his very bold scheme for a vaulted roof, questions are still raised regarding his ability to complete the task. There is no clear evidence which would explain why Chalmers decided on a ribbed vault. Chalmers was a successful and respected architect, yet he had no experience in the building of a vaulted roof. This and the boast by Chalmers, that he could build cheap churches, are reasons which probably prompted Sir John Stirling Maxwell to question Chalmers' suitability as architect for the restoration. Chalmers had built barrel vaulted roofs, but they cannot be compared with the complexity of a ribbed vault. Perhaps when Chalmers was invited to make rough sketches of a restored choir, as an antiquarian, he may have been tempted, just for effect, to draw Paisley choir complete with a ribbed vault. The donors, Stewart Clark, Allison and Craig, on seeing these rough sketches of Paisley with a ribbed vault, may have been so impressed that they offered to fund the restoration, possibly on the basis of what they saw was what they would get. There can be no doubt that Chalmers received the commission on the strength of his rough drawings. Whatever the reason for the ribbed vault, Chalmers was

now in the position where he would have to provide a ribbed vault or risk losing the commission.

Lorimer, as we know, had to change the plans for the vault, which Gourlay verified. This raises serious doubts as to whether Chalmers knew what he was about. His comments are crucial to any understanding of the Anderson and Chalmers restorations. Their importance cannot be over-emphasised, for Charles Gourlay was our witness to much that was going on at Paisley at that time. The completion of the universally admired vault by Lorimer probably enhanced his reputation (and deservedly so), but Paisley would not have had a vaulted roof had Chalmers not made those first rough sketches.

By the turn of the century, The Place could best be described as dignified squalor. Its partial renovation by Lorimer, after his completion of the choir, restored part of the building and redeemed its reputation. This was advanced by further restorations, including that to the first floor rooms financed by Sir John Stirling Maxwell. The restoration of The Place was only completed when James Steel Maitland renovated the attic area, forming it into a rather tasteful flat for the minister, Dr Rogan. Sadly (in the writer's opinion), this flat is now used as meeting rooms by the abbey congregation.

The saving of this important group of buildings, known as The Abbey, cannot be over-emphasized. Had the Paisley Heritors had their way in the late eighteenth century, Paisley Abbey would have been pulled down, but perhaps the initial opposition to their plans, together with the Rev Dr Boog's determination, taught them all a salutary lesson, as well as the realisation that the repair of the church would be continuous. The repair and maintenance of the church and buildings have continued

since Boog's day, and even during major restoration work as the records show. Therefore, all credit must go to Boog, whose inspiration meant that one day Paisley Abbey would again take its rightful place in Scottish architectural history with those other great pre-Reformation Scottish churches still in use today, namely its nearest neighbour St Mungo's Cathedral, St Giles, Edinburgh, St Machar's, Aberdeen, and St Magnus, Kirkwall begun in 1173 by Rognvald, the Norwegian earl of Orkney.

The saving of Paisley, also means that its unique nave, may yet be seen as having been part of a north European Renaissance in church building in the later Middle Ages, in which case it should be seen in a new context altogether.

Indeed Paisley, and the whole nation, should be thankful that those who were responsible for the various periods of the restoration of the abbey, namely the Restoration Committees and their architects, were aware of what they wanted to achieve, for the immediate result was a complete and sympathetic restoration of the building by architects who did not belong to the school of Wyatt and Scott. Unfortunately, this was not always the case in England, where the architects were often carrying out the directions of the deans and chapters of the cathedrals in which they found themselves working. Fortunately, this was not the case at Paisley, where the architects were given a free hand. Yet, in England there are also many examples of major restoration work which were sympathetic to the fabric of the buildings, so could be compared with that at Paisley.

On the whole Paisley choir, as restored by Chalmers and Lorimer, is preferable to that proposed by Anderson for his choir roof (lower than the nave) would have

looked odd. Even though Chalmers' vaulted roof has been criticised "as being an exercise in antiquarianism", Anderson's dignified wooden roofs at Dunblane cannot really be compared with it, and almost seventy years later visitors still admire the carved bosses. Lorimer's designs for the choir stalls are second to none, and do appear to "possess that quality of distinction" which Sir John always insisted was apparent in Lorimer's work.

The large gaps in its recorded history and archaeology are still problematical. This is unfortunate, for it means that it is still not possible to arrive at a complete assessment of Paisley's building history. Even though my thesis has shown that there is more evidence available than was realised in the past (on the abbots and medieval choir), for example, ignoring some of the obvious obstacles, a professionally organised excavation of the complete monastic site itself should provide us with answers, to some of the still unanswered questions. Also, a more careful examination of the remnants of the abbey church, which has been recorded here for the first time, may provide some answers; and by examination I mean drawing, measuring and photographing them for posterity.

Just as the various restorations of the nave saved it for posterity, it is even more true to say that ever since Boog's restoration the work of maintaining and restoring the abbey has continued. This great task has often been seen as the first consideration of the ministers of the abbey, and has continued till today when extensive restoration work is being carried out on the nave and west front during the ministry of the Rev Alan Birss. Indeed, perhaps credit must go to its ministers, rather than any others, for saving Paisley Abbey for posterity.

REFERENCES

CHAP 1 : NOTES AND REFERENCES.

[1] George Hay, "The Late Medieval Development of the High Kirk of St Giles", Proceedings Society Antiquaries of Scotland, 107 (1975 -76), 242-260.

[2] Gerald Cobb, English Cathedrals : The Forgotten Centuries, (London,Thames and Hudson, 1980), 124.

[3] ibid. 24.

[4] ibid. 50.

[5] A. R. Howell, Paisley Abbey 1929, (Paisley, Gardner, 1929), 51.

[6] Stewart Cruden, Scottish Medieval Churches, (Edinburgh, John Donald, 1986), hardly gives Paisley a mention.

[7] Coltart, J S, Scottish Church Architecture, (London, The Sheldon Press, 1936), 14.

[8] Johnston, Paul and Driscoll, Stephen T., Paisley Abbey : Investigations, 1991 : Geophysical Survey, Analysis of Silts Recovered from Medieval Drain and Trial Excavations in the Drain, (Glasgow, University Archaeological Research Division, 1991).

[9] Joan Evans, Romanesque Architecture of the Order of Cluny, (Farnborough, Gregg-International Publishers, 1931), 4.

[10] ibid. 5.

[11] see Raffaella Marghi, "Monastic Reform and Cluniac Spirtuality", in Cluciac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages, ed. Noreen Hunt, (London, MacMillan, 1971), 11-28.

[12] Warmlow, Joseph, "Cluny : Silentia Claustra", in Benedict's Disciples, ed. D. H. Farmer, (London, Fowler Wright Books, 1980), 118-138, at 136.

[13] G. F. Duckett, Charters and Records of Cluny, 2 vols, (Lewes, H Wolff, 1888), II, 164.

[14] ibid. II, 159 & 210.

[15] ibid. II, 196.

[16] ibid. II, 149.

[17] ibid. II, 159 & 210.

[18] Duckett, Charters and Records, I 36 and 38.

[19] Duckett, Charters and Records, II, 164.

[20] see W. A. Pantin, General and Provincial Chapters of the Black Monks, (Camden Society, Camden Series XLV, XLVII & LIV, 1931-1937).

[21] RSS, III, 1766.

[22] I.B. Cowan & D. E. Easson, Medieval Religious Houses in Scotland, 2nd ed. (London, Longman, 1976), 65.

[23] Duckett, Charters and Records, II, 208.

[24] J. Cameron Lees, The Abbey of Paisley, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1878), appendix k, iv.

[25] John Malden, The Monstery and Abbey of Paisley, (Paisley, Renfrew District Council, 1993), 45, for an updated list.

[26] John Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", Innes Review, 27 (1976), 118.

[27] McGurk, F, Calendar of Letters to Scotland of Benedict XIII of Avignon, 1394-1419, (Edinburgh, Scottish History Society, 1976), 259.

[28] David Knowles, Monastic Order in England, 2nd ed. CUP, 1963), part III, 502-505.

[29] McGurk, Calendar of Letters, 264.

[30] E. R. Lindsay, & A. I. Cameron, Calendar of Supplications Relating to Scotland from Rome 1418-1422, I, (Edinburgh, Scottish History Society 3rd Series, 1934), 61 - Bachelor of Decretals (B.Dec).

[31] A. I. Dunlop, Calendar of Supplications to Rome 1423-1428, VOL II, (Glasgow, GUP, 1972 ed.), xxiii: John de Eaglesham.

[32] Registrum Monasterii de Passelet, (Edinburgh, Maitland Club, 1832), 330 & 328; and Lees, Paisley, 115.

[33] see Mark Dilworth, "Monks and Ministers after 1560", Records Scottish Church History Society, 18 (1974) 201-221; and Charles H. Haws, "Scottish

Religious Orders at the Reformation", RSCHS, 16 (1969), 203-224.

[34] see Lees, Paisley, 122-123.

[35] Cruden, Medieval Churches, 45, maintains that the west front of Kelso has elements common to north European monasteries such as the twelfth century abbey church of Bad Munstereifel, near Bonn, in the north Rhineland; and the early thirteenth century Cistercian nunnery of Roermond in the Dutch province of Limburg.

[36] Coltart, Church Architecture, 17.

[37] Cruden, Medieval Churches, 93.

[38] Tim Tatton-Brown, Great Cathedrals of Britain, (London, BBC Books, 1989), 160.

[39] Coltart, Church Architecture, 8.

[40] ibid. 15.

[41] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 51-80.

[42] Cruden, Medieval Churches, 22.

[43] ibid. 123.

[44] ibid. 177.

[45] Peter MacGregor Chalmers, "Paisley Abbey", Transactions Scottish Ecclesiastical Society, (1908-1909), 401-404; 402.

[46] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 98-100.

[47] Lees, Paisley, 210.

[48] C. A. Radford, Raleigh & Gordon Donaldson, Whithorn (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1984), 15 & 17.

[49] ibid. 18.

[50] ibid.

[51] J. Patrick Greene, Medieval Monasteries, (Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1992), see fig 79, 173.

[52] ibid. 88-89.

[53] Jean Bony, The English Decorated Style, (Oxford,

Phaedon, 1979), 12.

[54] Cruden, Medieval Churches, 140-141.

[55] Cruden, Medieval Churches, 140; and Coltart, Church Architecture, 4.

[56] Cruden, Medieval Churches, 137.

[57] Coltart, Church Architecture, 25.

[58] Richard Fawcett, Scottish Architecture from the Accession of the Stewarts to the Reformation, 1371-1560, (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1994), 4.

[59] Bony, Decorated Style, 8.

[60] ibid.

[61] Coltart, Church Architecture, 51; and Richard Fawcett, "Scottish Medieval Window Tracery", in Studies in Scottish Antiquity Presented to Stewart Cruden, ed. J. Breeze, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1984), 173 n.XI A1.

[62] Coltart, Church Architecture, 150.

[63] ibid. 146.

[64] ibid. 170.

[65] ibid. 15; Coltart suggests that similar apsed ends are found in Germany, Flanders, east France, as at Beuvry-de-Calais, and the destroyed Saint Waast de Bethune.

[66] R. Fawcett, Scottish Architecture 1371-1560, 29.

[67] R. Fawcett, "Window Tracery", 167, VI B1.

[68] ibid. 167, VI B1.

[69] R. Fawcett, Scottish Architecture 1371-1560, 41-42.

[70] Coltart, Church Architecture, 29.

[71] ibid. 5-6.

[72] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", __ 120.

[73] D. McGibbon, & T. Ross, Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland, 3 vols, (Edinburgh, D Douglas, 1896),

III, 10.

[74] John Durkan, "Paisley Abbey and Glasgow Archives: Some New Directions", IR, 14 (1963), 46, 50-51.

[75] Joseph and Anne Rykwert, The Brothers Adam, (Glasgow, Blackie, 1975), 169-175.

[76] Cobb, English Cathedrals, 110-112.

[77] ibid.

[78] James Macaulay, The Gothic Revival, (Glasgow, Blackie, 1975), 256-257.

[79] ibid. 253-274.

[80] Banister Fletcher, A History of Architecture, 12th Edition, (London, Batsford, 1948), 854.

[81] Jane Fawcett, "A Restoration Tragedy : Cathedrals in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." in The Future of the Past : Attitudes to Conservation 1174-1974, ed. Jane Fawcett, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1976), 79. Fawcett writes that Blore, Salvin, Street, Burges, Jackson, Pearson and Blomfield were chiefly responsible for nineteenth century cathedral restoration.

[82] ibid. 92.

[83] Cobb, English Cathdrals, 165.

[84] Anthony New, A Guide to the Cathedrals of Britain, (London, Constable, 1980), 423.

[85] See entry on "Sir Edward Coley Burne-Jones" in Harold Osborne, The Oxford Companion to Art, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1981), 176; see also Jane Fawcett, "A Restoration Tragedy", 106ff.

[86] A. R., Anderson, "Augustinian and Benedictine Monasteries in Scotland", Transactions Glasgow Archaeological Society, 13 (new series 1954), 102.

[87] Frank A. Walker, The South Clyde Estuary, (Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press, 1986), 16.

[88] Elizabeth Angus, "University of Glasgow Memorial Chapel - 1913-1929, (Unpublished M.Phil Thesis, Glasgow University, 1991, 35-51 (57); see also Andor Gomme, & David M. Walker, The Buildings of Glasgow, (London, Lund Humphries, 1987), 177.

[89] New, Cathedrals of Britain, 414.

[90] Cobb, English Cathedrals, 64.

[91] ibid.

[92] ibid. plate 114, 71.

[93] New, Cathedrals of Britain, 50.

[94] ibid. 381.

[95] ibid. 381; see also Jane Fawcett, "A Restoration Tragedy", 98.

[96] ibid. 80.

CHAP 2 : NOTES AND REFERENCES

PART 1.

[1] Lees, Paisley, 26; G. W. S. Barrow, Anglo-Norman Era, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1980), 13.

[2] G.W.S. Barrow, The Kingdom of the Scots, (London, Edward Arnold, 1973), 338.

[3] Barrow, Anglo-Norman Era, 13.

[4] ibid. 14.

[5] Registrum, appendix i, 1-2.

[6] Walter, as Steward, had in his coat-of-arms a chequer-board as a symbol of his office. Today, a chequer-board still decorates the arms of the Abbey of Paisley.

[7] Registrum, note (a) iii.

[8] ibid. 1-2.

[9] ibid. preface iii n. a; considering that Walter I, as the founder of what became the Stewart dynasty, sealed the foundation charter of Paisley at Fotheringay in 1163, the execution there in 1587 of his direct descendant Mary, Queen of Scots, was indeed a rare twist of fate.

[10] G. W. S. Barrow, Scotland : 1000 - 1306, (London, Edward Arnold, 1981), 80.

[11] Duckett, Charters and Records, I, 25.

[12] Registrum, 3.

[13] ibid. 3-4.

[14] ibid. 4.

[15] ibid. 5-7.

[16] M. Barrett, Scottish Monasteries of Old, (Edinburgh, Otto Schulze, 1913), 100.

[17] Indeed, the first church on the Inch was dedicated to St James the Great.

[18] Alison Binns, Dedication of Monastic Houses in England and Wales, 1066-1216, (Woodbridge, Boydell, 1989), 36.

[19] Barrow, Anglo-Norman Era, 67.

[20] St Milburga was a Saxon princess, grand-daughter of Penda, King of Mercia. She had been Prioress of the Nunnery of Wenlock and had died in the odour of sanctity. see Donald Attwater, Dictionary of Saints, (London, Penguin Books, 1985), 238. Her tomb was accidentally discovered during the building of the new Cluniac monastery at Wenlock: see Rose Graham, The History of the Alien Priory of Wenlock, (London, HMSO, 1971 ed), 8.

[21] Barrow, Anglo-Norman Era, 67.

[22] ibid.

[23] Cosmo Innes, & James B. Birchin, Origines Parochiales Scotiae, 9 vols, (Bannatyne Club, 1850-1855), I, 49.

[24] G. W, S. Barrow, Scotland and its Neighbours in the Middle Ages, (London, Hambledon, 1992), 119, wrote that there is "..no way of measuring the historical loss which has been suffered through the failure to preserve the literature once treasured by such early shrines...but assuredly these and several other old centres must have produced or preserved some literature."

[25] David Semple, St Mirin, (Paisley, J & J Cook, 1877), 35; it has also been suggested that the church of St Mirren, with his tomb within, was the parish church of Paisley and stood at or near Seedhill. W. M. Metcalfe, A History of the County of Renfrew, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1905), 21.

[26] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 19.

[27] see Registrum, 5-7; translated and quoted by Lees, Paisley, 32-33.

[28] Barrow, Scotland and its Neighbours, 80.

[29] Justin McCann, Rule of St Benedict, (London Burns Oates, 1960), chap. 66, 153.

[30] Knowles, Monastic Order in England, 154 ff on Cluniac organisation in England.

[31] Cowan and Easson, Medieval Religious Houses, 65.

[32] ibid. 5-6 (undated charter).

[33] ibid. "et terram juxta illud molendinum ubi quidam vestrum prius habitaverunt", 408-410; see also Bull of Pope Honorius [1225-27] which mentions same, 410-414.

[34] Registrum, 249; and G. W. S. Barrow, Regesta Regum Scottorum, (Edinburgh, University Press, 1960), I, no. 254.

[35] Cowan & Easson, Medieval Religious Houses, 64.

[36] Registrum, v.

[37] Cowan & Easson, Medieval Religious Houses, 64; the Chronicle of Melrose states that in 1169 "Hunbaud, the prior of Weneloc, brought the convent to Passelet (Paisley)." Although this is ambiguous, it could be interpreted to mean that Humbold himself was actually present at the dedication of the new convent at Paisley. See, Joseph Stephenson (trans), The Chronicles of Melrose and Holyrood, (Dyfed, Llanerach Enterprises, 1988), 15.

[38] There are several requests by Thomas Morow, Abbot of Paisley, for a safe passport through England accompanied by a chaplain and servants: CDS, IV (1357-1509); entries 177. 6/7/1418, 885; 178. 4/8/1419, 891; 182. 21/4/1421, 902; see also ER III 1379-1406, lxxxiv; on the issue of passports to the abbot of Paisley and others to visit King James I in France.

[39] Joseph Stephenson (trans), The Chronicles of Melrose and Holyrood, 15.

[40] Registrum, 2-3.

[41] Metcalfe, Renfrew, 30, assumes that because Osbert was chosen as prior he would have accompanied Humbald northwards, (which is not necessarily the case). Since nothing is known of Osbert, he could just as easily have been one of the monks already at Paisley, and perhaps already acting as Superior.

[42] Registrum, 5.

[43] ibid. 74.

[44] Bond, Gothic Architecture, 43.

[45] Charles Gourlay, Collection of Papers in Mitchell Library. "The round headed doorway south east of the nave is Transitional, 1145-1190", note 20/5/1897; "it is the oldest part of Paisley Abbey and is toothed on each side into adjoining walls", n. 24/3/1913; see also Richard Fawcett, "The Medieval Churches of Glasgow and adjacent Areas", ARCH.J. 143 (1986), 3-6; 3.

[46] Richard Fawcett, "Glasgow Cathedral", in Elizabeth Williamson, Buildings of Scotlond : Glasgow, (London, Penguin Books, 1990), 108-136, in 108 & 109.

[47] Graham, Wenlock, 3.

[48] ibid. 11.

[49] G. Webb, Architecture in Britain : The Middle Ages, (London, Penguin Books, 1956), 95; see also Harold Brakspear, "A West Country School of Masons", Archaeologia, 31 2nd series (1931), 1-18.

[50] C. A. R. Radford, "The Cluniac Priory of St James, Dudley", Antiq.J. 20 (1940), 449-459; 450.

[51] Charles Gourlay B.Sc. ARIBA. (1865-1926), was Professor of Architecture and Building Construction at the Glasgow and West of Scotland Technical College. The Governors unanimously appointed him to the Chair, created for him, in April 1895. Since 1888, he had lectured on building construction, and in 1903 he published his famous book Elementary Building Construction and Drawing for Scottish Students, (London, Blackie, 1903), specially written for his students. He also wrote many articles on architectural subjects for the Architectural Journals.
Professor Gourlay was a frequent visitor to the Paisley Abbey during its restoration, where he often noted his comments (some very forthright), on the spot. As such, they are of tremendous importance in any understanding of the twentieth century restoration of Paisley Abbey. Who's Who in Glasgow in 1909.

[52] see Gourlay Coll. "J J Waddell told me that P MacGregor Chalmers got his idea of Cérisey being the original of the plans for Paisley Abbey from reading Bond's Gothic Architecture, n. 8/2/1917; see also Bond plan of Cérisey, 199, n. 7/5/1915.

[53] Gourlay Coll. op.cit. "Five altars, two on either side of high altar", note 24/3/1913; see also Binns, Dedications of Monastic Houses op.cit. 110-117; although most Cluniac houses appear to have had single dedications, others had dual dedications, but only Paisley appears to have had multi dedications.

[54] Gourlay Coll. op.cit.ibid. "There was no evidence of the sacristy except for the stumps of the bondstones of two walls which might have buttresses," note 30/6/1916.

[55] McGibbon and Ross, Ecclesiastical Architecture, III, 10, and fig. 354, 12.

[56] Lees, Paisley, 210.

[57] Registrum, 13; see also 55.

[58] ibid. 17.

[59] Denis McKay, "The Four Heid Pilgrimages of Scotland," IR, 19 (1968), 76-77.

[60] Barrow, Scotland : 1000-1306, 80.

[61] John Durkan, "Paisley Abbey : Attempt to make it Cistercian", IR, 7 (1956) 60-62; 61.

[62] Registrum, 8 & 9.

[63] Duckett, Charters and Records, II, 114-116.

[64] Lees, Paisley, 58.

[65] Registrum, 8.

[66] ibid. 9.

[67] ibid. 1; and Cowan and Easson, Medieval Religious Houses, 64.

[68] Registrum, 10.

[69] ibid. v; (see also Cowan and Easson, Medieval Religious Houses, 64-65.)

[70] Registrum, 15, this charter dated in the chartulary between 1243 and 1258 was sent on behalf of Stephen, abbot of Cluny, yet according to Duckett, Charters and Records, I, 25, the abbots during that time were either Guillaume III de Pontoise (1244-1257), or Yves I de Poyson (1257-1275), while the nearest Stephen was Étienne II de Berzé (1230-1236). see also Rose Graham, "The English Province of the Order of Cluny", TRHS, IV series, 7 (1924), 98-130, 100f., where she writes of similar problems among the English houses...In the early fifteenth century despite the political differences incurred by the Hundred Years War, Cluny could not agree to allow the English houses a similar degree of independence to that enjoyed by Paisley and Crossraguel. The priors of Lewes, the senior English Cluniac house, were usually (though not always) appointed vicars-general of the Cluniac Order in the Anglo-Scottish Province. However, the promotion of Bermondsey to an abbey by Richard II created problems for Cluny. Had Bermondsey's promotion been approved by Cluny, then Lewes would also have to have been promoted so that its superior could exercise his authority over Bermondsey. Were Cluny to have done so, it would have resulted in its losing complete control of its English houses. It appears that Cluny may never have approved of Bermondsey's promotion to an abbey, even though it is known as such.

[71] Registrum, 325.

[72] ibid. 19.

[73] ibid. 325.

[74] Gourlay Coll. "The building (was) probably completed by Abbot William in 1225-1248, who built the Early English nave", 20/5/1897.

[75] The north aisle lancet window is the original of the two, whilst that to the south west, which had been built-up was reopened during Boog's restoration and re-constructed; see chap.4.

[76] Gourlay Coll. "The Early English or first pointed west doorway [at Paisley], but greatly

flattened hood moulding owing to great richness and depth of moulding. The design is similar to that at south porch of Glasgow Cathedral, at Dunblane and Inchmahome Priory," note 25/5/1920.

[77] Brian de Breffey & George Mott, The Churches and Abbeys of Ireland, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1976), 79.

[78] Richard Fawcett, "Ecclesiastical Architecture in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century", in Scotland in the Reign of Alexander III, ed. Norman Reid, (Edinburgh, John Donald, 1990), 155.

[79] see Coltart, Church Architecture, 37-38.

[80] ibid. 38.

[81] ibid. 41.

[82] R. Rowand Anderson, et al "Examples of Scottish Architecture of the Twelfth to the Seventeenth Centuries", National Art Survey of Scotland, (Edinburgh, Waterson, 1921-33), The Abbey Church of St Mirren, Paisley, 1-7 & plates 17-39, 4; see also Ian Gow, "Design and Practice in British Architecture", Studies in Architectural History Presented to Howard Colvin, Architectural History, 27 (1984), 543-554.

[83] In the conjectural drawing, fig 7a, I have placed the encircled quatrefoils the right way up.

[84] see C. M. Girdlestone, "Thirteenth Century Gothic in England and Normandy - A Comparison", ARCH.J., 111 (1945), 116. Rose windows exist or existed in Britain at the abbeys of Arbroath, Byland, Pluscarden, Westminster; and at the cathedrals of Durham, Old St Paul's, London, and Lincoln.

[85] see Bond, Gothic Architecture, 73: The building of twin western towers at Paisley would have followed the tradition common among many great medieval churches, and as seen at those already noted, of having a west front where the emphasis was on verticality, emphasised by the towers.

[86] Gourlay Coll. "Paisley Abbey had western towers like Glasgow (J J Waddell)." note 8/5/1915.

[87] A letter written to the Renfrewshire Independent

on 12/11/1861 confirms this, for the correspondent more or less demanded that "the rosary" (as he described it), must be put back. David Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, 9 VOLS. I, 183.

[88] Webb, Architecture in Britain, 122.

[89] R. Fawcett, "Ecclesiastical Architecture in Thirteenth Century", 152.

[90] This was very much an Early English form, derived from the Romanesque, and very predominant in England. see Girdlestone, "Thirteenth Century Gothic in England and Normandy", 116.

[91] Gourlay Coll. At Paisley the bays [of the nave] had three arches in each bay of the triforium according to MacGregor Chalmers. The clerestory and triforium were bonded together as at Glasgow [nave] making the design in two heights instead of the normal three - note 13/6/1918.

[92] ibid. In Paisley the design of the nave was originally similar to Glasgow Cathedral choir - note 13/6/1918.

[93] see R. Fawcett, "Glasgow Cathedral", 109.

[94] New, Cathedrals of Britain, 142.

[95] see Bond, Gothic Architecture, 261.

[96] ibid. 530.

[97] ibid.

[98] ibid. 239.

[99] Heritors' Minutes, 1788-1804, 7: this copy of the Heritors' Records is held at Paisley Abbey.

[100] Gourlay Coll. op.cit. "1030-1066 - Bernay is the precedent building but it does not have the gallery at the end of the transept," undated note; see also G. T. Rivoira, Lombardic Architecture, 2 vols (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933), trans. G McN Rushforth; II, 75 & 103.

[101] Gourlay Coll. op.cit. This was Gourlay's opinion too, for he writes "There is a close resemblance between the east respond of the double arcade in

Paisley Abbey south transept with those of the eight smaller piers in arcade of Lower Church, Glasgow." - note 11/6/1920.

[102] Alexander Laing, "Present Conditions of Lindores Abbey", PSAS, 9 (1870-1872), 208-212.

[103] Alistair Gordon, "Paisley Abbey," ARCH.J. 143 (1986), 27-28; 28.

[104] The ribbing breaks into lines of the arcading.

[105] R. Fawcett, "Glasgow Cathedral", 118; see also Richard Fawcett, "The Blackadder Aisle at Glasgow Cathedral : a reconsideration of the Architectural Evidence", PSAS, 115 (1985), 277-287.

[106] see Bond, Gothic Architecture, 159.

[107] ibid. 198.

[108] This was also described as a sacristy/chapel by M. E. C. Walcott, Scoti-Monasticon, (London, Virtue Spalding and Daldy, 1874), plate xi.

[109] F. S. Gordon, The Cathedral of St Kentigern, Glasgow, (Glasgow, Oliver & Boyd, 1894), 134-141; the considerable amount of vestments, chalices, altar missals and furnishings held at Glasgow Cathedral prior to the Reformation suggests that a fairly large sacristy would have been required to hold them all, as well as the cupboards and cope chests.

[110] Ronald G. Cant, The College of St Salvator, (London, Oliver and Boyd, 1950), 151-163. The appendix to chapter III gives an inventory of all the altar furnishings once held at St Salvator's. There is a considerable list of vestments, which again gives an indication of the vestments and furnishings which Paisley Abbey may have required for the *OPUS DEI*, and again of the need of space required to house them.

[111] Charter of the Foundation of the Chaplainry of Sts Mirren and Columba in the Parish of Paisley, 15 July, 1499, translated by W. M. Metcalfe, Charters and Documents of the Burgh of Paisley, (Paisley, 1902), 55-58.

[112] Thomas Ross, "The Sculptures in St Mirren's Chapel, Paisley Abbey, Representing the Acts and Miracles of St Mirren; also Incised Sepulchral Slabs recently discovered in the Abbey Church, Paisley", PSAS, 35 (1900-1901), 44-64.

[113] Lees, Paisley, 176-78.

[114] The fact that the east front of the Aisle projects beyond the original building line, so upsetting the original ground plan [see fig b] illustrates this point. Moreover, the moulded remnants of an earlier window mullion, in the left hand corner, indicate that the present early Decorated window is a later insert.

[115] Bond, Gothic Architecture, 46; see also Girdlestone, "Thirteenth Century Gothic in England and Normandy", 130.

[116] The north porch may not have existed until the abbacy of John de Lithgow I, who is regarded as having laid its foundations.

[117] Girdlestone, "Thirteenth Century Gothic in England and Normandy", 130.

[118] R. Fawcett, "Glasgow Cathedral BQS", 109.

[119] Chalmers, "Paisley Abbey", 401-404.

[120] John Harvey, The Gothic World : 1100-1600, (London, Batsford, 1950), 76; though the square east end is suggested as having been a French Cistercian influence, Fred H. Crossley, English Church Design : 1040 - 1540, (London, 1945), 90.

[121] R. Fawcett, "The Blackadder Aisle at Glasgow Cathedral", 286.

[122] R. Fawcett, "The Medieval Churches of Glasgow", 3.

[123] Hugh Braun, English Medieval Architecture, (London, Bracken Books, 1985 ed.), 153-154: explains quite succinctly how great medieval churches were constructed, beginning at the east end and ending with the west front.

[124] Gourlay Coll. He recorded that according to

MacGregor Chalmers the "Nave of Glasgow and Paisley going on at same time," note 24/3/1913; though it is more than likely that it was the nave of Paisley and the choir of Glasgow which were being built simultaneously.

[125] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey : Attempt to make it Cistercian", 61-62.

[126] Duckett, Charters and Records, II, 119-121.

[127] Lees, Paisley, 58.

[128] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey : Attempt to make it Cistercian," 60.

[129] Grace Stretton, "Some Aspects of Medieval Travel", TRHS, 4 series, 7 (1924), 77-97; This deals with the travels of Henry, Earl of Derby, 1390-1393, who undoubtedly would have travelled in the style to which he was accustomed. Despite the "comfort" enjoyed by the earl, it is obvious that Continental travel, at that time, was very hazardous. This information provides us with an excellent contrast of just how difficult it would have been for the ordinary traveller at this time, especially monks setting out from Paisley [say] to journey to Cluny to take solemn vows before the Abbot of the Order.

[130] Lees, Paisley, 59, says Hugo VI was followed by Yves I as abbot of Cluny.

[131] see G. W. S. Barrow, "The Gilbertine House of Dalmilling", AANHSC 6 (1955-57), 2nd series, 51-67.

[132] Registrum, 17.

[133] ibid. 90-91.

[134] Lees, Paisley, 71; Cowan and Easson, Medieval Religious Houses, 63, in 1561 Paisley's income was £6100.

[135] Registrum, 92-96; James the Steward's charter of 1294 contained many restrictions.

[136] ibid. 95.

[137] Lees, Paisley, 92.

[138] Registrum, 416.

[139] This is recorded in the The Black Book of Paisley and is signified by a pointed finger, see Lees op.cit 93; Robert Brown, History of Paisley, 2 vols, (Paisley, Cook, 1886), I. 42, wrote that "in 1307 the English, under Aymer de Valence, burned the monastery and much of its surroundings." However, this is not proof that Valence, who as Edward I's Lieutenant in Scotland, was actually present at the destruction of the abbey church, or indeed ordered it.

[140] D. E. Easson, "The Scottish Abbeys and the War of Independence", RSCHS, 11 (1955) 63-81.

[141] A. Gordon, "Paisley Abbey", 27.

[142] Lees, Paisley, 93.

[143] When Selby Abbey was burnt in 1906 the walls of the choir, crossing and nave, including their respective triforia were all that were left standing. As would be expected, the interior furnishings all perished in the flames. It is more than likely that the situation at Paisley may well have been the same in 1307.
Although fire cannot consume stone it can damage it in such a way as to leave a building unsafe, which may explain why so little of Paisley's thirteenth century church remains. In any case, irrespective of the damage, a decision must have been taken at some time to demolish the remnants of the thirteenth century nave and replace it with the one we know today; see also Cobb, The Forgotten Centuries, plates 99 & 100, 67.

[144] Registrum, 382, 388 & 394; Lees, Paisley, 94; see also Robert Renwick, Glasgow Memorials, (Glasgow, Maclehose, 1908), 19-20; 28; and 66-67.

[145] Modern research in the Vatican Archives has provided substantiated evidence that there were two abbot John de Lithgows: see Malden, Abbey of Paisley, 45, for an updated list of abbots and priors of Paisley Abbey.

[146] Lees, Paisley, 93.

[147] Tatton-Brown, Great Cathedrals of Britain, 112; and R. Willis, "The Architectural History of the Conventual Buildings of the Monastery of Christ

Church, Canterbury", Archaeologia Cantiana, 7 (1868), 1-206.

[148] A. A. M. Duncan, Regesta Regum Scottorum, V (Edinburgh, 1989), n. 596, 697- 698.

[149] ibid. 567 n.1 697.

[150] Lees, Paisley, 99; Paisley Abbey Parish Magazine, Feb. 1956; also Paisley Daily Express, 31/1/1956 & February 1956.

[151] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 23.

[152] Registrum, 237; Lees, Paisley, 97.

[153] Registrum, 237.

[154] Lees, Paisley, 99.

[155] "ad reedifactionem ecclesie sue conventualis per gwerram inter regna Anglie et Scotie diutius habitam combuste." Registrum, 239.

[156] a similar gift had been granted to Melrose in 1315; see Lees, Paisley, fn. 102.

[157] ibid. 100.

[158] Ranald Nicholson, Scotland - The Later Middle Ages, (Edinburgh, Mercat Press, 1974). During the absence of David II (1329-1371) in France (1334-1341) a series of Regents maintained the Government of the country, 123-140.

[159] Lees, Paisley, 104.

[160] Nicholson, The Later Middle Ages, 123-140.

[161] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 23.

[162] Warmlow, "Silentia Claustri", 128-129; and Frank Bottomley, The Abbey Explorer's Guide, (London, Kaye & Ward, 1981), 43.

[162] Registrum, 9-10.

[163] ibid. 429.

[164] McGurk, Calendar of Letters, 10/8/1395, 42.

[165] Calendar Supplications to Rome, (Glasgow University, Scottish History, unpublished), 1940, 18/6/1492.

CHAP 2 : NOTES AND REFERENCES

PART 2.

[1] A. M. Maclean, Paisley Abbey Restoration 1913, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1913), 99.

[2] The Fitzalans, from being Hereditary High Stewards, became the ruling family of Scotland, a dynasty from which the present British monarch claims descent.

[3] see R. Fawcett, "Ecclesiastical Architecture in the reign of Alexander III", 176; also Joseph Robertson, "Scottish Cathedrals and Abbeys", Quarterly Review, 405, 169 (June 1849), 103-156.

[4] see Easson, "The Scottish Abbeys and the War of Independence", 79

[5] All the previous commentators on Paisley, including the most recent ones apart from the National Art Survey, have presumed that this was the case.

[6] ibid. 2

[7] Although Walcott, Scoti-Monasticon, 296, has written "bricht stair" as "brucht stair", nevertheless, he also takes it to mean a winding stair.

[8] Georgina Russell, "North Window of the Nine Altars Chapel, Durham Cathedral," BAA Transactions 1977, 3 (1980), 87.

[9] R. Fawcett, "Medieval Window Tracery", 172.

[10] C. MacWilliam, & C. Wilson BOS : LOTHIAN, (London, Penguin Books, 1978), 446.

[11] This was the usual practice: see Tatton-Brown, Cathedrals of Britain, 112; and R. Willis, "The Architectural History of Christ Church, Canterbury."

[12] Gourlay Coll. op.cit. "In lightening the effects of the interior of the nave they took all the thickness from off the inside of the wall, which explains the condition of the walls immediately below both bays at the west end" note 24/3/1913; Gourlay suggests that this cutting back of the wall meant that there was not enough room for the passage in the clerestory, hence the projecting platforms we see, which affords access for

maintenance of the glass etc. The width of the choir of Paisley was 32ft, that of the original nave was 27 feet, but by shelling back the inner faces of walls, one foot each side, the width was increased to 29 feet. note of 13/6/1918.

[13] see John James, The Temple Makers of the Paris Basin, (Australia, West Grinstead Publishers, 1989), plates 1 and 35.

[14] Tatton-Brown, Cathedrals of Britain, 122.

[15] Coltart, Church Architecture, 29 & 30.

[16] Christine McGladdery, James II, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1990), 120, 164 & 169.

[17] Some Dutch churches where Round piers are to be found are St Catharinakerk, Den Briel; Oude Kerk, Delft; O.L. Vrouwekerk, Dordrecht; R.K.Kerk, Prinsenhage, see F.A.J. Vermeulen, Handboek tot de Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Bouwkunst, ('S-Gravehage, Martinus Nijhoff, 1928); R. Fawcett, Scottish Architecture 1370-1560, 41-42; and Coltart Church Architecture, 30.

[18] Cowan and Easson, Religious Houses in 1561 the income of Dunkeld was £3400 202, whereas Paisley's income was £6100, 63.

[19] Gardner, Samuel, A Guide to Gothic Architecture, (Cambridge, CUP, 1922), 6; sexpartite vaulting was normally used where the width of the nave was twice the width of each bay, which is the situation at Paisley.

[20] Bond, Gothic Architecture, 320.

[21] NAS, note to plate 27 "when restoring the vaulting in plaster have used same mould for both north and south aisles, and have worked the springer of those ribs (being the only original bay remaining to same as master mould."

[22] The central boss, and the boss on the east transverse rib of the rib vaulting in the second bay west, in the south aisle, are original.

[23] There are supposedly a few fragments of original stained glass in The Place, but there is no record of them. However, there is no doubt that stained glass was used in Scottish medieval churches as is shown in the article by F. C. Eeles, "Medieval Stained Glass recently recovered from the Ruins of Holyrood Abbey Church", PSAS,

(1914-1915) 81-91; see also appendix i of modern stained glass.

[24] Harvey, The Gothic World, 46.

[25] Richard Fawcett, "Late Gothic Architecture in Scotland", unpublished summary of lecture delivered to the Scottish Medievalists.

[26] Roland Sanfacon, L'Architecture Flamboyante en France, (Quebec, Les Presses de L'Université de Laval, 1971), plate 89, 90.

[27] Geoffrey Stell, Dumfries and Galloway, (Edinburgh, RCHAMS, 1986), 145.

[28] R. Fawcett, "Medieval Window Tracery", 176, suggests the following building dates for the appropriate tracery at Paisley 1384-1433; and at Lincluden 1398 and c.1429.

[29] Harvey, The Gothic World, 98; Harvey suggests that Morrow or Moreau was French, because he was Parisian born. However, it is more than likely that he was of Scots extraction, as his name Morow or Morrow suggests. Morrow may be an alternative spelling of Murray; see A. Harrison, Surnames of the United Kingdom, 2 vols, (London, The Eaton Press, 1912), 29; or perhaps an anglicised version of the Irish or Scots Marcladh, see Patrick Hanks, and Flavia Hodges, Dictionary of Surnames, (Oxford, OUP, 1988), 376.

[30] J. S. Richardson, The Medieval Stone Carver in Scotland, (Edinburgh University Press, 1964), 57.

[31] We can only assume that this was the case, from his claim to being Parisian born from his plaque in the south transept of Melrose:-

John Morow sum tym callit was I
and born in parysse certainly
and had in kepyng al mesoun werk
of Santandroys ye hye kyrk
of Glasgw melros and paslay
of nyddysdall and of galway
I pray to God and mari bathe
And swete sanct Johne
to kepe this haly kyrk fra skathe.

[32] J. A. Smith, "Notes on Melrose Abbey; especially of the inscription on the wall of the south transept", PSAS, 1 (1854-57) 166-175: see also Douglas Knoop & G. P. Jones, The SCOTTISH MASON, (Manchester, MUP, 1939). Though they do not mention Morrow specifically they do give a good picture of the activities of the Scottish medieval mason.

[33] Dunlop, Calendar of Supplications to Rome, II, xxiii and 31.

[34] ibid. xxii-xxiii.

[35] ibid. 31.

[36] ibid. 30.

[37] see George Crawfurd, and William Semple, The History of the Town and Parish of Paisley, (1782), 81; and C. Mackie, A Historical Description of the Town of Paisley, (1835), 35, repeats this inaccuracy.

[38] Curvilinear tracery in the form of entwined encircled mouchettes and triple curved triangles, also encircled, are also to be found in public buildings like the fourteenth century facade of the Town Hall of Bruges: Nicholas Pevsner An Outline of European Architecture, Jubilee Edition, (London, Penguin Books, 1960), plate 211, 255.

[39] Bond, Gothic Architecture, 508.

[40] Paul Frankl, Gothic Architecture, (London, Penguin Books, 1962), 178.

[41] see - Henning Bock, Der Decorated Style, (Heidelberg Carl Winter, Universtatsverlag 1960), fig 27 p.142.

[42] Crawfurd and Semple, History of Paisley, 81; and Mackie, Historical Description of Paisley, 35.

[43] At Prague Cathedral, Peter Parler the master mason, used mouchettes, curved triangles and squares to great effect in the tracery of the choir.

[44] Godfrey H Evans et al. "The French Connection : Scotland and the Arts of France, Exhibition Catalogue, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1985), 23.

[45] R. Fawcett, "Medieval Window Tracery", 175 & 167.

[46] ibid. 173-176.

[47] John Harvey, Henry Yevele, (London, Batsford, 2nd ed. 1946), 57-58; During 1362 and 1363 he was working simultaneously on Westminster Abbey nave and west cloister, and the abbot's house, work which continued for a considerable number of years: as well as transforming part of the crypt below the

south transept at Canterbury Cathedral into a chantry chapel for his patron, the Black Prince, ibid. 64.

[48] I have measured them.

[49] There is also much evidence of masons' marks in the nave, especially on the piers.

[50] I have measured all of them.

[51] MacGregor Chalmers, "Paisley Abbey", 402.

[52] Peter Ferguson, Architecture of Solitude, (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1984), suggests that churches with transepts lower than the height of the choir and nave are usually found in early Cistercian monasteries. However, research into some of the examples given shows that at Tintern and Fountains, for example, the transepts are the same height as the choir and nave.

[53] Gourlay Coll. He dated it "1520 and built by Abbot John Hamilton" note 24/3/1913.

[54] R. Fawcett, Scottish Architecture 1370-1560, 101.

[55] NAS, 4.

[56] Nicholson, The Later Middle Ages, 190 & 246; during which time seven Urbanist Popes, Urban VI (1378-89), Boniface IX (1389-1404), Innocent VII (1404-6) and Gregory XII (1406-1409), or Clementine Popes, Clement VII (1378-94), Benedict XIII (1394-1419) and Clement VIII (1423-9); and two other anti-Popes, Alexander V (1409-10) and John XXIII (1410-15), all claimed at some time to lawfully occupy the chair of St Peter. see entries on individual Popes in J. N. D. Kelly, Oxford Dictionary of the Popes, (Oxford, OUP, 1986).

[57] McGurk, Cal. Letters to Scotland, 10/12/1412, 261.

[58] ibid. 10/12/1412, 263.

[59] Registrum, 332.

[60] Lees, Paisley, 123; Lees's obvious error was made because the papal documents and letters relating to the period were not available to him.

[61] McGurk, Cal. Letters to Scotland, 10/12/1412, 263.

[62] ibid. 10/10/1414, 301 + 302.

[63] ibid. 13/12/1415, 331.

[64] ibid. 13/12/1415, 331.

[65] ibid. 13/12/1415, 331.

[66] ibid. 339.

[67] Lindsay and Cameron, Cal. of Supplications to Rome, 75.

[68] ibid. xxx & 75.

[69] ibid. xxx & 75.

[70] Lees, Paisley, 126.

[71] Lindsay and Cameron, Cal. of Supplications to Rome, xxx-xxxi.

[72] see Register of Cluny fol 81b-83b, as quoted by Duckett, Charters and Records, II, 198.

[73] see J. H. Baxter, "Thomas Morow, Abbot of Paisley", GLASGOW HERALD 12 JANUARY, 1929; "To the vacant charge (of Paisley) is appointed the trusty and reliable Thomas Morow, Bachelor of Decreets, who had already during a considerable time given proof of his worth while serving as a religious in the Abbey of Cluny", as quoted from the Cluniac manuscripts in the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris.

[74] Dunlop, Calendar of Supplications to Rome, II, 30 n.2.

[75] ibid. xxii; see also Nicholson, The Later Middle Ages, 245.

[76] Nicholson, The Later Middle Ages, 246.

[77] Graham, "The English Province of the Order of Cluny", 98.

[78] Dunlop, Calendar of Supplications to Rome, II, 10/6/1423, 27.

[79] ibid. xxii.

[80] See Baxter, "Thomas Morow Abbot of Paisley".

[81] Dunlop, Calendar of Supplications to Rome, II xxii.

[82] see Registrum.

[83] Lees, Paisley, 126.

[84] ibid. 125; Registrum, 336.

[85] J. Campbell, Balmerino and its Abbey, (Edinburgh, Paterson, 1867), 108.

[86] Lionel Butler & Christopher Given-Wilson, Medieval Monasteries of Great Britain, (London, Michael Joseph, 1987), 69.

[87] McGladdery, James II, 120; n.14 164; see also A. I. Dunlop & D. MacLaughlan, Calendar of Supplications to Rome 1433-1447, IV (Glasgow, Glasgow Universty Press, 1983), 3/3/1441, 181-82 & 1049; 1/8/1444, 261.

[88] A. I. Dunlop, & I. B. Cowan, Scottish Supplications to Rome 1428-1432, III (SHS, 1970), 25/6/1430 page 52.

[89] ibid. 18/12/1432, 266-267.

[90] Dunlop and MacLaughlan, Calendar of Supplications, 3/4/1445, 293-94.

[91] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 210.

[92] Dunlop and MacLaughlan, Calendar of Supplications, 1/8/1444, 261.

[93] ibid. 748 3/3/1441, 181.

[94] McGladdery, James II, 120, 164/f.113v; and 169/f.119v; Morow also visited the king, as is shown by his application, together those of his staff, to be supplied with passports in October 1421 and February 1422 to visit James I in France. ER, IV 1406-1436, lxxxiv; see also Lees, Paisley, 123n.

[95] see Dunlop & D. MacLaughlan, Cal. Documents relating to Scotland, IV refs 1418, 1419, 1421.

[96] see Baxter, "Thomas Morow Abbot of Paisley".

[97] ibid.

[98] McGurk, Cal. Letters to Scotland, 24/4/1415, 315-316.

[99] Lindsay and Cameron Cal. of Supplications to Rome, 24/2/1422, 282; see also McGurk, Cal. Letters to Scotland, 10/8/1395, 42.

[100] R. Fawcett, Scottish Architecture 1370-1560, 101.

[101] ibid.

[102] Dunlop and MacLaughlan, Calendar of Supplications, IV 24/10/1444, 331; and entry of 7/11/1444, 271.

[103] As the east wall of the north transept would have been divided into little chapels, at which the monks would have said the required daily Masses for benefactors and others, its completion would not only have been important to the efficient management of the horarium, but would have been necessary.

[104] McGladdery, James II, 120.

[105] Dunlop and MacLaughlan, Calendar of Supplications, IV, 31/8/1444, 264.

[106] J. M. Webster, Dunfermline Abbey, (Glasgow, McCorquodale, 1948), 48-49.

[107] Despite his reluctance, he did accept Paisley, perhaps as a stepping stone. However, his friends in the curia [ibid. 47] may have helped his promotion to the Royal Abbey of Dunfermline.

[108] ibid. 230.

[109] ibid. 230.

[110] ibid. 49.

[111] Dunlop and MacLaughlan, Calendar of Supplications, IV, 24/10/1444, 331.

[112] ibid. 7/11/1444, 271.

[113] ibid. 24/22/1444, 331.

[114] Duckett, Charters and Records, II, 214-217.

[115] Lees, Paisley, 127.

[116] Francis H. Groome, ed. Ordnance Gaxeteer of Scotland, 6 vols, (Edinburgh, Jack, 1882-1885), III, 431.

[117] see Thomas Thomson, ed. Auchinleck Chronicle, (Edinburgh, Private Circulation, 1819), 19-20; also McGladdery, James II, 120, 164 & 169.

[118] R. Fawcett, "Medieval Window Tracery". 165, 168, 174 & 178.

[119] see Coltart, Church Architecture, 5.

[120] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 80; see also Semple, Coll. of Antiquities, I, "Charter of Woodside", 197.

[121] Gourlay Coll. note of 13/6/1918.

[122] John Stirling Maxwell, The Shrines and Homes of Scotland, (London, MacLehose, 1937), 195.

[123] I have been up to the clerestory several times and have seen no evidence for this.

[124] McGibbon & Ross, Ecclesiastical Architecture, III, 23.

[125] Coltart, Church Architecture, 163.

[126] Hubert Fenwick, Scottish Abbeys and Churches, (London, Hall, 1978), 144.

[127] R. Fawcett, Scottish Architecture 1370-1560, 101.

[128] Several facts suggest this: firstly, in England the clerestory walk forms part of the actual structure of the large church, usually in the choir, transepts and nave; secondly, in France, and in Italy, the triforium gallery often projects from the wall. At Paisley the clerestory walk is a compromise between the two, but on the whole I believe it to be more French (or northern European) than English; see note 127.

[129] Sanfacon, L'Architecture Flamboyante, plate 154, 131.

[130] see R. Fawcett, "Medieval Window Tracery", 178.

[131] R. Fawcett, "Late Gothic Architecture in Scotland", PSAS, 112 (1982) 427-496; the tracery at the west gable window of Paisley Abbey is very similar in style to St Mary's Dundee [fig 3d p.490] and in its own way similar to the others mentioned; see also D. MacRoberts, "Notes on Scoto-Flemish Contacts", IR, X (1959), 91-96.

[132] R. Fawcett, "Medieval Window Tracery", 178.

[133] W. M. Metcalfe, The Lordship of Paisley, (Paisley, A Gardner, 1912), lviii.

[134] McGladdery, James II, 160.

[135] ibid. 169.

[136] P. A. Ramsay, Views of Renfrewshire, (Edinburgh, Willam H Lizars, 1839), 42.

[137] Gourlay Coll. "J J W Boyd and self think that the choir has never been vaulted, but MacGregor Chalmers thinks it has, and wants to [stone] vault it - "undated note"; there is no evidence that the choir was ever vaulted - it may have been built and covered with a wooden roof." note 30/6/1916.

[138] C. A. R. Radford, Glasgow Cathedral, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1974), 29; see also W. T. Oldrieve, "The Ancient Roof of Glasgow Cathedral - its Condition and Restoration", PSAS, 50 (1915-1916), 155-172.

[139] Ronald G. Cant, The Building of St Machar's Cathrdral Aberdeen, (1976), 7; see also A. Stewart Todd, The Cathedral Church of St Machar, Old Aberdeen.

[140] Sir Rowand Anderson followed this precept when he restored the transepts of Paisley Abbey in the nineteenth century, giving them simple but dignified wooden waggon roofs.

[141] Fletcher, A History of Architecture, 455, figs N, P, Q, R and S, on mouldings of the Decorated Style.

[142] see Coltart, Church Architecture, 82; and R. Fawcett Scottish Medieval Churches, 54.

[143] R. Fawcett, Scottish Architecture 1371-1560, 101.

[144] see R.Fawcett, "Medieval Window Tracery", 174.

[145] ibid. The style of the tracery in this fourth window was also very common in Scotland during the fifteenth century, and similar examples can be seen in the collegiate churches at Dalkeith, Haddington, Seton and Stirling, and also at the parish church of Linlithgow.

[146] The piers to the east were designed by Anderson as part of his overall plan for the rebuilding of the choir, but he preferred to build the piers to his own design rather than just build copies of those built to the west of the crossing in the fourteenth century.

[147] Registrum, 237-242.

[148] ibid. 239.

[149] ER III, 222-23.

[150] Gourlay Coll. "King Robert III, who died in 1390, sent glass for choir before then." see note 24/3/1913; and Howell, Paisley Abbey, 23.

[151] Maclean, Abbey Restoration, 99.

[152] ibid.

[153] see Lees, Paisley, 120.

[154] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 22.

[155] Although Robert III was laid before the high altar of Paisley there is no evidence of a costly or sumptuous monument, for in life he abhorred such things. Indeed, it was eighteen years before payment of 18s. was made tc Paisley "pro exequiis domini regis defuncti faciendis." ER IV 1379-1406, 390-391; see Lees Paisley, 120.

[156] Gourlay Coll. 8/9/1915.

[157] As shown from traces found during the modern restorations by Mr Taylor the builder, verified by Rowand Anderson and witnessed by Prof Gourlay who wrote "saw that Sir R Anderson was right. Buttresses had been clawed off choir. Windows were above wall as occurred to me." - Gourlay Coll. note 28/3/1910.

[158] Greene, Medieval Monasteries, 184.

[159] see also plate 83d the reconstruction of the canons' choir at Haddington, where the choir stalls are placed immediately behind the rood screen (there may have been no pulpitum); excellent Scottish examples are still extant in the chapels of King's College, Aberdeen, and St Salvator's College, St Andrews.

[160] Harvey, Gothic World, 98.

[161] ibid. 98.

[162] Item the xxv day July in Pasley, to the kingis offerend to the reliques....xiiijs. TA, III

(1506-1507), 292.

[163] Richardson, Medieval Stone Carver, 69

[164] McGladdery, James II, 169. Unfortunately, in the exhibition on Paisley Abbey in Paisley Museum held in 1992 none of Thomas de Tervas's books appeared, suggesting that they are no longer extant, and if extant their provenance may well be unknown.

[165] ibid. 169.

[166] James S. Richardson, "Fragments of Altar Retables of Late Medieval date in Scotland", PSAS, 62 (1928), 197-224.

[167] Gourlay Coll. "Level stone base within choir - no stepping up each end as is general." see note 24/3/1913.

[168] Michael Jenner, Journeys into Medieval England, (London Michael Joseph, 1991), 158, where these tiles are illustrated in full colour; see also Folco, John di, A Survey of medieval floor tiles in St Andrews Cathedral Museum and the Abbot's House, Arbroath Abbey, PSAS, CV (1985), 289-295; and also Richard Fawcett, Scottish Abbeys and Priories, (Edinburgh, Batsford/Historic Scotland, 1994), 124; plate 100 showing tiles found during excavation at Newbattle Abbey, Midlothian.

[169] MacGregor Chalmers made use of what he could of the remnants of the original sacristy doorway, and replaced the other stones with new ones cut and moulded in the same manner.

[170] Gourlay Coll. op.cit. "Of course, the door on the south side of the wall of the choir must have been into a sacristy." - note 30/6/1916.

[171] McGladdery, James II, 169.

[172] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 120.

[173] Johne Leslie, trans. James Dalrymple, The Historie of Scotland, 2 vols. 1596, (Edinburgh, Scottish Text Society, 1898), I, 16.

[174] Lees, Paisley, 130.

[175] ibid. 132.

[176] ibid. 133.

[177] Knoop & Jones, Scottish Mason, 30 & 31.

[178] Lees, Paisley, 166.

[179] Richardson, Medieval Stone Carver, 44-45.

[180] Lees, Paisley, 166.

[181] Richardson, Medieval Stone Carver, 43.

[182] ibid. 44.

[183] ibid. 41.

[184] Cruden, Scottish Medieval Churches, 132.

[185] Richardson, Medieval Stone Carver, 41.

[186] Mr Lawson, the Church Officer of Paisley Abbey, pointed these out to me.

[187] Robert Brown, History of Paisley, 2 vols, (Paisley, Cook, 1886), I, 51.

[188] Lees, Paisley, 137; MacDougall, Norman, James III, (Edinburgh, 1982), 103.

[189] ER, IX, 1480-1487, 2/9/1483, 209.

[190] MacDougall, James III, 256 & 263?

[191] Registrum, 84.

[192] Mary McCarthy, A Social Geography of Paisley, (Paisley, Public Library, 1969), 35ff.

[193] In 1488 the population of the burgh was approximately 508, see Semple, Collection of Antiquities, VIII.

[194] Registrum, 258.

[195] ibid. 261.

[196] ibid. 260 & 263.

[197] TA, I, 1473-89, 183.

[198] Calendar of Supplications to Rome, (Glasgow University, Scottish History, unpublished), 1864, 10/10/1491 and 1876, 8/11/1491.

[199] ibid. 1887, 20/12/1491.

[200] see TA I, 21 November, 1489, 183; II, 11 August, 1502, 157; 20 May, 1503, 312; III, 26 April, 1506, 192; 23 July, 1506, 405; IV, 1 May, 1512, 344.

[201] Lees, Paisley, 142-143.

[202] Registrum, 356.

[203] Malden, Abbey of Paisley, 14-15.

[204] PDE 31/1/1956 and Feb. 1956. These two newspaper articles are inconclusive about whose bones they were, though those of a woman led to much speculation that here could be the bones of Princess Marjory, daughter of Robert I and wife of Walter II the High Steward.

[205] Richard Fawcett, Glasgow Cathedral, Edinburgh, HMSO, 1985), 18.

[206] Ian C. Hannah, "Screens and Lofts in Scottish Churches", PSAS, 70 (1935-36), 181-201.

[207] Reconstruction of a rood screen, part of permanent exhibition at Haddington Parish Church; see also H. B. Mackintosh & J. S. Richardson, Elgin Cathedral, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1980), 43; "although lacking the protection of the roof "for several score years", the painted timber roodscreen with the great painting of the Crucifixion which was framed in the arch over the loft remained in excellent condition until it was taken down and destroyed in 1640 by a minister from Elgin named Gilbert Ross."

[208] Bond, Gothic Architecture, 180.

[209] Durkan, in "Paisley Abbey in Sixteenth Century", 114ff, suggests that the Lady Chapel was situated off the choir.

[210] Bond, Gothic Architecture, 201.

[211] Reconstruction of nave chantries or chapels using wooden screens, part of permanent exhibition at Haddington Parish Church.

[212] All of these altars have been mentioned by Durkan - in Paisley Abbey in Sixteenth Century op.cit. 115-117; see also James McKinlay, Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, David Douglas, 1910-14), where there are various references to the former altars in the nave of

Paisley Abbey.

[213] Lees, Paisley, 176-177; see also Metcalfe, Charters and Documents, 55-58 for a translation of the Charter of Foundation.

[214] Bond, Gothic Architecture, 197.

[215] MacGregor Chalmers, "Paisley Abbey", 403, states specifically that as a result of the disastrous fire of 1498, "the retrieving of the choir and central tower could not be undertaken at this time so a wall about eight feet thick was built across the east end of the nave." However, the fire was probably not quite as disastrous as he infers. C. S. Black, The Story of Paisley, (Paisley, J & J Cook, 1952), 49-50. Even though he admits that there is no record of the extent of fire damage to the abbey in 1498, nevertheless, Black assumes that the church was virtually gutted, the roofs falling down with disastrous effect. Such opinions, based on hearsay, obscure the more likely opinion that the fire was perhaps contained to the west, and so was not quite as disastrous as was previously considered by previous commentators on the abbey.

[216] Durkan, "Paisley in Sixteenth Century", 111; see Leslie, Historie, I, 16.

[217] Mark Dilworth, "The Social Origins of Scottish Medieval Monks", RSCHS, XX part 3 (1980), 197-209; who writes that John Hamilton was only fourteen years when appointed to Paisley, 203; while Sister Dominic Savio CP. Kilwinning Abbey, (Irvine, Fasprint Services, 1988), 15, says he was 15.

[218] RSS, I (1488-1529), 3353.

[219] see Lees, Paisley, 186.

[220] RSS, III op.cit. 601.

[221] ibid. 2122.

[222] ibid. 2800.

[223] ibid. 2531.

[224] ibid. 2800.

[225] ibid. 1696.

[226] ibid.

[227] Lees, Paisley, 192, he quotes Stewart of Cardonald, a spy for John Knox, "The Abbot is to go secretlie to France ... to get the red hat to himself to be Cardinal, and the Bishopric of Mirypois in God," a diocese held by the murdered Cardinal Beaton; appendix xxxv, "the Abbot of Paisley shal be made Cardinall and great lyueings geven him."

[228] RSS, IV (1548-1556), 1547.

[229] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey and Glasgow Archives", 46.

[230] Lees, Paisley, 189.

[231] McGladdery, James II, 169.

[232] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 28.

[233] In modern times we have a parallel situation: the tower was begun by Rowand Anderson as part of his crossing, it was continued by MacGregor Chalmers, and finally completed by Lorimer.

[234] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in Sixteenth Century", 120.

[235] David M Walker.

[236] see fall of Chichester Tower in Basil H. Jackson, The Recollections of Thomas Graham Jackson, (London, OUP, 1950), 83 and 84.

[237] Mackintosh & Richardson, Elgin Cathedral, 43-44.

[238] William J. Anderson, "Three Sixteenth Century Scottish Missals", IR, 9 (1958), 206-207.

[239] ibid. 207.

[240] Gourlay Coll. undated written note. When Rowand Anderson took down the east wall and the crossing, and those at St Mirren's Aisle, "....a large number of fragments of hewn masonry were inbedded in it, including portions of vaulting ribs and even tracery." see NAS, 4; also "In taking down the [old] bridge at this time, a large number of rubble stones, used for inside packing of the land-stools and piers, were found to be broken mouldings and sculptured stones, no doubt gathered from the monastery buildings." David Semple, History of the Abbey Bridge of PAISLEY, (Paisley, J Cook, 1878), 7.

[241] Gourlay Coll. "Hamilton after 1525 completed the tower of which Abbot Tervas had built a portion. It was 300ft in height, and it fell shortly after completion on account of defective foundations. In

the fall it spared the nave and St. Mirren's Aisle but completely destroyed the choir" - undated note.

[242] McGibbon & Ross, Ecclesiastical Architecture, III, 10.

[243] Gourlay Coll. "Rev Mr MacLean says in his book (Abbey Restoration) that the foundations were good but that is not the case. The south side of the choir was actually built on the silt of a dried-up former branch or side-by-wash (tributary) of the River Cart, and as a direct consequence the building cracked." see note 4/9/1914.

[244] ibid. "Mr Murray said that he did find the founds of the south east and north east piers of Paisley Abbey's central tower. The foundations of those at the south east, north west and south west went down as far as thirteen feet below ground level, but those at the north east only went down five feet below ground level, and so did not rest upon the gravel. The foundations of the north east pier was of rubble bedded in clay only, and there were distinct evidences that it had sunk - 5 ns. at least for that is the difference in level of the base course in that part from the south east angle of the choir. The tower must have been built as high as to finish the nave ridge but there is no evidence to show that it had gone higher or what was really there. According to this weak angle there is every possibility that it caused or at least aided the fall of the tower. The south west pier had gone off the plumb in building by 10 ins. This was probably the way the masonwork had been done, for Mr Murray was a mason and [such tradesmen] have a way of filling in spalls when anything goes off the plumb. When he took down the wall between the west piers in the 1900 restoration and had loosened this pier it came back to the vertical." see note 30/6/1916.

[245] M. E. L. Addis, Scottish Cathedrals and Abbeys, (London, Elliot Stock, 1901), 171.

[246] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey and Glasgow Archives" 46-47.

[247] D. MacRoberts, "Material Destruction caused by the Reformation", IR, 10 (1959) 126-172; 165-169.

[248] Richardson Medieval Stone Carver, 208-209.

[249] Gordon Donaldson, Scotland : James V - VII, (Edinburgh, Mercat Press, 1987), 102.

[250] ibid. 161.

[251] Lees, Paisley, 195.

[252] The aim of the reformers was to transform the existing churches where possible into buildings suitable for Calvinist worship.

[253] Lees, Paisley, 196.

[254] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 32; see also Barrett, Scottish Monasteries of Old, who says that a century after the Reformation, Paisley was still seen as a "very nest of Papists."

[255] Lees, Paisley, 199.

[256] ibid.

[257] ibid. 199.

[258] ibid. 200.

[259] ibid. 232.

[260] Why did he not say distroyed [destroyed], if that was the truth, rather than waste = of buildings = empty, unoccupied; but not necessarily ruined; see Mairi Robinson, ed. Concise Scots Dictionary, (Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Press, 1987), 772.

CHAP 3 : NOTES AND REFERENCES.

[1] Walter Horn & Ernest Born, The Plan of St Gall, 3 vols, (University California Press, 1979), II, 319ff.

[2] A good local example of the Cistercian ground plan is Dundrennan, see fig 47.

[3] Carolyn Lucia Marino Malone, "Monastic Planning after the Plan of St Gall : Tradition and Change", (MA Thesis, History of Art, Univ. of California, Berkeley, 1968), 17-22 for a summary of a description of monasteries which existed at other times, but which were finally superseded by the Plan of St Gall.

[4] G. H. Cook, English Monasteries in the Middle Ages, (London, Phoenix House, 1961), 58; Only the Carthusians, Gilbertines and the Friars departed from its main features, though, it can be argued that the ground plans of the houses of the friars contain most of the usual monastic offices surrounding a square cloister. However, because of their relatively modest size, they are usually more compact than the average monastic site, see R Roy Gilyard Beer, ABBEYS, (London, HMSO, 1976), Clare Priory, Suffolk.

[5] Anthony New, A Guide to the Abbeys of England and Wales, (London, Constable, 1985), 82. It was originally founded as a Benedictine abbey in 1107, but by 1539, the year of its dissolution, it was a Cistercian house. Buckfast Abbey was refounded in 1882 by Benedictine monks from Pierre-qui-Vire in France, and rebuilt following the twelfth century plan.

[6] C.H. Lawrence, Medieval Monasticism, (London, Longman, 1984), 24.

[7] Duckett, Charters and Records, II, 214, is referring specifically to a letter from Cluny in 1447 regarding Barber's apostasy in which he is described as a monk of Cluny. Yet this same Robert Barber, or Barbier had successfully supplicated Rome for his appointment as cloistral prior in 1444, Dunlop and MacLaughlan, Scottish Supplications to Rome, IV, 271.

[8] Rose Graham, "The Monastery of Cluny 910-1155", Archaeologia, 80 (1930), Part 1, 146-147. These Farfa Customs even laid down the route the cloistral prior took as he visited the different parts of the abbey of Cluny, see Evans, Romanesque Architecture,

136-137.

[9] Horn and Born, St Gall, II, 340; "The analysis of Cluny II as described in the Farfa Text discloses however, that it was the arrangements seen on the Plan of St Gall which became the guiding pattern for later monastic plans."

[10] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 149-152.

[11] Cook, English Monasteries, 58.

[12] Cowan & Easson, Religious Houses, x-xi.

[13] R. Fawcett, Dunfermline, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1990), 4.

[14] Cowan & Easson, Religious Houses, 55.

[15] see Anthony New, A GUIDE TO ABBEYS OF SCOTLAND, (London, Constable, 1988).

[16] Binns, Dedication of Monastic Houses, 113.

[17] Duckett, Charters and Documents, I, 30.

[18] Warmlow, "Cluny : Silentia Claustra", 136.

[19] Duckett, Charters and Documents, I, 19.

[20] Graham, Wenlock, 5 & 10.

[21] Ossa Raymond Sowers, "Medieval Monastic Planning, its Origin in the Christian East and Later Development in Western Europe", (unpublished PhD Thesis, Columbia University, 1951), 20.

[22] So different from the rigidly imposed Cistercian planning. Cluny II had also quite an influence on Benedictine planning, particularly in England, where several houses there adopted the Customs of Cluny but remained independent: Reading and Battle Abbeys are two of the more important ones.

[23] W. H. St. John Hope, "The Architectural History of the Cluniac Priory of St Pancras at Lewes", ARCH.J. 41 (1884), 17; see also Horn and Born, St Gall, II, 341.

[24] Horn and Born, St Gall, II, 340; and Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 136.

[25] Horn and Born, St Gall, II, 341-348.

[26] ibid. II, 341.

[27] Knowles, Monastic Orders, 118.

[28] There were 130 or so monastic houses in Scotland at the Reformation, see Cowan and Easson op.cit.

[29] Butler, Cuthbert, Benedictine Monachism, 2nd ed. (Canterbury, Speculum Historiale, 1961), 27-28; he further develops this theme in 122-145.

[30] ibid. 27.

[31] see McCann, Rule, chap 66, 53.

[32] ibid. ch. 22, 27: "si potest fieri, omnes in uno loco dormiant."

[33] Sowers, "Medieval Monastic Planning", 215.

[34] Butler, Monachism, 35 & 46-57.

[35] Indeed, Saint Benedict in the seventh chapter of his Rule wrote that "the ninth degree of humility is that a monk restrain his tongue and keep silence, not speaking until he is questioned."

[36] Butler suggests that St Benedict did not advocate in his Rule the "perpetual silence" of a later age but "....that the monks spoke when reasonable necessity arose in the conduct of the affairs and life of the monastery. Nevertheless, St Benedict laid great stress on silence which was probably rarely broken", Butler op. cit. 288. Indeed, it is said that speech was allowed for a half hour in the morning after chapter, and for a little while before Sext, but never on Sundays and the great feast days; Joan Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny : 910-1157, (London, OUP, 1931), 88-89. To get round the perpetual silence an elaborate sign language was developed for use at other times when it was necessary to communicate. Of course, this may well have been the ideal in the earlier days of high ideals.

[37] Although for St Benedict the Opus Dei was the public recital of the office and nothing else, it has been interpreted as being the essence of the communal life, which encompassed not only the public recitation of the office but also the disciplined life according to the rule and under the obedience of an abbot.

[38] Math 19: 16-22.

[39] From the Farfa Customary it is obvious that at Cluny the choral office, this daily round of prayers and praise, was the core of the daily life of the monk whose day began around 1.30-2.30 am. and ended about 6.00 pm: Butler, Monachism, 23-34.

[40] Warmlow, "Silentia Claustra", 128-129.

[41] Noreen Hunt, Cluny Under St Hugh, (London, Edward Arnold, 1967), 101-103; On the rare occasion that real manual labour was performed outside the cloister it was reduced to ritual semblance: see Evans, Life at Cluny, 87; and were the monks to share in the gathering in of the harvest out of poverty - in other words if they could not afford to hire help, or did not have enough labourers among their tenants - then they should do so without grumbling "for then are they truly monks when they live by the labour of their hands, like our fathers and the apostles." "quia tunc vere monachi sunt, si labore manuum suarum vivunt, sicut patres nostri et apostoli." McCann, Rule, ch. 48, 111.

[42] "At Cluny the ancient balance between spiritual and manual labour was changed: psalm-singing and prayer became the peculiar labour of the monks, who employed lay brethern, serfs and servants for the cultivation of the lands. In any case, Benedict assumed that a monastery would possess buildings and land, and that more often than not, the estates would be worked by tenants." Lawrence, Medieval Monasticism, 25.

[43] At Cluny there were famuly or lay brothers who enabled the choir monks to perform their duties, but there is no evidence that such was the case at Paisley and her sister Cluniac houses in Britain. see Giles Constable, "Famuli and Conversi at Cluny", Cluniac Studies, (London, Variorum, 1980), 326-350.

[44] Semple, St Mirin, 108; according to McCarthy, A Social Geography, 33, the main granges were at Blackstone on the Gryfe (Renfrew), Kilpatrick Barns (Dumbarton), Monkton Place (Ayr) and Huntlaw (Monk's Tower, Roxburgh); see also Lees, Paisley, 161.

[45] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the sixteenth Century", 119, "As might be expected, around a big abbey were many lay dependants. Not only smiths [fabri ferrarii] after whose smithy Smithhills gets it name, but tailors, leather-workers and habit-makers. A painter John Houston, appears in 1545.

John Urie was janitor or porter in 1542; Archibald Campbell of Paisley, falconer. A brewer, John Aitken, "bruarius le broster" of the monastery, appears at the barley house [domus ordii] in 1542."

[46] Matt 19: 16-22.

[47] I believe that "metanoia" or repentance, which Christ invites all believers to do (Lk. 5: 32), is the correct word to use to describe the life of the monk.

[48] Mk. 10: 21-15.

[49] Xavier Leon Dufour, Dictionary of Biblical Theology, 433. Even though Benedict's view of monastic life was hard and self-denying, it was not to be penitential, no more than was often imposed on christians living in the world. see Butler, Monachism, 26 on St Benedict's concept of the penitential.

[50] Butler, Monachism, 30.

[51] Horn & Born, St Gall, 315-348, shows the similarity between the plan of Cluny II and that of St Gall cannot be ignored, not just because the Farfa text described a monastery laid out similarly to St Gall but also because it became the model for later monasteries. This is perceptible by a comparison of English monastic sites with that of Cluny because "...they disclose that the layout adopted at Cluny was transmitted to the English houses and became traditional."

[52] ibid. II, 340-341.

[53] McCarthy, A Social Geography, 54.

[54] McCann, Rule, ch. 66, 153.

[55] Obviously St Benedict gave much thought to what a monastic community would need if it were to succeed. If some of these essential requisites were absent it is quite clear that he believed that the communal life might fail to develop, and grow into a thriving religious community.

[56] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 15.

[57] Simpson, Ann Turner, and Stevenson, Sylvia, "Historic Paisley, the Archaeological Implications of Development", Scottish Burgh Survey, (Glasgow University, Dept. Archaeology, 1982), 21.

[58] Metcalfe, Charters and Documents, xiii. In the footnote to this page, Metcalfe is relying on Laing Charters, 582 [2480] where they state that this was spoken of as late as 1656.

[59] Though, it has been suggested that with the arrival of the monks at Paisley, and the building of the abbey, in order to safeguard their isolation, they had no alternative but to move the hamlet of Paisley to the opposite west bank of the Cart: McCarthy, A Social Geography, 29; see also Simpson and Stevenson, "Historic Paisley", 3.

[60] Registrum, 6.

[61] Simpson and Stevenson, "Historic Paisley", 22.

[62] "As having ".. occupied the edge of a wooded plain, protected on two sides by a tidal river abounding in fish and pearls. Opposite to it on the west, rose the shelving bank of the White Cart covered by the forest of Paisley. To the north west were seen the wooded heights of Oakshaw, while to the south and south west, beyond the forest of Paisley, were the Gleniffer Braes and the Ferneze Hills in the distance. On the north and east side stretched a dense wood, through which tracks led to the Steward's castle at Renfrew and the cathedral church at Glasgow." W. M. Metcalfe, History of Paisley 600-1908, (Paisley, A Gardner, 1909), 10.

[63] Lees, Paisley, 52.

[64] Simpson and Stevenson, "Historic Paisley," 22.

[65] Thomson, Auchinleck Chronicle, 19; see MacGladdery James II, 120, f.119r/169.

[66] Semple, Abbey Bridge, 5 & 10.

[67] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 30.

[68] see chap 2, part 2, note 201.

[69] William Hector, Judicial Records of Renfrewshire, 1st Series (Paisley, Cook, 1876); 2nd Series (Paisley, Cook, 1878), 245-250.

[70] Semple, Abbey Bridge, 11.

[71] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century",

125.

[72] Leslie, Historie, I, 15.

[73] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 123.

[74] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 26.

[75] Paisley Daily Express, /12/1959.

[76] The tablet reads:-
"Tha callit the abbot Georg of Schaw-
About this abbay gart make this waw-
A thousande four hundreth zheyr-
Aucthy and fywe, the date but veir.
{Pray for his saulis salvacioun}
That made this nobil foundacioun."
Howell, Paisley Abbey, 25. The tablet [plate 89] now sits in the restored cloister, and is still legible. The fifth line was chiselled off, but according to Metcalfe it was seen by Pennant.

[77] Thomas Pennant, A Tour in Scotland, (Warrington, Eyres, 1772), 149.

[78] Lees, Paisley, 142, recorded that in his day there were remnants of the wall still standing on the east and west sides of the abbey bridges.

[79] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 125-126.

[80] ibid. Approaching from Glasgow the wall was first met at point A. It followed the line of the present Incle St to point B, from this point the wall went down Lawn St (to east Gauze Street). From C the wall went along old Smithhills to the old bridge at D (along the present west Gauze St). From D the wall ran to E (the new Abbey Bridge) and thence to F (the old abbey dovecote above Seedhill). It then seems to have returned to A apparently by way of the present Mill St. - see also fig B.

[81] see Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 139-152.

[82] Knowles, Monastic Order, 435-436.

[83] Sowers, "Medieval Monastic Planning", 286.

[84] ibid. 287.

[86] Horn & Born, St Gall, I, 246. It is seen as having derived from Hildemar of Corbie, commen-

tator on the Rule of St Benedict 845-850, who wrote that the cloister should be "large enough so that monks can attend to all of their chores without finding cause for murmur, yet not so grand as to invite them to spend their time in gossip." In a later paragraph he was more explicit when he wrote that "It is generally held that a cloister should be 100 ft sq., and not less, because that would make it too small, however, if you should wish to make it larger this is permissible."

[87] An examination of plans of both Paisley and Crossraguel with a proper scale give these approximate measurements.

[88] A comparison of the extant Scottish cloister garths indicates that, out of a total of thirty-eight monastic sites, only fifteen were 100 ft sq., or more. Thus in Scottish terms the Paisley cloister, in area, was equal to or greater than other Scottish examples.

[89] F. Hallitwell, "Prittlewell Priory and the Church Site" JBAA, 3rd. Series 20-21 (1957-58), 84-94.

[90] Even in later centuries where the west range was often added to, to increase the abbot or prior's lodgings, these additions would have projected further beyond the building line of the west front, but not into the cloister itself.

[91] see fig 46.

[92] See figs. A, 3 and 46.

[93] see W. R. Lethaby, "The Cloister of Southwark Priorys and other early Cloisters", ARCH.J. 71 (1914), 156.

[94] Glyn Coppack, Abbeys and Priories, (London, Batsford/English Heritage, 1990), 71-72.

[95] Gourlay Coll. Prof Gourlay noted this in a hand-written undated note, but then said that both seat and floor of the cloister were at their correct levels. The floor perhaps, but not the seating, but then it never was seating.

[96] There is no evidence whatsoever to indicate what form the arcading of the cloisters would have taken either at Paisley, or of any of the remaining extant British Cluniac houses.

[97] Gourlay Coll. note 4/9/1914.

[98] Royal Commission Ancient and Historic Monuments, Scotland, The County of Roxburgh, 2 vols (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1956), I, 195.

[99] See Lethaby, "The Cloister of Southwark Priory", 155-160.

[100] see Evans, Romanesque Architecture, Cloisters 139-141.

[101] Abbot Francis A Gasquet, English Monastic Life, 2nd ed. (London, Methuen, 1904), 15.

[102] F. H. Crossley, The English Abbey, its Life and Work in the Middle Ages, (London, Batsford, 1935), 40.

[103] Horn and Born, St Gall, II, p.336.

[104] Duckett, Charters and Records, I, 30 recounts Bermondsey's promotion to abbatial status, as does Rose Graham, "The Priory of La Charité-sur-Loire and the Monastery of Bermondsey", JBAA, 33 (1926), 156-187, 181. In the fifteenth century Cluny and La Charité failed to recover their rights over Bermondsey in 182. Yet, according to a list of Cluniac houses drawn up in the late fifteenth early sixteenth century Bermondsey is still described as a priory, Duckett, Charters and Records, I, 30. This suggests that Cluny never acknowledged Richard II's promotion of Bermondsey to an abbey in 1399 and approved by Pope Boniface IX, Graham, "La Charite and Bermondsey", 181.

[105] A. R. Martin,"On the Topography of the Cluniac Abbey of St Saviour at Bermondsey," JBAA, 32 (1926), 201.

[106] D. H. S. Cranage, "The Monastery of St Milburge at Much Wenlock, Shropshire", ARCHAEOLOGIA, 72 (1921-1922), 116.

[107] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 59. like other commentators refers to this cupboard quite erroneously as where the monks kept their choir books.

[108] Hunt, Cluny Under St Hugh, 120. It appears to be the case that at Cluny in its early days "..... writing, in the technical sense, was recognised as a necessary work and the scriptorium was an essential office."

[109] Warmlow, "Silentia Claustra", 198.

[110] Durkan J & Ross A, "Early Scottish Libaries", IR (1961), 121.

[111] ibid. 40-41.

[112] W. H. St John Hope, "Castleacre Priory", NORFOLK ARCHAEOLOGY, 12 (1895), 126.

[113] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 142.

[114] At Castle Acre the west front is decorated with blind arcading of a very high quality, which compares favourably with that in the chapter house at Wenlock.

[115] But the chapter house was, nevertheless, seen as an important symbol of the community and as such was usually impressive architecturally.

[116] Lees, Paisley, 142. Lees like most commentators on Paisley Abbey repeat this as factual, but provide no source to prove that Schaw did build a new chapter house.

[117] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 141-142.

[118] According to Howell, Paisley Abbey, "it can be seen behind masonry at the top of a recess in a room under the present Session House." He continues that "at the same time, near at hand, portions of an original archway were revealed, presumably of the slype from the cloisters at this point"

[119] Also, such archaeological evidence is difficult to eradicate completely, as is evident at St Andrews, where there is evidence of blank arcading of the former west range in the exterior of the south wall of the nave [see plate 110]; and at Pluscarden there is evidence of springers for the lost vaulting of the choir.

[120] Such a suggestion is not unreasonable, for St Mirren's Aisle with seats round the walls for the monastic community would have made a rather dignified chapter house.

[121] James Wilkie, The Benedictine Monasteries of Northern Fife, (Edinburgh, Blackwood, 1927), 239. Balmerino has a fine vaulted chapter house.

[122] It was customary in the monastic environment to replace one building with a new one in a much

grander scale.

[123] Wolfgang Braunfels, Monasteries of Western Europe, 1972, trans. Alistair Laing, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1979), 58. The windows of open arcading, flanking the main entrance, would have allowed the novices and other members of the community, not admitted to the proceedings, to listen to the house chapter meetings.

[124] Unfortunately, there is no evidence whatsoever of either the style or proportions of the entrances to the chapter houses at Castle Acre, Thetford or Monk Bretton, but it is more than likely that they would have conformed to this early tradition, as seen at Wenlock.

[125] Registrum, 74.

[126] see McGibbon & Ross, Ecclesiastical Architecture, I, 369; Bathgate church also has a fine Transitional door: and see also I, 475.

[127] Pluscarden has an exceptionally fine, though unusual, thirteenth century example of a chapter house doorway, whilst at Durham, although the chapter house is a restoration, nevertheless, it does give the observer not only the grandeur of the room, but also its austerity. The original was pulled down on the advice of James Wyatt (1747-1813), and the remainder made into a vestry. The chapter house was rebuilt much later.

[128] see New, Abbeys of England and Wales, 179.

[129] John Stuart, The Records of The Monastery of Kinloss, (Edinbugh, R & R Clark, 1872), lix.

[130] At Dunfermline the vaulting of the undercroft of the frater has long since disappeared, yet the undercroft of the entrance block provides us with a good impression of the vaulting below the frater .

[131] The day room was introduced into the east range by the Cistercians, when manual labour in the fields was replaced by working in the scriptorium .

[132] Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 138; and Radford, "Priory St James Dudley", 451.

[133] Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 129-130.

[134] Horn and Born, St Gall, II, 337.

[135] ibid. II, 337.

[136] Registrum, 11.

[137] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 117.

[138] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 145.

[139] see Cook, English Monasteries, 66.

[140] see Lees, Paisley, 126.

[141] Campbell, Balmerino, 108.

[142] Horn and Born, St Gall, II, 337.

[143] ibid. II, 336.

[144] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 146.

[145] Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 127.

[146] David Knowles, Medieval Religious Houses in England and Wales, (London, Longman, 1971), 95.

[147] see Knowles.

[148] see Hope, "Priory of St Pancras at Lewes", 25-27.

[149] The remains of the monks' dorter at the Benedictine abbey of Battle, in Sussex [plate 120b], which still stand to their full height, may well provide the observer with a better picture of the dorter at Paisley, considering that the dressed stones of the exterior at Battle have not been stripped from the building, as happened at Castle Acre.

[150] Richard Morris, The Church in British Archaeology, Research Report 47, (The Council for British Archaeology, 1983), wrote in the frontispiece, wrote that "in this report *church archaeology* is taken to be the complete historical study of the material remains of a church, above and below ground, in relation to its site, contents, historic setting, and to the community it has served."

[151] This stairwell was reinstated by Lorimer during his restoration of The Place.

[152] Cranage, "Wenlock", 118 n.2, suggests that this may have been a muniments room.

[153] F. C. Hunter-Blair, Charters of the Abbey of Crossraguel, 2 vol (Ayrshire & Galloway Archaeological Assoc. 1886) II, 98; I, xxxii.

[154] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 146.

[155] ibid.

[156] ibid.

[157] This stair was renewed by Lorimer as part of his restoration on The Place.

[158] Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 145-146.

[159] C. A. R. Radford, The Cluniac Abbey of Crossraguel, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1970), 18 and 15.

[160] I have measured both of them.

[161] Personal inspection of these of both stairs show that they are both safe to walk up and down on, so great care was obviously taken in their construction.

[162] see Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 124.

[163] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 59.

[164] Butler & Wilson, Medieval Monasteries, 218.

[165] Hunt, Cluny Under St Hugh, 90; see also Constable, "Famuli and Conversi at Cluny", 334-350.

[166] Knowles, Medieval Religious Houses, 95-97. In the thirteenth century the Cluniac priories at Lenton and Church Preen each had 2 lay brothers, whilst Monkton Farleigh had an indeterminate number.

[167] Hope, "Castleacre Priory", 132 & 134.

[168] The day room at Pluscarden was divided into the kitchen and refectory after 1946 to provide better accommodation for the restored community.

[169] Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 132.

[170] Brown, History, I, 53-54. Its description is reminiscent of that at Lewes, where the great drain "is a well built tunnel 5 feet wide, and at

least 5 feet high lined with stone and covered by a barrel vault."; see also Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 22.

[171] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 151 n.28 noted that Mr T Reid, Engineer, who was present during the 1889 visit with the BAA said that it went into Ellis's Lane; for a report of the visit see JBAA XLV (1889), 280.

[172] "Although the evidence is not conclusive, it never is, nevertheless it can be implied that a building could have sat astride the drain at this point", Geoffrey Stell, RCAHMS.

[173] Metcalfe, Lordship, lvii.

[174] Lees, Paisley, 202.

[175] Although the term The Place is used here it certainly does not describe what we know as The Place today.

[176] Lees, Paisley, 242.

[177] See Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 117.

[178] Indeed, in the fifteenth century the gradual change in use and emphasis in monastic buildings was made by the abbots themselves; good examples are at Neath Abbey, West Glamorgan, where the east end of the dorter range was formed into an abbot's lodging see New, Abbeys of England and Wales op.cit 274; again at Valle Crucis Abbey, Clwyd, the dorter was sub-divided and altered to form the abbot's lodging, ibid. 400. Although these examples illustrate that heads of monasteries changed buildings to suit the changing needs of the monastery, nevertheless, they show just how such buildings were so easily adaptable.

[179] New, Abbeys of Scotland, 104.

[180] ibid. 148.

[181] New, Abbeys of England and Wales, 123.

[182] Semple, St Mirin, 28.

[183] McCarthy, A Social Geography, 50, has suggested that parts of The Place are remnants of the abbot's lodging, which they are not.

[184] see D. McGibbon & T. Ross Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland, (Edinburgh, D Douglas, 1887-1892), V 11-14.

[185] Metcalfe, Lordship 1, sees this as a distinct possibility, hence the difficulty of ascertaining just what is "*old*" and what is a rebuild because of the "*re-use*" of monastic ashlar. Metcalfe is obviously talking of the building campaign attributed to the Dundonalds which is dated 1672, one hundred years after Claud took over the monastic buildings.

[186] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey and Glasgow Archives", 50-51.

[187] J. Wilson Paterson, & D. McRoberts, Inchcolm Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1984 ed.), 13-14.

[188] Royal Commission Ancient Historical Monuments, Scotland, County of Stirling, 2 vols (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1963)., I. 17.

[189] Stuart, Kinloss, lix.

[190] Metcalfe, Lordship, 1.

[191] James Steel Maitland, PDE 2/12/1959.

[192] New, Abbeys of Scotland, 55.

[193] James Steel Maitland, Lecture on The Place of Paisley, (delivered to the Friends of Paisley Abbey, (Paisley, 1/12/1959), 4.

[194] ibid. 3.

[195] ibid. 4.

[196] ibid. 5.

[197] These measured drawings by Peter MacGregor Chalmers recorded the condition of The Place in 1910 before any restoration work was carried out on the Place. The plans tell their own story.

[198] PA Papers, Richardson's Report of 17/5/1937.

[199] Wilson & McRoberts, Inchcolm Abbey, 27.

[200] RCAHMS, Stirlingshire, I, plate 112.

[201] Cranage, "Wenlock", 114, maintains quite wrongly, I believe, they are not hatches belonging to the

frater.

[202] Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 138.

[203] Hope, "Priory of St Pancras at Lewes", 18.

[204] see New, Abbeys of Scotland, for descriptions of individual monasteries.

[205] The post-Reformation, and later floors, were replaced with concrete ones by Sir Robert Lorimer.

[206] see Metcalfe, Lordship, xii.

[207] At the Cistercian abbey of Beaulieu the simple reader's pulpit of the frater, which is now used as the parish church, still projects from the wall. There can be no doubt that such a simple pulpit, is one that could easily be removed, and if Paisley had one such as that, then it could have been removed without trace.

[208] Graham, Wenlock, 20-21, perhaps the only similarity between them.

[209] Both J. C. Dickinson, Monastic Life in Medieval England, (London, Black, 1961), 34; and Cook, English Monasteries, 69, confirm this.

[210] The entrance into the frater at Wenlock is similar to the east processional doorway still extant at Kilwinning.

[211] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 126.

[212] Lees, Paisley, 215, concludes that the abbot's lodging once stood at the south end of what is Cotton Street solely on the basis of the ground plan of Wenlock. Nevertheless, this would have been the most likely site.

[213] At Crossraguel the kitchen lies immediately to the south of the frater, but is part of the south range, see fig 56.

[214] David Semple, Second Supplement to St Mirin, (Paisley, J & J Cook, 1874), 20-21; see the obituary notices to David Semple in the last volume of his Index to the History of Renfrewshire.

[215] ibid. 37. Although he corrected himself later, nevertheless, his overall stance spelt

disaster for the west range

[216] Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 139.

[217] Semple, Second Supplement, 19.

[218] It is self-evident from the many changes in the stonework, in their size and use, that the exterior walls of the west range were changed many times. Also, the fact that the corbels were extant, which once supported the roof of the cloister garth, ought to have been sufficient evidence for Semple and others, that they were misinterpreting the archaeological evidence.

[219] Semple, Second Supplement, 20.

[220] ibid. 21.

[221] ibid. 21-22. Alexander Nisbet's Essay on Armories, (1718), 81: "The essayist, it will be observed, has omitted the angel supporters of the shield." see also the Life of George Schaw, Abbot of Paisley, Paisley Repository, XII 1-5.

[222] Maitland, The Place of Paisley, 2.

[223] Semple, Second Supplement, 37.

[224] Dickinson, Monastic Life, 40.

[225] Semple, Second Supplement, 22-23.

[226] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 59. During the restoration of the north cloister walk under Peter McGregor Chalmers, but, there is nothing to suggest just what these remnants actually consisted of.

[227] Semple, Second Supplement, 32-33.

[228] ibid. 23.

[229] In the reconstruction of the west range, probably advocated by Dr Daniel Richmond or the in 1873, this corbelling was adapted to form part of an oriel window: see fig 78.

[230] Margaret Wood, The English House, (London, Bracken Books, 1982 ed.), 328.

[231] Since Crossragual did not have a west range, the abbot's lodging was always separated from the cloistral ranges.

[232] Cranage, "Wenlock", 113.

[233] An external stair led to the hall on the first floor of the west range at Bradenstoke Priory, in Wiltshire; also, the former hospitum at St Mary's, York, still has its fine external stair to the first floor.

[234] Semple, Second Supplement, 23.

[235] ibid. 24.

[236] see D. Hawkes Richards, "The Chimney", JBAA, 24 3rd series (1961), 67-91.

[237] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, IX, for several reports on Rowand Anderson's lecture on Paisley Abbey to the Glasgow Archaeological Soc., 16 March 1882. On 17 April, 1887, W G Black wrote on behalf of the Society to the Marquis of Bute. (Bute Papers) He intimated to his lordship the intentions of the Council of the Society to publish Rowand Anderson's lecture, perhaps as a separate publication for sale to the public. It appears not to have been published, not even in the Transactions of the Society.

[238] Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 140.

[239] Cook, "English Monasteries", 49.

[240] see Dickinson, Monastic Life, 13-15, where he suggests that there may have been an almost yearly accommodation for the poor within the outer courts of some monasteries.

[241] see Cook, English Monasteries, 75.

[242] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 110.

[243] Metcalfe, Lordship, li.

[244] see Richard Fawcett et al. Arbroath Abbey, Edininburgh, HMSO, 1982), 19; and Stewart Cruden, St Andrews Cathedral, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1950), 18.

[245] Hope, "Castle Acre Priory", 142.

[246] Colin Platt, The Abbeys and Priories of Medieval England, (London, 1984), 158; see also Wood, The English House, 23.

[247] F. J. E. Raby & P. K. Baillie Reynolds, Thetford Priory, Norfolk, (London, HBMCE, 1984), 15.

[248] Platt, Abbeys and Priories, 161; see also Wood, The English House, 203-204.

[249] Butler & Wilson, Medieval Monasteries, 304-305.

[250] McCann, Rule, chap 53, 118-123; "Let there be a separate kitchen for the abbot and guests, so that the brethern may not be disturbed when guests - who are never lacking in a monastery - arrive at irregular hours."
Coquina abbatis et hospitum super se sit, ut incertis horis supervenientes hospites, qui numquam desunt monasterio, non inquietant fratres, 120; see also Butler, Monachism, 195-197.

[251] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 117.

[252] see note 68.

[253] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 117.

[254] Metcalfe, Lordship, 1.

[255] David J. Breeze, A Queen's Progress, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1987), 50-51.

[256] TA, II (1500-1504), 444 & 447.

[257] Metcalfe, History, 118.

[258] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiqities, I, 19-20. The housing of a large number of people by the abbot and monks of Paisley would not really have been a problem, for they had property within the town of Paisley.

[259] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 117 n.53, SRO Protocol Book of John Vaus, senior (NP1/201). Although the small and large halls of the abbot are mentioned by Durkan the notarial references are of the middle of the sixteenth century at which date it is likely the abbot of Paisley would have had his own separate lodging; and there is every chance that these halls are the outer and inner chamber of the abbot, which is the situation at Castle Acre, and Crossraguel. (see also notes 260 & 261 below).

[260] ibid. 117 Protocol book of Thomas Inglis (NP/59).

[261] ibid. 118 n.54, John McQuhin, fo 40.

[262] ibid. 113; see Metcalfe, Lordship, xlviii, who also makes this point, but unfortunately mentions no source.

[263] Semple, St Mirin, 108.

[264] see New, Abbeys of Scotland.

[265] see New, Abbeys of England and Wales.

[266] Lees, Paisley, 215.

[267] see Geoffrey Stell, "Architecture : the Changing Needs of Society," in Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century, ed. Jennifer M Brown, (London, Arnold, 1977), 153-183 in 117.

[268] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey and Glasgow Archives", 47.

[269] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 113.

[270] McCann, Rule, chap. 36, 90: "Before all things and above all things care must be taken of the sick, so that they may be served in every deed as Christ himself; for he said: I was sick and ye visited me; and, what ye did to one of these least ones, ye did unto me."
"Infirmorum cura ante omnia et super omnia adhibenda est, ut sicut revera Christo ita eis seviatur, quia ipse dixit: Infirmus fue et visitastis me; et: Quod fecistis uni his minimis, mihi fecisties."

[271] see Cranage, "Wenlock", 121ff.

[272] New, Abbeys of Scotland.

[273] see Evans, Romanesque Architecture, 175.

[274] Durkan, "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", 125-126.

[275] Metcalfe, Lordship, xxvi.

CHAP 4 : NOTES AND REFERENCES.

[1] Lees, Paisley, 239. Despite the Reformation Act of 1560, the people of Paisley resisted the Reformation, and insisted on being present at the Mass. Because of this, the first minister of the Kirk, Patrick Adamson, was not appointed until 1572, twelve years after the Reformation. In fact, Adamson had to live in Glasgow for he could not obtain lodgings in Paisley.

[2] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 211.

[3] Gourlay Coll. undated note + note of 8/5/1915, Reformation wall at east end of nave taken down (this wall was seven feet thick); also much earlier, David Semple had noted that when the old abbey bridge was taken down "...a large number of rubble stones, used for inside packing of the land- stools and piers, were found to be broken mouldings and sculptured stones, no doubt gathered from the Monastery buildings." Semple, History of the Abbey Bridge op.cit. 7.

[4] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 211.

[5] ibid.

[6] "The Baillies and Councillors have concludit that there sall be pews buildit in the church upon the town's expenses, and then rouped and sett yearlie, and Bailie Paisley and John Park, younger, are appointed to oversie the work and to agree with workmen making thereof." Brown, History, I, 96.

[7] The Council records show that there was "...paid out towards the expenses made in building the town's new seat in the church, for timber and workmanship two hundred punds money and £53 10s. 4d. be the treasurer." ibid.

[8] Metcalfe, Lordship, lviii.

[9] ibid.

[10] Brown, History, I, 96-97.

[11] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 211.

[12] Although this lithograph is dated c.1820 (and probably taken from across the river), it gives

the observer a good indication of the clutter around the abbey, which hid most of it from view (apart from the west front); see Boog's plan fig 73 which illustrates just how bad the situation was in 1788.

[13] Lees, Paisley, 336.

[14] Metcalfe, Lordship, li.

[15] "Upon the 22d day of January, there will be sold by public roup, at the Abbey of Paisley, various parcels of the Abbey gardens of Paisley belonging to the earl of Dundonald."Lees, Paisley, 336-37.

[16] ibid.

[17] Abercorn had purchased the abbey property and lands from Dundonald in 1764.

[18] Metcalfe, Lordship, liii.

[19] It is clearly shown on the Boog's plan of May of that year; see also Howell, Paisley Abbey, 43.

[20] Lees, Paisley, 337.

[21] New, Abbeys of Scotland, 193; see also Ker, W Lee, The Abbey of Kilwinning, (Ardrossan, 1900), 163.

[22] The monastic ranges once again belonged to the Hamiltons, and the fact that the south aisle doors were reopened during Salmon's restoration of 1859-1862 suggests that up till that time they had probably never been used since the monks vacated the premises after the Dissolution in 1560.

[23] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 2.

[24] see also Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 211.

[25] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 2.

[26] ibid. 16.

[27] ibid. 57. Seven years later, on 11 June 1812, he requested an increase in salary of 2 guineas, which was approved, providing he agreed to sweep the inside of the walls and windows twice a year, in May and November, ibid. 68.

[28] ibid. 2. Those chosen were Baillie Pattison, Messrs. Houstoun, Ross, Fulton, Corse, Wilson and Rev Mr Boog; and their report was to be ready for the next Heritors' Meeting on Monday 24 March.

[29] ibid. 3.

[30] I shall refer to the committee as the Restoration Committee.

[31] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 10; see also Metcalfe, Lordship, lix.

[32] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 4.

[33] ibid. 6; ; accordingly the Committee met the following: Alex Bilsland, Samuel Henning, James Findlater, and William Lamb, wrights; George Morris, Robert Muir, and Archibald Yuill, masons; and William Aitken, and John Abercrombie, slaters. ibid. 4-5.

[34] ibid. 12. What this suggests is that the new roof actually replaced the late medieval one.

[35] ibid. 6.

[36] Abbot Crichton may have replaced Abbot Tervas's slated roof with one of lead, see Lees, Paisley, 135, but there is no evidence to suggest just when slates replaced the lead roof.

[37] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 15-16.

[38] ibid. 13.

[39] ibid. 12.

[40] ibid. 7.

[41] These were finally replaced by those put up in 1862 as part of the restoration work carried out by James Salmon, the Glasgow architect.

[42] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 6; unfortunately there is no evidence of what the style of the turrets were beforehand, though there is every likelihood that by pyramidal the tradesmen meant conical.

[43] The Committee employed the four they thought best qualified, and offered them two guineas each, plus another two guineas for the best plan.

[44] PRONI D623/A/64/20 part: letter of 17 May, 1788 from Rev Robert Boog, minister of the first charge at Paisley Abbey to the earl of Abercorn.

[45] PRONI/D623/A/64/20/part - see figs 74A & B.

[46] PRONI D623/A/64/20 part: letter of 17 May, 1788.

[47] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 9.

[48a] see Howell, Paisley Abbey, 44.

[48b] Ramsay, Views of Renfrewshire, 42.

[49] "I shall be happy" Lord Abercorn wrote from London on 9 April, 1788, "in promoting the views of the Heritors by consenting to their removing the projection of the Abbey, and I have writ to my factor to that affect. Before the house at the west door was built," he continued, "that place was a receptacle for filth and a nuisance: Opening the [west] door will be a great improvement. Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 13.

[50] ibid. 15.

[51] It was Alex Bilsland and James Findlater who advised the Heritors on the form the roof should take, and the dimensions of the timbers; Willie Lamb and Sam Henning did the wright work; and Rob Muir, George Morris and Archie Yuill did the mason work.

[52] ibid. 14.

[53] ibid. 32.

[54] The earl of Abercorn, the earl of Glasgow, the Burgh of Paisley, Lords Blantyre and Douglas, Sir John Stirling Maxwell, Messrs Spiers, McDowall, Houston, Dunlop, Maxwell, Fulton, and some generous minded persons, among the smaller Heritors and inhabitants of the parish, all contributed towards the cost of the new pulpit and galleries.

[55] ibid. 38-39.

[56] Mackie, A Historical Description, 75-76. "The judicious appropriation of the pews, together with the tasteful disposition of the gallery around the whole edifice, render the *tout ensemble most complete*" was how the interior of the nave was to be described later. "The galleries" (the description continues) "are equally divided into as many sections as there are pillars, and their extremities are constructed in such a manner as to preserve an entire view from any position within the church.

[57] Brown, History, I, 98, where he lists each notable family's pew, and where their armorial bearings were to be found.

[58] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 34.

[59] ibid. 40.

[60] ibid. 14.

[61] ibid. 40.

[62] ibid. 34.

[63] ibid. 34.

[64] ibid. 35.

[65] ibid. 35-36.

[66] Perhaps the reason is a simple one. It would probably have been much cheaper to replace the wood covering the northern windows with glass, rather than taking down the stone blocking the south clerestory windows.

[67] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 36.

[68] ibid. 38.

[69] ibid. 38.

[70] The canopy no longer forms part of the monument, and is stored behind the reredos at the Communion Table. Unfortunately, as it is showing signs of damage, it would be better stored somewhere in the abbey where visitors might see it.

[71] In the 1950s, when the monument was dismantled, before its rebuilding in the choir, male and female skeletal remains were found inside. It would be interesting to speculate why the bones were placed there, perhaps Boog believed they were Marjory's remains, but no evidence appears to exist to explain this matter.

[72] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 40.

[73] ibid. 41

[74] ibid. 41; and Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 218.

[75] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 42; and Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 212.

[76] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 63.

[77] ibid. 42.

[78] ibid. 64.

[79] ibid. 65.

[80] In 1812, at the age of 74, the University of Glasgow honoured Boog with the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity: Brown, History, I, 100.

[81] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 70-71; the enclosure should be made by a parapet wall of hewn or dressed stone, surmounted by an iron railing, with gates immediately opposite the west door of the church, and a smaller one on the south side.

[82] However, because of various improvements to the design of the gates and railings, the final cost had risen to £211.15s.

[83] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 78.

[84] ibid.

[85] In 1812 the Heritors appointed a Fabric Committee consisting of the Provost of Paisley, Messrs Hartfield, Kibble, Sheddan, Orr, Wilson and Dr Boog, who were given the task of ensuring that the work was carried out satisfactorily.

[86] Heritors' Minutes 1788-1802, 78.

[87] ibid. 79.

[88] ibid.

[89] ibid.

[90] ibid. 81, "and perhaps the running of a slight moulding around the spaces formed by the intersections of the joists below the galleries, which have at present a very unfinished appearance."

[91] ibid. 79.

[92] ibid. 92. This plaster hood-mould was clearly visible in old photographs of the interior. [see plate 167]

[93] ibid. 98. At the same meeting the Heritors authorized the Fabric Committee to ensure that "...the earth accumulated at the west side of the north porch of the church be removed as far as may conveniently be done." ibid. 99.

[94] consisting of the Provost of Paisley, Messrs Wilson, Orr of Ralston, Brown, Tribble, and Rev Mr McNair.

[95] Abbey Heritors' Minute Book, SRO/HR.778/3/1824-1836, 6; "to inspect the roof and make out a specification of the necessary repairs...[and] when this specification is made out it be put into the hands of respectable tradesmen in order to obtain estimates to be reported to another Meeting of Heritors."

[96] Messrs Bryce, Wallace, Mair and Gillespie, slaters; Messrs Childs and Jamieson, plumbers, Messrs Hunter, Forrest and Ritchie, wrights; and Messrs Millan and Davidson, masons.

[97] Heritors' Minutes 1824-1836, 8.

[98] ibid. 9.

[99] ibid.

[100] ibid. 10.

[101] ibid. 14.

[102] David Rowand, Pictorial History of Paisley, (Darvel, Alloway Publishing, 1993), 39; see also entry on James Lamb in Dictionary of British Architects 1834-1900, ed. Alison Filstead, (London, Mansell/RIBA, 1993), 538.

[103] Heritors' Minutes 1824-1836, 29.

[104] ibid. 29-30. However, Robert Wylie, writer, representing the marquis of Abercorn, moved that the two proposals set before the meeting should be decided by a committee with powers to consult an architect and a scientific person [or engineer]. A Committee was then formed consisting of Provost Boyd, Messrs Wilson, Burns and Langmuir, the Provost to be the Convener, ibid. 30.

[105] ibid. 32-33, "The masonry appears to be giving way" Lamb wrote, "owing to the decayed state of the beams of wood upon which the walls have been built, and must therefore be supported; the most effectual mode of doing so, would be to build up the voids on the east and west sides, remove the old beams and fill up the space with masonry."

[106] ibid. 33.

[107] ibid. 35-36.

[108] ibid.

[109] ibid. 36; comprising the Provost of Paisley, Rev Mr McNair, Messrs Langmuir, Buchanan and Bell, to oversee the complete renovation of the Session House.

[110] The successful restoration by Robert Boog had impressed on the Heritors and other interested parties, the need to maintain and conserve the abbey, for it was something more than just another parish kirk. Some of these men of influence would have witnessed Boog's restoration and how its successful conclusion affected the people of Paisley.

[111] James Russell, Architect, Three Mile House,

Paisley, Preserved Pencillings Delineated from Actual Measurements Taken, (Paisley Museum, 1829). These drawings are contained in a large scrapbook, once the property of Russell.

[112] R. W. Billings, The Antiquities of Scotland, IV, 1854.

[113] Heritors' Minute Book, 1824-36, 51; and Messrs Main and Brewster were appointed at that meeting to enquire into the practicality of the same.

[114] ibid. 51-53;

[115] ibid. 53.

[116] ibid. 84.

[117] ibid. 86-88; He also insisted that "unless the work is to be done well and without the least hazard to the church it ought not to be done at all, and at all events it will not receive my assent."

[118] ibid. 87-88.

[119] ibid. 82-84; Mr Nott, who had developed his own method of heating public buildings, proposed to heat the church with four stoves at a cost of £80.

[120] ibid. 90-91.

[121] ibid. 91.

[122] ibid. 91-92.

[123] ibid. 92-93.

[124] ibid. 101; and Mr Gillespie, slater, and Mr Donaldson, mason, were appointed to report on the physical state of the church.

[125] ibid. 138.

[126] ibid. 139.

[127] ibid. 139-140.

[128] Minute Book of Heritors' Committee 1830-1890,

SRO/HR.778/6, 109.

[129] ibid. 158-59. The window was to be designed by the famous stained glass artist Frans Fries, of Munich and Vienna, and was to be executed at the famous Royal Munich Glass Works under the Director-in-Chief M Faustner. Although this stained glass was actually placed into the east gable window, it was removed to the south transept when Rowand Anderson took down the east wall, as part of his restoration work at the abbey 1898-1907. In 1929, during the incumbency of Rev A R Howell, this window was being stored in the abbey. The minister recorded this fact in his book Paisley Abbey - op.cit. 130 - but since then the stained glass from the window appears to have gone astray.

[130] F. C. Eeles, "Medieval Stained Glass from Holyrood Abbey Church", PSAS, XCLX (1914-1915), 81-91; this article supports the suggestion that Paisley Abbey would also have been adorned with similar glass, just as it is today; see also Appendix i of stained glass.

[131] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1828-1854, SRO/CH/2/490/47, 7/4/1837.

[132] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 212.

[133] The Committee members were Messrs Sinclair, Salmon, McInnes, Brown, Richardson, and Baillie Brown of Paisley. This Mr Salmon, was the factor of the Houstons of Johnstone and not the architect of the 1860s restoration, who will be mentioned later.

[134] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 36.

[135] ibid. 37; The damage to the windows (including the west window) may have been due to the severe storm of February, 1856, as reported in the PHRG, 4, 28/2/1857.

[136] PHRG, 28/2/1857.

[137] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 58.

[138] ibid. 58.

[139] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1854-1880, SRO/CH/2/490/48, 115.

[140] Lees, Paisley, 339.

[141] ibid.

[142] ibid.

[143] with Mr McInnes, Convener, the Provost of Paisley, Messrs Richardson, Ralston, Murray Brown, and Salmon.

[144] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 59; see also Kirk Session Records, 1854-90, 115.

[145] see entry on James Salmon, in Filstead, Dictionary of British Architects, 797.

[146] Gomme and Walker, Architecture of Glasgow, 170n, 172.

[147] Heritors' Committee, 1820-90, 60.

[148] ibid.

[149] see Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 21-23 for a complete copy of Salmon's report.

[150] The building south of the west front, in this old print, was the west range with external stairs leading up to the first floor. The first floor entrance was supported by a corbel, which sprang from dogtooth moulding.

[151] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 61-63; see also PHRG, 10/11/1860, 4.

[152] ibid. 61.

[153] The committee members included the two ministers, Wilson and Lees (who were also members of the Restoration Committee), as well as Messrs Lorimer, Hutcheson, Muir, with Lees as Convener. Lorimer has no connection with Sir Robert who would eventually complete the restoration of the choir in 1926.

[154] Kirk Session Records, 1854-80, 161-163.

[155] ibid. 165.

[156] consisting of Rev Messrs A Wilson and J Cameron

Lees, and Messrs Lorimer, Hutchison, with Rev Mr Lees as Convener, which Committee would endeavour to carry out the Session's resolutions.

[157] ibid. 173.

[158] PHRG, 10/11/1860, 4.

[159] ibid. 1/12/1860, 4.

[160] Kirk Session Records, 1854-80, 185, 188 & 198.

[161] ibid. 188.

[162] PHRG. 28/3/1861.

[163] Maclean, Abbey Restoration, 15-16.

[164] This was the same Dr Daniel Richmond who in 1873 became a forceful advocate for the retention and restoration of the then endangered west cloistral range.

[165] PHRG. 28/3/1861.

[166] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 71.

[167] ibid. I, 99.

[168] ibid. I, 116.

[169] ibid. I, 116.

[170] During the restoration of St Giles, Edinburgh, between 1871 and 1883 [McWilliam, Colin ed. Buildings of Scotland : Edinburgh, (London, Penguin Books, 1984), 106], a great many human bones were removed from under the floor and re-intered elsewhere (se also Tales of St Giles and Holyrood, Newtongrange, Lang Syne Publishers, 1978). As at St Giles, the accumulation of bones at Paisley probably came about because the dead were, more than likely, closely packed together, and laid in layers, year after year and century after century, with a very small covering of earth, until the dust of the departed increased to three feet in height, [Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 213.]

[171] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 69.

[172] ibid. 70.

[173] ibid.

[174] ibid. 71.

[175] Semple, Scapbook of Antiquities, I, 84.

[176] RENFREWSHIRE INDEPENDENT, 15/5/1861.

[177] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 143-144.

[178] ibid. I, 158.

[179] ibid. i. 214.

[180] These were removed when Rowand Anderson rebuilt the crossing, as part of his restoration in 1899. He placed these stained glass windows into the two new windows he had designed in the east wall of the north transept as part of the restoration.

[181] Even today, depending on the light, Paisley Abbey can be a very dark and forbidding place.

[182] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 213-214.

[183] ibid. I, 219.

[184] ibid. I, 213; fifteen hundred feet of piping being required to heat the church adequately.

[185] ibid.

[186] ibid. I, 215.

[187] From close examination they are showing signs of weathering, so are now being repaired as part of the major refurbishment of the abbey begun in 1993.

[188] Gourlay Coll. He noted that "...a good deal of the north porch is old although rebuilt", note 28/3/1910; see also Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 159.

[189] ibid. This is quite clear form close examination.

[190] ibid. I, 78.

[191] ibid. I, 215

[192] PH, 26/4/1862.

[193] ibid. 26/4/1862.

[194] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 220; the funding consisted of £600 from Heritors + £400 from the abbey congregation, with approximamtely £1000 from public subscription (including £100 from the Prince of Wales).

[195] ibid. I, 220. This was to prove a bone of contention between the Kirk Session and the Heritors during the eventual final phase of the complete restoration of the church, inaugurated by the Rev W M McLean in 1912.

[196] ibid. II, 130-133.

[197] ibid. II, 133.

[198] ibid.

[199] Plans to pedestrianise the abbey precinct to link up with a riverside walk, have already been formulated by Renfrew District Council as part of a major regeneration of Paisley Town Centre. However, there appears to be no definite date when this is expected to begin, parhaps due to the forthcoming Local Government re-organisation; see also John Malden, "The Monastery of Paisley", GLASGOW ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY BULLETIN, no. 28, (Spring 1992), 10-12.

[200] see Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 72-73; as recorded during the committee meeting of 19 December, 1861, Bailie Gillespie was then called upon to examine the roof and report on any necessary repairs. He produced a rather comprehensive report, with work estimated to cost £46. On 17 September, 1862, Mr Gillespie produced a more detailed report (ibid. 89-90), which the committee decided, the following day, should be referred to James Lamb, the architect. Lamb was to inspect the building and report on what immediate repairs were necessary. ibid. 86-87.

[201] Kirk Session Records, 1854-80, 330.

[202] David Semple, Town Improvements, Restoration and

Preservation of Paisley Abbey, (Paisley, J & J Cook, 1873), 3.

[203] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, VIII; "and the great [west] doorway and the beautiful transept window were confronted by a poor little narrow street [see plate A], and a grim Dissenting church. The fair old orchard land has left no trace but a name. Where the green pleasant grass once went down to the riverside, enclosed for monastic quiet by the wall of a famous abbot, are now endless piles of little unsightly dwellings, which make it hard to charm back the days of that earlier time." as quoted from Paisley Abbey, People's Friend, Dundee, 12/11/1873.

[204] Bute Papers, Mount Stuart: Letter from Dr Daniel Richmond, 13 May, 1873.

[205] ibid. This fact is mentioned in the original hand-written copy of the report on the west range at Paisley which Bute was later to commission from the architects Bryce, Anderson and Bryce, 4 June, 1873.

[206] ibid.

[207] ibid.

[208] David Semple (1808-1878), was a man much thought of in Paisley, as his many flowery obituaries testify. He was a solicitor and notary public, and went into business on his own account on the completion of his apprenticeship in 1828. After being in partnership with different lawyers, he founded the law firm of David Semple and Sons, Writers, Paisley. He became a Fellow of the Faculty of Procurators in 1831.

He was a liberal in politics, and sat in the Town Council from 1842-45, as Councillor for the second ward after which he was offered the post of Town Clerk, for which he was considered to be more than qualified.

However, he will be best remembered as a historian and antiquarian. His collections of material, on every aspect of Paisley's history, show that he was a sagacious man, for he was aware of the importance of the material he was collecting, and how it was essential that it be collated, indexed, and presented to Paisley Central Library, and thus made available to the general public. His research into Paisley's

history was his life's work, writing many books in the process. Without a doubt, Semple's collection is of inestimable value for the researcher into Paisley and her history. Unfortunately, despite his Fellowship of the Society of Antiquaries (Scotland), and that of other such bodies, his knowledge of archaeology and architecture did not measure up to his knowledge of his town's recorded history, for had it done so the history of Paisley Abbey might have been different.

[209] see Semple, Second Supplement. He was an excellent antiquarian and recorder of Paisley's history. His recording of the west range prior to its demolition is surely proof that the west range, despite its many changes, was medieval. Indeed, it could be said that his description of the west range was the best, most poignant and most articulate argument put forward at that time for saving it.

[210] ibid. iii-iv.

[211] ibid. 19.

[212] see chap 3 for discussion of west range.

[213] Semple, Abbey Bridge, 10.

[214] see William Grant & David Donald Murison, Scottish National Dictionary 9 vols, (Edinburgh, Scottish Nat. Dict. Assoc), IX (1931-1976), 186.

[215] Semple, Abbey Bridge, 19-38.

[216] ibid. 41.

[217] Semple, Improvements Scheme, 4.

[218] Bute Papers, original copy.

[219] Sam McKinstry, The Life and Work of Sir Robert Rowand Anderson, 1834-1921, (unpublished PhD thesis, St Andrews University, 1986), 97. It was Rowand Anderson who would eventually undertake the second stage in the final restoration of Paisley Abbey, 1898-1907.

[220] Gourlay Coll. "The old foundations of the whole cloister remain," undated note. Even though Gourlay believed in 1913 that the foundations of

the cloisters still remained, there was certainly no evidence in 1873 (or 1913 for that matter) to suggest that they did, so by their restoration, Bute may well have meant their rebuilding.

[221] McKinstry, Rowand Anderson, 10-11.

[222] Bute Papers: copy of original hand-written report.

[223] Semple, Town Improvements Scheme, 11.

[224] PRFG. 25/3/1882; see also report in THE SCOTSMAN, 25/3/1882.

[225] Bute Papers: On 8 Jan. 1912, Dr Metcalfe wrote to Mount Stuart requesting permission to have sight of Rowand Anderson's detailed report of 1873. Bute instigated an extensive search for Anderson's plans, measured drawings and photographs, but they were nowhere to be found. They are still missing!

[226] PRFG, 14/2/1874, 5; Indeed, "...a single glance will convince anyone" wrote Mr John Crawford, "that the row of single arched buildings or cells forming the west side of the cloister court, now in course of demolition, is no part of the "Place of Paisley" erected by Lord Dundonald after the Reformation, but part and pertinent to the abbey church property - *extra commercium* - the same as the abbey itself, and which the Duke of Abercorn could no more sell or make merchandise of, than he could sell the transept or the choir, or any part of the abbey churchyard itself."

[227] Fig 78 is obviously a proposed scheme for a fully restored Paisley Abbey, which included not only a restored west front of the abbey church, but also a refurbished west range, in what was considered a more authentic manner. The marquis of Bute voiced opinions as to how the west range should be restored, but so did Dr Richmond before him. Richmond is said to have drawn up plans for the restoration of the west range and refectory, which here forms an integral part of the restoration.(see chapter 3 note 229.) He also drew up an alternative plan for the realignment of Abbey Close.

[228] See vol II appendix ii, Stained Glass, for

Bute's scheme.

[229] Semple, Town Improvements.

[230] Semple, 2nd Supplement to St Mirin, 24,

[231] ibid. 25.

[232] ibid.

[233] ibid. 11-12; 38-41.

[234] Steel Maitland, "Lecture", and with regard to the abbey Donald Macpherson, consultant architect to the abbey in 1987, holds the same opinion.

[235] ibid. 207.

[236] PRFG, 27/11/1875, 4.

[237] PAPERS RE.ECCLESIASTICAL BUILDINGS 1873-1832, SRO/HR.778/15/1, 31/7/1902. 5-6; In 1902 T Graham Abercrombie, another Paisley architect, advised that it be left untouched, but that if possible heavy traffic be diverted from Abbey Street. Today, there is evidence that this south west corner is unstable, which could be verified by an examination of the south west gable at clerestory level. Although the opening in the ashlar has only recently been repaired, had the west range been extant to support the south west corner, perhaps this problem could have been avoided.

[238] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 217-218;

[239] Provost Murray, Messrs Wilson of Freeland, MacGregor, Wilson of Dykebar, and Salmon formed the sub-committee.

[240] ibid. 220.

[241] ibid. 221-224.

[242] The floor and seating of the north aisle, as far as the north porch, was particularly bad, as was the front of, and the floor under the west gallery.

[243] Mr Davidson, as instructed, presented his estimate of £702 for the complete job, to the

meeting of the sub-committee held on 20 October, 1875; and Mr Bryce's estimate for the joiner work was £50.

[244] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 224; and 222.

[245] ibid. 229-231. The Superintending Committee authorised the sub-committee to proceed with the work on the 25, November. The sub-committee then instructed Mr Davidson to prepare the necessary plan.

[246] ibid. 225-228.

[247] ibid. 258; at a total cost of £603.11s: Thomas Wilson was paid £347.10s. for mason work and £190.8s.11d. to J Bryce for joiner work, the difference paid for necessary extra work not in the contract.

[248] ibid. 259-261. Apart from the east gable wall (pointed during Salmon's restoration), the walls of the church, especially the west front and Salmon's turrets, were in need of pointing. However, the roofs (apart from that of the south aisle which required reslating) were in a good state of repair. A second report was read from Mr James Gillespie, on the state of the walls and roofs.

[249] ibid. 262.

[250] ibid. 263.

[251] ibid. 264-266. Davidson agreed with Gillespie on the need for pointing the walls, but suggested that it would be more economical to have the slates all lifted and re-nailed, as well as the repair and replacement of certain rones and gutters, all at a cost of £209.

[252] ibid. 268.

[253] ibid. 270.

[254] ibid. 271.

[255] ibid. 274-275; The west corner of the south aisle was yet to be pointed at a cost of £20. William Gillespie & Son concluded the contract by cleaning and pointing the south west corner of the abbey for £7.10s.

[256] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, IX for several reports on Rowand Anderson's lecture to the Glasgow Archeological Society, 16 March, 1882. Unfortunately, despite the intentions of the Society to publish Anderson's lectures in full in its Transactions, this appears not to have been carried out.

[257] McKinstry, Rowand Anderson, 97, for the sum offered by Bute was £1000.

[258] see GH, 27/3/1882. The correspondent was of the opinion that Semple was right on the antiquity of The Place.

[259] McKinstry, Rowand Anderson, 141. Anderson now called himself Rowand Anderson since adopting his mother's maiden name around 1879.

[260] Kirk Session Records, 1880-92. Gentles had been honoured with the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity on 15/3/1897 by the University of Aberdeen.

[261] Stirling Maxwell was to play a major part in the drama which preceded the final phase in the restoration of the abbey.

[262] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 297.

[263] ibid. 304; see also PRFG, 20/7/1889, 5.

[264] Gourlay Coll. He wrote "that in St Mirren's chapel there is now the Sicilian marble cross slab which was not *able to withstand* the external exposure; and when it was brought inside and covered over had to be rechiselled." note 28/3/1910; see also Ecclesistical Buildings, SRO/HR.778/15/1, Superintending Committee Meeting of 8/11/1905, 2.

[265] RCHAMS, Argyll, "Iona", IV. 123, 137, 152, 179, 245, and 252. At Iona Anderson removed much rubbish and fallen walls from the cloister court, and from the nave and ambulatory, which made them more noticeable. Although some exciting discoveries were made, no significant artefacts were found. In 1909 the restoration of the nave at Iona was undertaken by Peter MacGregor Chalmers, who was to succeed Anderson as the architect for the final phase of the restoration of Paisley Abbey, which began in 1912.

[266] McKinstry, Rowand Anderson, 122-123. Anderson also did work at Jedburgh Abbey in the 1870s for the Marquis of Lothian (ibid. 189-190), and in 1886 he again carried out work for the Marquis by doing a feasibility study for a proposed restoration of Holyrood Abbey for Queen Victoria's Jubilee, but unfortunately this work was never carried out. ibid. 220-228.

[267] ibid. 225.

[268] ibid. 228. R S Lorimer, who was eventually to complete the restoration of Paisley Abbey, was Anderson's chief draughtsman on the restoration of Dunblane.

[269] Howell, Paisley Abbey, and of this sum Gentles had already raised £20,000. £10,000 had already been contributed by the congregation, and £6,935 was provided by eleven of the Heritors, but it is unclear who donated the remainder.

[270] Gourlay Coll, note 9/6/1914.

[271] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, VIII.

[272] As noted earlier, these walls were composed of a large number of dressed and moulded stone, some of which included portions of vaulting ribs and window tracery, which probably belonged to the choir and/or the north transept.

[273] see Gourlay Coll, "The three pillars of the tower were all originally bedded on gravel, but not the fourth which gave way and caused the fall of the tower", note 9/6/1914. Gourlay had inspected and collected specimens of this red gravel and obviously considered that it was strong enough to support the crossing piers.

[274] ibid. "The site was a branch or side-by-wash (tributary) for the river, and it got silted up. They built [the north wall of the choir] directly on this silt and building cracked in consequence." note 4/9/1914. Therefore Chalmers "... had to take the old choir wall down to the clay rubble and in most parts to the actual underlying gravel. The old wall had been so long exposed that this was the only way to do it." note 9/6/1914; see also note 24/3/1913. 4, "all east of the tower is fine sand".

[225] ibid. "Mr Murray said that he did find the founds of the south east and north east piers of Paisley Abbey central tower." note 30/6/1916.

[276] ibid. "The founds of the north east pier was of rubble embedded in clay only, and there was distinct evidence that it had sunk five feet down and did not rest on the gravel." note 30/6/1916.

[277] ibid. note 30/6/1916; "The south west pier had gone off the plumb during construction by ten inches, this was probably the way the mason work had been done, for Mr Murray, the Clerk of Works, was a mason and (it would seem) masons have ways of filling in spalls when anything goes off the plumb." "In 1895, Rowand Anderson took down walls at the east end. When the south-west pier was freed from the wall between the crossing piers, it came back to the vertical." ibid. note 30/6/1916.

[278] ibid. report on visit of the Ecclesiological Society to Paisley Abbey, 26/8/1908; see also Chalmers, "Paisley Abbey".

[279] ibid. page 4 notes 24/3/1913.

[280] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, II, 152.

[281] Gourlay, 30/6/1916; the description of these two grave stones fits the two which are to be found lying in the north cloister walk; see also Ross, "Sculptures in St Mirren's Chapel", 64-66. In the restored cloister there is part of a third grave slab, which has so far gone unmentioned.

[282] Gourlay Coll, "Paisley tower is a very heavy, one bay = 40ft." note 20/9/1925.

[283] ibid. "Rowand Anderson should have carried his tower arch to the nave much higher and made it like Glasgow Cathedral. He has place his capitals just above the triforium spring, and carving at the junction has never been cut, it looks very awkward and patchy." note 20/9/1925.

[284] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 47.

[285] Gourlay Coll. "Apparently Rowand Anderson intended to vault the new choir of Paisley Abbey (in stone) for he started the west end of it next (the) tower, leaving the springer stones etc. in position. Of

course, he may never have intended to take this the whole length of the choir." note 12/6/1914.

[286] ibid. "Sir Rowand Anderson has built a wall over (the) arcading. But Chalmers says it should be with a chapel above and the upper part screened from the church. This I don't accept. GC." page 3 notes 24/3/1913.

[287] Sir John Stirling Maxwell Papers (Strathclyde Regional Archives) T-PM 122/1/27: letter from A M Maclean to Sir John Stirling Maxwell, 26/4/1912.

[288] McKinstry, Rowand Anderson, 287.

[289] Blythswood - like Lord Banff in his infamous quarrel with William Adam over the completion of Duff House - did not really understand the architect's craft, for he was apparently, more concerned with the financial aspects of the contract than with either the final appearance of the building or the architect's reputation.

[290] Slevin was the Hon. Treasurer to the Restoration Committee.

[291] JSM Papers, letter 4/3/1904.

[292] ibid.

[293] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO/HR.778/15/1, Heritors' Superintending Committee Report 6 June 1903, 3-7.

[294] These "differences" he had already experienced with the Board of Manufactures over his restoration of Dunblane, already noted. But like his differences with the Board, those at Paisley were not entirely his fault either, for there is no doubt that the Restoration Committee did not fully appreciate just what problems he was up against, just as the Board of Manufactures at Dunblane had failed to fully grasp what he had set out to achieve at Dunblane.

[295] But, over relatively minor matters like his unwavering opposition to the placing of brass plaques on walls.

[296] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO/HR.778/15/1, 31/7/1902, 5-9.

[297] ibid. 10. Abercrombie advised the members that some parts of the masonry were dangerous and required immediate attention, that two parts of the triforium needed rebuilding, and that the nave required much pointing. He also wrote that the small cluster columns of wood above the clerestory should be replaced by masonry similar to that at the tower. The north clerestory walk should be floored in granolithic paving like that to the south, the lath and plaster in the triforium galleries should be covered with sloped staging, and the galleries cleaned out.

[298] ibid. 5-8, and 9; Abercrombie's work included the taking down some of the clustered columns over the clerestory and replacing them with stone copies, as well as beginning the external pointing of the north wall. The Heritors had previously agreed to this work being carried out; and the lead gutters and some rones required remedial work. A positive sign was the good condition of the roof timbers, but he did suggest that a proper access should be made to the roof. As he could not cost the work required he suggested that it could be in excess of £500.

[299] ibid. 27/4/1903, 1-3.

[300] ibid. Heritors' Meeting, 8/11/1905, 2-10.

[301] ibid. Meeting of Superintending Committee, 1/1905,3.

CHAPTER 5 : NOTES AND REFERENCES.

[1] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1903-1911, 259, 2/5/1910.

[2] JSM Papers, letter from A M Mclean 7/3/1911.

[3] KS Records (1903-11), 280, 14/11/1910.

[4] JSM Papers, letter from A M Maclean 1/1/1911.

[5] ibid. letter 7/3/1911; Stirling Maxwell had been chairman of the Building Committee for the previous restoration under Dr Gentles 1898-1907.

[6] ibid. letter 7/3/1911.

[7] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1911-1918, see letter from J Stewart Clark 6/1/1912, 20-21.

[8] ibid. see letter from Rob Allison 13/1/1912, 33-34.

[9] ibid. see letter from A F Craig 12/1/1912, 32-33.

[10] ibid. letter from Maclean to Stirling Maxwell, 16/1/1912.

[11] Rt Rev James Cameron Lees was a former minister of the abbey and now Dean of the Thistle and Chapel Royal.

[12] Maclean, Abbey Restoration, 27.

[13] ibid. 33.

[14] KS Records (1911-1918), 31-32;

[15] T D Laird, as well as being the Heritors' Clerk, was also the Paisley Burgh Prosecutor for number of years. He had been a member of the Abbey Parish since 1910, an Elder for forty years, and latterly Session Clerk. He was in this post for thirty years and only resigned just before his death in January 1960.

[16] The firm is still in existence but is now known as Walker, Laird, Herron and Harper.

[17] Ecclesistical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1 letter from Sir John Stirling Maxwell 17/5/1912 to T D

Laird Sec. of Heritors' Superintending Committee.

[18] PA Papers.

[19] KS Records (1911-1918), copy of agreement between Chalmers and Kirk Session 63-68.

[20] It is more than likely that this last clause was inserted into the agreement because the minister and the Kirk Session were determined at all costs to avoid the experience of such disputes which arose during the previous restoration, and which effectively resulted in the "*black balling*" of Sir Rowand Anderson.

[21] see Gourlay Coll, newspaper report 22/1/1912.

[22] The Superintending Committee was in effect a general management committee which dealt with all matters pertaining to the fabric of the abbey.

[23] Gourlay Coll, see GH 23/10/1912.

[24] KS Records (1911-1918) op.cit. 42.

[25] ibid. 42; "necessary to protect their own interests..", and those of the lair holders, since the choir was effectively a graveyard.

[26] ibid. 42.

[27] ibid. 43.

[28] ibid. 42 & 43.

[29] ibid. letter from Chalmers 18/3/1912, 53-54.

[30] ibid. letter from Maclean to Laird 25/3/1912, 53-58.

[31] ibid. 56.

[32] ibid. letter from Laird 5/8/1912, 94. The Heritors, however, did not finally grant approval for the excavation for another five months (on 5 August, 1912) when they wrote to the minister that "the Heritors Committee agreed with reference to your letter of 25 March last to grant leave to the Restoration Committee to make excavations and other preliminary investigations to enable the necessary plans to be prepared, reserving their decision until the final plans are submitted for their consideration and approval."

[33] ibid. letter to Laird, 56.

[34] Houston Papers, Srathclyde Regional Archives: TD 263/303.

[35] W. G. Black, A Handbook of the Parochial and Ecclesiastical Law of Scotland, (Edinburgh, W Green, 1888), 27.

[36] ibid. 37.

[37] The Church of Scotland Trustees, copy 6/4/1906.

[38] JSM Papers, letter to Maclean of 14/2/1912.

[39] ibid. letter to Maclean of 29/3/1912.

[40] Ecclesistical Buildings, HR.778/15/1, 6/7/1899.

[41] ibid. 14/3/1904.

[42] JSM Papers op.cit. letter from R Slevin to Rowand Anderson, 14/3/1904.

[43] ibid. letter to Maclean, 29/3/1912.

[44] ibid. letter to Stirling Maxwell, 10/2/1912.

[45] Gomme and Walker, Buildings of Glasgow, 67.

[46] JSM Papers, letter to JSM 10/2/1912.

[47] ibid. letter to Maclean, 14/2/1912.

[48] PA Papers - Rowand Anderson correspondence. letter to Maclean, 29/5/1912.

[49] ibid. letter to Maclean 19/6/1912.

[50] see McKinstry, Rowand Anderson, chap V; Indeed, two architects wrote to the newspapers applauding Anderson's reputation, one even asking why he had not been re-employed to complete the restoration that he had begun, see GH 23/1/1912.

[51] JSM Papers, letter from Anderson to Stirling Maxwell, 9/1/1912.

[52] There is no extant copy of Anderson's letter to Maclean, but it is likely that he would probably have reminded the minister of his considerable achievements at Paisley. There is no doubt that he would have wished to see its completion, and saw

his replacement by Chalmers or another architect, as "*a great personal disappointment.*"

[53] Since Stewart Clark had served on the previous Restoration Committee, and was party to the 1904 agreement. Anderson may have thought that Clark would have preferred him as the architect.

[54] ibid. copy of letter from Stewart Clark 12/1/1912.

[55] ibid. letter from Anderson to JSM 15/1/1912.

[56] ibid. letter from Maclean to JSM 16/1/1912.

[57] Arthur Forman Balfour Paul was a pupil of Rowand Anderson 1892-1897, an assistant 1897-1899, and became a partner in 1904, Sam McKinstry, Rowand Anderson : the Premier Architect of Scotland, (Edinburgh, EUP, 1991); and see also entry in Filstead, Directory of British Architects, 695-696.

[58] Gomme & Walker, Buildings of Glasgow, 169-170.

[59] see obit P. MacGregor Chalmers, AJ 29/3/1922, 458; see also JRIBA, XXIX (1921-1922), 440, and THE BUILDER, 24/3/1922, 436.

[60] JSM Papers, letter to Maclean 14/2/1912.

[61] ibid. letter from Maclean to JSM 16/1/1912.

[62] ibid. 16/1/1912.

[63] ibid. 16/1/1912.

[64] ibid. 16/1/1912; Of course, in saying this he was deliberately ignoring the fact that he already had a set of plans available for use, namely Anderson's, which had been drawn up long before MacGregor Chalmers was invited in 1911 to draw up tentative plans and estimates for himself and the Kirk Session.

[65] ibid. 16/1/1912.

[66] ibid. letter from Maclean to Stirling Maxwell, 16/1/1912.

[67] KS Records (1911-1918), letter from Chalmers to Maclean, 51-52.

[68] ibid. It is obvious that Gourlay was aware of

what Rowand Anderson had said regarding the original choir buttresses, for he had a copy of a newspaper article from the PRFG of 22/4/1899 on Rowand Anderson's restoration at the abbey, so was obviously determined to check this for himself at the first opportunity, see also notes 28/3/1910, 4/9/1914.

[69] ibid. Gourlay actually gives three different measurements for the width of the old buttresses:-2ft 5ins on 9/6/1914; 2ft 3ins on 4/9/1914 and 2ft 6ins x 4ft on 30/6/1916. The slight difference in each measurement suggests a slip of the pen rather than professional carelessness.

[70] ibid. Professor Gourlay may have mentioned Bothwell Parish Church here as a point of comparison with Paisley, perhaps because Rowand Anderson had previously restored the choir, adding a new nave and western tower in 1898.

[71] PA Papers, see RRA's report to Gentles of his scheme for the restoration of Paisley Abbey, 21/1/1898.

[72] McKinstry, Rowand Anderson, 302.

[73] PA Papers, Letter from the Session Clerk in January 1931 to solictors, Niven & McNiven, engaged by Mrs Chalmers.

[74] JSM Papers op.cit. letter to Maclean 3/2/1912.

[75] ibid. 14/2/1912.

[76] It must be pointed out that since MacGregor Chalmers had begun his practice in 1887, at the youthful age of twenty-nine, twenty-four years had passed. In that time he had either built or did work on no less than forty-four churches, and churches which were not lacking in either grace or dignity, whilst Lorimer's considerable reputation as an architect (despite his acclaimed Thistle Chapel, his first ecclesiastical commission), rested on his astute restorations of, and additions to, large country houses.

[77] Ecclesistical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1 op.cit. letter from Maclean to Laird, 3/6/1912.

[78] Gourlay Coll, note 19/5/1916.

[79] JSM Papers, letter from Maclean 28/2/1912.

[80] ibid. The scheme which Chalmers had adopted for his restoration of Holy Trinity, St Andrews, was simmply to reproduce, as far as was possible, the medieval plan of the church [plates 187a & b]. The post-Reformation galleries of the old church were removed and the side aisles reduced to their original height. The nave arcading resumed its old place and form, and then the clerestory was rebuilt. A new aisle was introduced to the east of the bishop's aisle, and the porch was rebuilt on its former foundations. The tracery of the windows and the moulds and decorations of the doors were in keeping with the suggestions obtained from churches contemporary with Holy Trinity.

[81] JSM Papers op.cit. letter to Stirling Maxwell, 28/2/1912.

[82] The Bailie, 10/9/1919.

[83] Peter Savage, Lorimer and the Edinburgh Craft Designers, (Edinburgh, Harris, 1980), 88.

[84] JSM Papers, letter from Maclean, 28/2/1912.

[85] ibid. letter to Maclean 14/2/1912.

[86] Gourlay Coll, note 25/5/1915

[87] The Hon Sir Schomberg McDonnell GCVO. KCB. CVO. fifth son of the earl of Antrim, had been Sec. HM Office of Works since 1902 - Who'S Who, 1912.

[88] JSM Papers, letter from McDonnell, 1/2/1912.

[89] David Alexander Edward Lindsay, Lord Balcarres, eldest son of the earl of Crawford, was MP for Chorley, Lancs. As well as being a Trustee of the National Portrait Gallery, he was also Hon. Secretary of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. Balcarres was also the author of books on Donatello [1903] and Italian sculpture [1910], Who's Who, 1912.

[90] JSM Papers, letter from Balcarres, 1/2/1912.

[91] M R James, former Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum, had been Provost of King's College Cambridge since 1905. James, as well as being a learned theologian and acknowledged bibliographer. He was the author of several books and articles on the Old and New Testaments, and had catalogued a number of very important MSS including several Cambridge Colleges, as well as that of the Fitzwilliam Museum. James also

wrote on medieval art and architecture, namely on the sculptures in the Lady Chapel, at Ely Cathedral, 1895; two essays on the abbey of St Edmund at Bury, 1895; the sculptures in the Bauchon Chapel, Norwich Cathedral 1908, and was the author of several books on medieval architecture, Who's Who op.cit. He was also a renowned writer of ghost stories.

[92] JSM Papers, letter from James to Stirling Maxwell, 11/6/1912. "I did see the church at St Andrews and I did think very well of it the way in which the very extensive restoration had been carried out. But I do not feel," he continued, "that the image which has remained in my mind is clear ever to justify me in giving a reserved opinion. My impression is that the man who did that work is capable of handling a job of the magnitude you indicate."

[93] ibid. Coats, another of the Heritors, was feeling anxious regarding the appointment of the architect to restore the abbey, and was keen that the Heritors should seek opinions favourable to Chalmers just to ensure that the Kirk Session had made the right decision; letter from Coats, 21/6/1912.

[94] It was later written of MacGregor Chalmers' work at Iona that "..... his repair and reproduction of the original features of the historic structure, together with his knowledge of ancient ecclesiastical architecture, combined with his technical skill, enabled him to restore the dignified simplicity of the ancient building." P. MacGregor Chalmers, obit. JRIBA, XXIX (1921-22), 440. His work at Iona also "... involved the design of a new west front, of considerable merit." "Iona," 27. Though such assessments were made in retrospect, they still support what Lady Balfour said to Glen Coats about MacGregor Chalmers' work at Iona, as well as showing that his work there, was more successful than he has often been given credit for. They also contradict the even later judgement that Chalmers's restoration work at Iona was "rather over-thorough". Gray A. Stuart et al. Edwardian Architecture : a BiographicaL Dictionary, (London, Duckworth, 1985), 139.

[95] JSM Papers, letter from Coats 21/6/1912.

[96] ibid. letter from 26/4/1912.

[97] Semple, Scrapbook of Antiquities, I, 220.

[98] JSM Papers, letter from Maclean 26/4/1912.

[99] Before the First World War there was a reasonable support for Home Rule throughout Scotland, as was the case in Ireland, though the Establishment was against it. Indeed, as early as 1886 a branch of the Scottish Home Rule Association was established in Paisley. Paisley, however, has a more radical past, for some of its citizens, had been active in the Rising of 1820. Even though it is eighty-two years since the Rev A M Mclean made his statement, there is still a strong desire among many Scots for Home Rule.

[100] JSM Papers, letter to Maclean, 1/5/1912.

[101] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1, letter from A M Maclean to T D Laird of 3/6/1912.

[102] ibid.

[103] ibid. Rev Prof Herkless wrote that in view of his highly successful restoration of Holy Trinity, St Andrews, they were wise in taking him as their architect for the restoration of Paisley; the Rt Rev Alex Stewart, another Iona Trustee, and Principal of St Mary's College, St Andrews, said that he did splendid work at both Iona and St Andrews; the Rev Patrick Playfair, Minister of Holy Trinity Church, St Andrews, considered the restoration of his church to be a great success.
The minister also sought the opinions of the Very Rev Mitford Mitchell, ex-Moderator of the General Assembly, and the ministers of Glasgow Cathedral and St Giles, both of whom were Iona Trustees, and each responded positively on MacGregor Chalmers's qualifications as an architect.

[104] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1, letter to Laird 3/6/1912, par 9 of opinions on Peter MacGregor Chalmers.

[105] ibid.

[106] JSM Papers, letter from A M Maclean, 26/4/1912.

[107] ibid. letter to A H Spiers, 27/4/1912.

[108] ibid. letter from A M Maclean, 26/4/1912.

[109] PA Papers.

[110] JSM Papers, letter from A M Maclean, 26/4/1912.

[111] ibid. copy letter from R R Anderson to J Stewart

Clark of 12/1/1912.

[112] ibid. letter from A H Spiers, 23/4/1912.

[113] ibid. letter to Spiers of 27/4/1912.

[114] ibid.

[115] ibid. letter from Spiers, 30/4/1912.

[116] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1, letter from Sir John Stirling Maxwell to T D Laird, 17/5/1912.

[117] ibid.

[118] ibid.

[119] ibid. memo from JSM T D Laird, 17/5/1912.

[120] ibid. letter from A M Maclean, 26/4/1912.

[121] ibid. letter from T D Laird, 20/5/1912.

[122] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1 op.cit. memo of JSM 17/5/1912.

[123] JSM Papers, letter to T D Laird, 23/5/1912.

[124] ibid. letter from T D Laird to A M Maclean, 29/5/1912.

[125] ibid. letter from T D Laird to the Office of Works, 29/5/1912.

[126] ibid. letter from Office of Works, 6/12/1912.

[127] ibid. letter from T D Laird, 7/6/1912.

[128] ibid.

[129] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1, letter from Sir John Stirling Maxwell to T D Laird, 23/5/1912.

[130] KS Records (1911-1918), 81-85, letter from T D Laird to donors, 15/6/1912.

[131] He mentioned proposed legislation that the Office of Works would in the future have to be consulted before any major work of restoration was carried out either at Paisley, or elsewhere. (Since this did not immediately affect the restoration work being planned at Paisley, there appears to be no

real reason for his mentioning it, apart from the fact that he was merely repeating what Stirling Maxwell had written to him.)

[132] ibid. letter to donors, 15/6/1912.

[133] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1, letter from donors to T D Laird, 20/6/1912.

[134] ibid. letter from Sir John Stirling Maxwell to Laird, 17/5/1912.

[135] JSM Papers, letter from Laird, 25/6/1912.

[136] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1, letter A M Maclean to T D Laird, 28/6/1912.

[137] JSM Papers, letter from Laird, 13/7/1912.

[138] Ecclesiastical Buildings, SRO HR.778/15/1, letter from T D Laird to donors, 13/7/1912.

[139] ibid. letter from donors to Laird, 24/7/1912.

[140] JSM Papers, letter with accompanying memo from Laird, 4/7/1912.

[141] ibid. letter from Bine Renshaw, 20/6/1912.

[142] ibid. memo from Laird, 4/7/1912

[143] Lees, Paisley, 339.

[144] Heritors' Committee, 1830-90, 29/5/1890. They more or less took it upon themselves to dictate the style of any stained glass window placed in the church. They naturally assumed it as their right, as Heritors and not on account of any knowledge of the art of stained glass, to make such valued judgements. Because some of the members of the Heritors' Superintending Committee felt they needed expert advice on such matters, the Heritors eventually appointed Rowand Anderson, the architect, as consultant on all matters relating to stained glass on 23/1/1890. The motion was introduced by G L Houston of Johnstone and seconded by the Rev Thomas Gentles; and no doubt Anderson through his appointment would have come to know some of the most influential among the Heritors.

[145] JSM Papers, letter from A H Spiers, 23/4/1912.

[146] ibid. letter from Shaw Stewart, 16/6/1912.

[147] ibid. letter from T D Laird, 4/7/1912.

[148] PA Papers, letter from Rowand Anderson to A M Maclean, 31/7/1912.

[149] ibid. Anderson to Maclean, 29/5/1912.

[150] ibid. Anderson to Maclean, 19/6/1912.

[151] ibid. letter from Dr Gentles to Sir John Stirling Maxwell, 20/6/1900; see also letter from Gentles to G L Houston of Johnstone, 4/5/1898, Houston PAPERS, where the minister actually lists the amount each principal donor had promised towards the Restoration Fund. Subsequently, Houston offered 200 guineas toward the Fund; see letter from Gentles to Houston, 7/5/1898, ibid.

[152] PA Papers, letter from Gentles to Sir John Stirling Maxwell, 20/6/1900.

[153] ibid. letter from Gentles to Sir John, 6/7/1900.

[154] KS Records (1911-1918), 94-95, 5/8/1912.

[155] ibid. 53-54, 18/3/1912.

[156] Gourlay Coll, It was J J Waddell who said that Chalmers got the idea from Bond's Gothic Architecture, note 7/5/1915.

[157] ibid. newspaper report of 4/10/1913.

[158] ibid. note 7/5/1915

[159] ibid. note 25/5/1915.

[160] ibid. note 19/5/1916.

[161] KS Records (1911-1918), 133.

[162] Gourlay Coll, newspaper report 4/10/1913.

[163] ibid. newspaper report 16/10/1913.

[164] ibid. newspaper report 16/10/1913.

[165] ibid. newspaper report 16/10/1913.

[166] ibid. note 14/4/1915.

[167] ibid. notes of 9/6/1915 and 14/4/1915.

[168] ibid. newspaper report 24/5/1913.

[169] PRFG, 11/6/1913.

[170] Gourlay Coll, newspaper report 14/7/1913.

[171] ibid. newspaper report 31/10/1913. Photographs of this momentous occasion appeared in several newspapers, including the English DAILY MIRROR of 1 November, 1913.

[172] ibid. newspaper report 4/10/1913.

[173] PA Papers, Chalmers report 17/12/1910. In the first instance, he would have to lower the level of cloister court (which he considered was 18" higher than the original), and remove the heating chamber, forming a new one in the basement of the proposed new entrance hall in the north block of The Place. Then, the north walk of the cloister would be reconstructed on its original site, and be joined to part of the east cloister walk. The new 1914 door afforded access to the adjoining seventeenth century block, which occupies part of the site of the chapter house.

[174] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 58.

[175] Gourlay Coll, James Young may have been emulating his predecessors for his work was "full of irregularities like old work." note 4/9/1914.

[176] PA Papers, page 10 report of committee of Kirk Session to solicitors acting on behalf of Mrs Chalmers, with accompanying letter of 10/12/1930.

[177] Nikolaus Pevsner, "Northumberland", The Buildings of England, (London, Penguin Books, 1979), 33, maintains that the water-leaf motif is typical of the Transitional period between Norman and Early English.

[178] There is another possibility, perhaps the columns could have been reversed: polygonal/round, and round/polygonal.

[179] Gourlay Coll, "The entasis is of 1/8in. or fully 1/16in. on columns of new cloister at Paisley Abbey. In fact, they taper from 5.5ins. to 4.75 ins., length 3ft 8ins. or 3ft 10ins." note 9/6/1914.

[180] ibid: the professor suggested that there was "too much taper on the columns of the new cloister at

Paisley because both ends were bigger in diameter than the old capitals." note 28/4/1916; and which a close examination will verify.

[181] ibid. "they found a base which is believed to be part of the old cloister and this base has not so large a diameter at the top as the new columns have - entasis appears to me to rather great." note 28/4/1916.

[182] ibid. note 8/9/1915.

[183] ibid. "When renewing the cloister at Paisley Abbey Mr Campbell told me that Mr MacGregor Chalmers found three graves one of which had a stone coffin which was an important question (St Somebody or other I think). The places where these were found were to have been marked with a cross but nothing has yet been done." note 6/8/1917.

[184] GH 30/7/1915.

[185] The choir at Paisley, which is 129ft long, is almost as long as the nave of Dunblane Cathedral.

[186] Gourlay Coll, newspaper report 5/5/1916.

[187] ibid. notes 4/9/1914 and 30/6/1916.

[188] ibid. note 30/6/1916.

[189] ibid. note 30/6/1916.

[190] ibid. note 8/8/1916.

[191] The CONTRACT REPORTER stated that Anderson "and his assistants had been engaged in making very careful examinations to ascertain as to the stability of the foundations throughout the choir, and also of the four piers which carried the central tower of the abbey. All these were found in a satis factory condition. The foundations of the choir were discovered on both sides to consist of massive masonry of the most stable character 8 to 9ft in depth, and capable, in the opinion of the architect, of carrying any possible weight. The foundations of the piers also showed a good basis, part being of solid rock." Gourlay Coll. 24/9/1898.

[192] Gourlay Coll, 4/9/1914 and 7/5/1915.

[193] ibid. Professor Gourlay had inspected the lime - he had a piece of it - and was satisfied that it was perfectly hard and good. He also inspected the

reddish gravel, and had scraps of that too, upon which the church was built. note 9/6/1914. The pieces of lime and gravel are still among his papers.

[194] ibid. note 9/6/1914.

[195] ibid. note 9/6/1914.

[196] ibid. note 10/5/1924.

[197] ibid. note 6/9/1915.

[198] ibid. note 13/6/1918.

[199] PDE, 30/5/1918.

[200] KS Records (1911-1918), 163 of 9/11/1914 notes that Rev Maclean was now an army padre; see Gourlay Coll, newspaper report 31/10/1917.

[201] PDE, 30/5/1918.

[202] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1918-1925, letter from P MacGregor Chalmers to Kirk Session, 126.

[203] ibid. letter from Chalmers to Kirk Session of 8/2/1922, 132.

[204] PA Papers, letter from Sir Reginald Blomfield of 22/9/1922; Blomfield actually designed four sizes of cross: (1) 15 ft 6 ins; (2) 19ft; (3) 24 ft; and (4) 28 ft.

[205] In 1920 Glasgow University had conferred the honorary degree of LLD on Peter MacGregor Chalmers.

[206] "It is fitting," said Howell, "that some grateful acknowledgement of all we owe to this great master should be made from this pulpit today. No one could be better fitted than Dr Chalmers was for this great task of the restoration of the abbey. He was of the noble line of the craftsman of the age of faith. Not only had he all the requisite technical knowledge and skill he had also the necessary religious instinct and spirit. Ever a loyal churchman he had an intense devout mind and a high sense of Christian stewardship in the exercise of his splendid gifts. He had undoubted genius; and he possessed the artistic quality the sheer love and enthusiasm for beauty even to the smallest detail that are characteristic of the great days of Christian architecture. His work

will survive to the far distant future. His influence will still live in the enduring monuments his genius has erected. The Church of Scotland has special reason to be grateful to him. To him more than any living man we owe the great renaissance the last thirty years have witnessed in the beauty and dignity of our church fabrics. May I also add how sincerely and with what profound sympathy we feel for Mrs Chalmers in her terrible bereavement. A great Christian architect - some would call him - has gone hence, a brilliant exponent of a noble art and an outsdanding gift of God to his day and generation." KS Records (1918-1925), 144-145, 19/3/1922.

[207] PA Papers - Auditor's Report of 31/12/1922, signed H MacRobert CA, auditor, 9/3/1923.

[208] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 49.

[209] KS Records (1918-1925), letter from Sir Robert Lorimer of 29/1/1924, 219-221.

[210] ibid. letter from Niven McNiven & Co. solicitors acting on behalf of Mrs Chalmers to J Gardner, Secretary of the Restoration Committee, 27/2/1930.

[211] PA Papers, letter of 8/5/1930 to solicitors acting on behalf of Mrs Chalmers.

[212] ibid. newspaper report 27/8/1923.

[213] D M Walker.

[214] Ecclesistical Buildings, SRO.HR.778/15/2 29/3/1923.

[215] ibid.

[216] ibid.

[217] ibid.

[218] KS Records (1918-1925), 218, 24/1/1924.

[219] ibid. letter from Sir Robert Lorimer 29/1/1924, 220.

[220] ibid. 221.

[221] Gourlay Coll, note 18/8/1924.

[222] see note 18.

[223] Gourlay Coll, note 13/6/1918.

[224] Unfortunately, none of Chalmers' working drawings for his vaulted ceiling are extant, but there is no doubt that Charles Gourlay did have sight of them during his many site visits, as his notes indicate.

[225] Gourlay Coll, note 8/8/1916.

[226] ibid. note 8/8/1916.

[227] ibid. note 19/5/1916.

[228] ibid. "Mr Murray, Clerk of Works at Paisley Abbey sacristy, means to make the arches unequal so as to keep the ridge straight. P MacGregor Chalmers did not know what to do with this when it was first broached to him." note 6/1/1915.

[229] ibid. note 6/1/1915.

[230] ibid. note 14/4/1915.

[231] David M Walker, see also Gourlay Coll, note 6/4/1926.

[232] Gourlay Coll, note 1/7/1925.

[233] ibid. undated note.

[234] ibid. note 6/4/1926.

[235] ibid. note 10/5/1924.

[236] ibid. note 1/7/1928.

[237] ibid. note 6/4/1926.

[238] ibid. note 6/4/1926.

[239] ibid. note 18/8/1924.

[240] ibid. note 6/4/1926.

[241] ibid. note 6/4/1926.

[242] ibid. note 10/9/1925.

[243] ibid. note 6/4/1926.

[244] ibid. note 10/9/1925.

[245] ibid. undated note.

[246] ibid. Gourlay wrote that "Lance Harrison, carver, was at all my lectures with some others of the Paisley Abbey job. He learned far more than he did at George Bond's lectures in London. He was employed at Liverpool Cathedral, but the quality of the work at Paisley is much higher," Gourlay maintained; see note 1/7/1925.

[247] ibid. note 10/5/1924.

[248] PA Papers, letter from Peter MacGregor Chalmers 22/10/1913; see also vol II, appendix iii.

[249] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 51.

[250] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1933, 203.

[251] Gourlay Coll, note 6/4/1926.

[252] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1925-1930, letter from Miss Robina Clark to Sir John Stirling Maxwell of 6/7/1926, 34-36.

[253] ibid. 35.

[254] Dr Gentles had worked out a scheme of stained glass for the choir windows, see vol II, appendix iv: Rev A. R. Howell was to do likewise, see vol II, appendix v.

[255] PDE, 30/5/1918.

[256] Savage, Lorimer and the Edinburgh Craft Designers, 86, see also 163. W and A Clow were woodcarvers who set up shop in 1891. They were introduced to Lorimer in 1892. They went on to work exclusively for him. The Thistle Chapel Stalls was their first big commission. They were something of linguists and scholars, totally absorbed in their work. They took holidays in Europe only to measure and draw more details from buildings and museums. They achieved a virtuosity unsurpassed since the Middle Ages (Hussey) and often worked from plaster maquettes modelled by Deuchars, Hayes and latterly by Meredith-Williams and Pilkington Jackson.

[257] KS Records (1925-1930), see report of official opening of the Choir on Saturday 1/12/1928, 173-5.

[258] PA Papers, letter from Sir John Stirling Maxwell to Rev A. R. Howell, 12/2/1936.

[259] ibid. letter of 12/2/1936.

[260] PA Papers.

[261] KS Records (1956), 3, 30/1/1956: On 12 February, 1955 Bryce had produced a brief report outlining the difficulties involved in moving it to the choir, as some of the stones weighed over 15 cwts., so moving it safely in three weeks was an impossible task; see also 6-7, 17/2/1956.

[262] ibid. 14, 14/3/1956.

[263] ibid. 40 19/9/1956.

[264] This replaced an earlier one of bronze designed in 1902 by J Craig-Barr, architect, Paisley.

[265] The pulpit was presented to the abbey by Mrs James McKean, in memory of her late husband and his sisters.

[266] Both Maclean and MacGregor Chalmers had intended this, but obviously it was never carried out.

[267] PA Papers, letter from W & J Taylor, Builders, 29/11/1930.

[268] The alterations included the infilling of the Abercorn vault with rubble and concrete in order to support a new floor at the original level. It appears that the then extant floor had been altered to accommodate the Abercorn burial vault. Paterson had also to re-arrange the carved retable stones

[269] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1956, 7, 14 & 16; and Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1957, 54 and 66.

[270] PA Papers, letter 24/4/1936.

[271] ibid.

[272] ibid. Dr Gentles' letters of 18/7/1900, 24/7/1900 and 5/12/1900.

[273] KS Records (1903-1911), 36-38; and see also 260.

[274] House numbers are still visible on the south east corner of the Place.

[275] KS Records (1903-1911), 48 & 50.

[276] ibid. 310.

[277] ibid. 45.

[278] ibid. 251. The committee consisted of the ministers, Dr Gentles and Mr Fulton, and Messrs Gourlay, Craig Snr., Barry, Lee, Harvey, and Jack, with Gentles as Convener. Gentles' convenership was rather short, as he died in May 1910.

[279] KS Records (1903-1911), 280.

[280] KS Records (1903-1911), 308.

[281] The dormer window with the wooden pediment (to the south-west of the south front of The Place) was to be restored in stone (this was not done until the 1930s). The built up windows in the ground floor would be re-opened and one new window would be built in the east gable, this also appears to have been carried out (again in the 1930s). He proposed removing the modern chimney stacks visible from the cloister side, to remove the sky-light window and form two new dormer windows, perhaps in the style of the south front. These were certainly not built; and there is no indication that the work needed to strengthen and repair the oak roof and wallheads of the south block was ever carried out.

[282] This was done by Lorimer, and also in the work carried out in the 1930s, perhaps acording to his suggestions.

[283] Gourlay Coll, note 7/5/1915.

[284] Despite its often being described as such, there is no evidence to suggest that this was the priest's room, but as the monastic strong room it would have been quite inaccessible to outsiders.

[285] KS Records (1903-1911) 13/2/1911, 308-309; see also PA Papers, Chalmers' report of 17/12/1910.

[286] KS Records (1911-1918) 19/10/1911, 5.

[287] ibid. 196.

[288] KS Records (1918-1925) 11/9/1922, 156-157, letter from Lorimer to Maclean of 30/5/1923; and letter from Maclean to Lorimer of October, 1923, 210.

[289] KS Records (1918-1925) letter from Maclean to Lorimer of October, 1923, 208-209.

[290] PA Papers, Abbey Club Report, undated.

[291] KS Records (1918-1925), Lorimer to A M Maclean, 12/6/1923, 208.

[292] KS Records (1918-1925), letter from Lorimer to Maclean of 2/6/1923, 209.

[293] In fact, that is why he had engaged the services of MacGregor Chalmers for the restoration of the choir and tower, for he saw consultation as a means to an end. Thus, by engaging Lorimer he hoped to find donors who would be willing to pay for the restoration of The Place, just as he had done for the restoration of the choir and tower.

[294] KS Records (1918-1925) letter from Maclean to Lorimer of October, 1923, 210.

[295] ibid. letter from Lorimer to Maclean 1/11/1923, 211.

[296] It is likely that this decision was made in view of the difficulties which arose on the appointment of Chalmers to complete the restoration of the church over Sir Rowand Anderson.

[297] KS Records (1925-1930) op.cit. 24/2/1923, 123.

[298] Howell, Paisley Abbey, 61.

[299] When the panelling in the first floor rooms was eventually removed in the 1930s, the stonework required much attention, which proved to be very expensive.

[300] R S LORIMER PAPERS, Edinburgh University Library, letter from Melville, Dundas and Whitson to Lorimer, Gen 1963/18/17b.

[301] ibid. Gen 1963/18/18a+b, 79B.

[302] RSL PAPERS op.cit. letter from Binnie, Murray and Hutton to Lorimer, Gen 1963/18/18 a+b-23/10/1928; Gen 1963/18/21a-c, 7/8/1928; and letter from Murray, Gen 1963/18/29b accepting offer of ferro-concrete flooring at cost price, 27/10/1928.

[303] RSL PAPERS op.cit. Gen 1963/18/20c+d - report from Binnie, Murray And Hutton to Lorimer, 5/7/1928.

[304] ibid. Gen 1963/18/341 letter to Lorimer from Henry S. Brown, Sec. of the Restoration Committee for The Place, 28/1/1928, Gen 1963/18/34a letter from Brown to Lorimer, 16/4/1929; & Gen 1963/18/46b+c letter from Binnie, Murray and Hutton to Lorimer, 8/7/1928. The rooms mentioned are the rooms where Lorimer left stonework exposed, they are now used as the abbey offices. see plates 218a & b.

[305] ibid. Gen 1963/18/34a+b, 16/4/1929, Gen 1963/18/37, 1/5/1928, and Gen 1963/18/40, 20/5/1929, letters from H S Brown to Lorimer; Lorimer rebuilt some of the steps at the bottom, as well as splicing up the outer wall of the stair with five or six inch rubble to secure it.

[306] ibid. T4/5 Gen 1963/52 Paisley Abbey, 1929: Statement from Binnie, Murray and Hutton of 15/7/1929.

[307] KS Records (1925-1930) op.cit. 216; also see obit. JRIBA VOL XXVI 3rd Series (1928-1929), 771, 21/9/1929.

[308] PA Papers, report Binnie, Murray and Hutton, 6/3/1931.

[309] ibid. letter from Binnie, Murray and Hutton, 5/6/1931.

[310] ibid. letter from Binnie, Murray and Hutton, 19/4/1933.

[311] ibid. account from Binnie, Murray and Hutton, 8/11/1933.

[312] ibid. see letter from Sir John Stirling Maxwell to Dr Guthrie Cooper, minister of the Abbey, on his plans for the restoration of two rooms in The Place, 25/4/1936.

[313] ibid. account from G & T Houston & Sons, Joiners, for work done on behalf of Sir John, 9/1/1935.

[314] ibid. account from Binnie, Murray and Hutton, 11/3/1935.

[315] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records (1956), 48.

[316] Rev W H Rogan was awarded an honorary DD in 1963 by Edinburgh University, his old Alma Mater.

[317] Newspaper report 25/4/1960.

[318] KS Records (1956), 50.

[319] ibid. 61.

[320] PDE, 2/12/1959.

[321] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records (1958), 145.

[322] Paisley Abbey Kirk Session Records 1959), 159.

[323] These are now the Church Officer's flat.

[324] see Collection of Plans and Drawings of James Steel Maitland held at Paisley Museum.

CHAPTER 6 : NOTES AND REFERENCES.

[1] Ross, Thomas "The west front of St Andrews", TSES 8 (1924-1927), 93-94; also see frontispiece.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Primary Sources (Unpublished).

Belfast.

Abercorn Papers (PRONI).

D.623/A/64/1-47 (1788): "Scottish Letters" to the the Earl from agents and others about the Scottish estate business, including a letter from Robert Boog enclosing sketches of plans of the abbey church at Paisley.

D.623/A/175/1-73 (1791): "Letters" to the Marquis from Scottish agents and others about estate business, including a report on Paisley Abbey.

Edinburgh.

Anderson, R Rowand — Sketch Books, 2 vols (NMRO).

Johnston, Charles S. — Collection of Masons' Marks, (Nat. Lib. MS.3726, 3727, 3728, 3729).

Anderson, R Rowand — Edinburgh Collection of Office Drawings, (Edinburgh Univ Lib Sp. Coll.)

Lorimer, Robert S — Lorimer Papers, Paisley Abbey,1939, T4/5. GEN 1963/2; and Paisley 1-49, Box Gen 1963/18, (Edinburgh Univ. Library, Sp. Coll).

Papers relating to Paisley Abbey.

Heritors and Kirk Session Minutes (SRO).
1785-1820, HR.778/1.

1819-1829, HR.778/2.

Heritors' Minutes (SRO).
1824-1836, HR.778/3.

1850-1890, HR.778/6.

Minute Book of Heritors' Committee 1830-1890 (SRO).
HR.778/6.

Cash Book (SRO).
1856-1896, HR.778/9.

Papers re-Ecclesiastical Buildings etc (SRO).
HR.778/15/1.

HR.778/15/2.
Papers re-Transference of Property to Church of Scotland General Trustees (SRO).

1927-1931, HR.778/16.

Accounts (SRO).
1715-1768, CH:2/490/1.

1775-1785, CH.2/490/2.

Accounts and Proclamations (SRO).
1795-1811, CH.2/490/3.

1811-1824, CH.2/490/4.

1824-1860, CH.2/490/5.

Cash Book (SRO).
1844-1876, CH.2/490/6.

1876-1899, CH.2/490/7.

1900-1927, CH.2/490/9.

Ledger (SRO).
1844-1866, CH.2/490/11.

1876-1879, CH.2/490/12.

1887-1899, CH.2/490/12.

1900-1919, CH.2/490/13.

Kirk Session Records (SRO).
1699-1706, CH.2/490/46.

1710-1775, CH.2/490/46.

1795-1828, CH.2/490/46.

1828-1854, CH/2/490/47.

1854-1880, CH/2/490/48.

1880-1892, CH.2/490/49.

1892-1903, CH.2.490/50.

Glasgow.

Gourlay, Prof Charles — Collection of Papers (Mitchell Library).

George L. Houston, of Johnstone Castle. — Houston Papers, Strathclyde Regional Archives - SRA/TD 263/303.

Maxwell, Sir John Stirling — Stirling Maxwell Papers, Strathclyde Regional Archives SRA/T-PM 122/1/1/27.

Records of Glasgow Institute of Architects (held by Secretary).

Paisley.

Paisley Abbey.

Abbey Papers, A Collection of various documents, including correspondence, reports and newspaper cuttings on the nineteenth-twentieth Restorations, and other aspects of Paisley Abbey, held at the abbey.

Heritors' Minutes.
1788-1802.

Kirk Session Records.
1903-1911.

1911-1918.

1918-1925.

1925-1930.

1931-1959.

Maitland, J. Steel — "Lecture on The Place of Paisley," to the Friends of Paisley Abbey, (Paisley, 1/12/1959).

Paisley.

Burgh Minutes (Paisley Library).

Boog, Robert — History of the Abbey of Paisley, (Paisley Library).

Semple, David S. — Scrapbook of Antiquities 1861-1873, 9 vols. (Paisley Library).

Semple, David S. — Local Works 1870-1878, (Paisley Library).

Semple, David S. — Local Memorabilia, (Paisley Library).

Semple, David S. — Old Houses, Families and Times of Paisley, 3 vols, (Paisley Library).

Semple, David S. — Index, 3 vols, (Paisley Library).

Semple, David S. — Index - W Crawfurd and W Semple, History of Renfrew, (Paisley Library).

Pamphlets : 39. (Paisley Library).

Russell, James Architect, 3 Mile House, Paisley. — Preserved Pencillings Delineated From Actual Measurements taken from Paisley Abbey, (Paisley Museum, 1829).

Rothesay.

Bute, Marquis of — Bute Papers, Mount Stuart.

Primary Sources (Published).

Anderson, Marjorie O. ed. — Scottish Chronicle - Chronicle of Holyrood, (Edinburgh, Scottish History Society, 1938).

Blair, F. C. Hunter- — Charters of the Abbey of Crossraguel, 2 vols (Edinburgh, AGAA, 1886).

Bain, Joseph and Rogers, Charles — Liber Protocollorum and Rental Book OF Glasgow Diocese, (London, Grampian Club, 1875).

Bannatyne, George ed. Ritchie, Tod — Bannatyne Memoriales, (Edinburgh, Blackwood, 1928-34).

Burns, Charles ed. — Calendar of Papal Letters to Scotland of Clement VII of Avignon, (Edinburgh, SHS, 1976).

Driscoll, Stephen T. — Glasgow Cathedral Excavations 1992-1993, (Glasgow, GUARD, 1993).

Duckett, G. F. — Charters and Records of the Ancient Abbey of Cluny 1077-1534, 2 vols, (Lewes, H. Wolff, 1888).

Dugdale, William ed. Caly et al. — Monasticon Anglicanum, (1665-1673), 6 vols in 8, VOL V, Cluniacs and Cistercians, (1817-1830).

Duncan, A. A. M. — Regesta Regum Scottorum, V (Edinburgh, EUP, 1993).

Dunlop, Annie I. — Apostolic Camera and Scottish Benefices 1418-1488, (London, OUP, 1934).

Dunlop, Annie I. — Calendar of Supplications Relating to Scotland from Rome 1418-1422, I (Edinburgh, SHS 3rd Series, 1934).

Dunlop, Annie I. — Calendar of Supplications Relating to Scotland from Rome 1423-1428, II (Edinburgh, SHS 3rd Series, 1956).

Dunlop, Annie I. and Cowan, I. B. — Calendar of Supplications to Rome 1428-1432, III (Edinburgh, SHS, 1970).

Dunlop, Annie I. and Maclaughlan, D. — Calendar of Supplications to Rome 1433-1477, IV (Glasgow, GUP, 1983).

Durkan, John and Ross, Anthony — Early Scottish Libraries, (Glasgow, Burns, 1961).

Glasgow University Dept. Scottish Hist. — Calendar of Supplications to Rome, (Glasgow University, unpublished).

Gordon, J. F. S. — Monasticon, I (Glasgow, John Tweed, 1868).

Hector, William — Judicial Records of Renfrewshire, 2 Series (Paisley, J & J Cook, 1876-78).

Innes, Cosmo and Brichan, James B. — Origines Parochiales Scotiae, (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1851-1855).

Johnston, Paul and Driscoll, Stephen T. — Paisley Abbey : Investigations 1991: Geophysical Survey, Analysis of Silts Recovered from Medieval Drain and Trial Excavations in Drain, (Glasgow, GUARD, 1991).

Leslie, Johne tr. James Dalrymple — A Historie of Scotland, 2 vols, (Edinburgh, STS, 1898).

Lindsay, E. R. and Cameron, A. I. — Calendar of Supplications Relating to Scotland from Rome, I (1418-1422), (Edinburgh, SHS 3rd Series, 1934).

McDowall, William — The Chronicles of Lincluden, (Edinburgh, Adam and Charles Black,

1886).

McGurk, F. — Calendar of Letters to Scotland of Benedict XIII of Avignon 1394-1419, (Edinburgh, SHS, 1976).

Marwick, J. D. — Charters and Documents Relating to the City of Glasgow, (Glasgow, Scot. Burgh Rec. Soc., 1897).

Metcalfe, W. M. — Charters and Documents Relating to The Burgh of Paisley, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1902).

Metcalfe, W. M. — The Lordship of Paisley, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1912).

Murray, David ed. — The Black Book of Paisley, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1885).

Paisley Abbey — Registrum Monsterii de Passelet, (Edinburgh, Maitland Club, 1832).

Paisley — James IV Charter to Burgh of Paisley, 1488. (1816 ed).

Pantin, W. A. — General and Provincial Chapters of the Black Monks, (Camden Society, Camden Series XLV, XLVII & LIV, 1931-1937).

Paton, Henry M. — Accounts of Masters of Works, 2 vols (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1957).

Salzman, L. F. — "The Chartulary of the Priory of St Pancras at Lewes", Sussex Record Society, 38 (1932), and 40 (1934).

Scotland — Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, (1473-1566), 11 vols.

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, (1108-1516), 5 vols.

Calendar of Scottish Papers, (1547-1563).

Exchequer Rolls, (1264-1567), 19 vols.

Register of the Great Seal, (1306-1580), 4 vols.

Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland, (1488-1567), 5 vols.

	Statistical Account, VII, "Lanark and Renfrew", 1791-1799.
Scott, Hew	Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III (Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd, 1920).
Stephenson, Joseph	The Chronicles of Melrose and Holyrood, (Dyfed, Llanerach Enterprises, 1988).
Stuart, John	The Records of the Monastery of Kinloss, (Edinburgh, R & Clark/Soc. Antiquaries Scotland, 1872).
Thomson, Thomas	Auchinleck Chronicle, (Edinburgh, Private Circulation, 1819).
Watt, D. E. R.	Scotichronicon, VI (Aberdeen, AUP, 1991).

BOOKS.

Acland, James H. — Medieval Structure : The Gothic Vault, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1972).

Addis, M.E.L. — Scottish Cathedrals and Abbeys, (London, Elliot Stock, 1901).

Allsopp, Bruce and Clark, Ursula — Architecture of France, (Newcastle, Oriel Press, 1963).

Anderson, G. Reid — The Abbeys of Scotland, (London, James Clarke, 1938).

Anderson, R.Rowand et.al. — National Art Survey, 4 vols (Edinburgh, Waterson, 1921-1933).

Anderson, W. and Hicks, C. — Cathedrals in Britain and Ireland, (London, Book Club Associates, 1978).

Anderson, W. A. — The Rise of the Gothic, (London, Hutchison, 1985).

Anstey, John — Anstey's Abbeys, (London, Surveyors Publications/RICS, 1987).

Ashley, Maurice — The House of Stuart, (London, Dent, 1980).

Aston, Michael — Monasteries, (London, Batsford, 1993).

Attwater, Donald — Dictionary of Saints, (London, Penguin Books, 1985).

Aubert, Marcel — High Gothic Art, (London, Methuen, 1964).

Barrett, Michael — The Scottish Monasteries of Old, (Edinburgh, Otto Schulze, 1913)

Barrett, Michael — Footprints of the Ancient Scottish Church, (London, Sands, 1914).

Barrett, Michael — Sidelights on Scottish History, (London, Sands, 1914).

Barrow, G. W. S. — The Kingdom of the Scots, (London, Edward Arnold, 1973).

Barrow, G. W. S. — Regesta Regum Scottorum, I,

(Edinburgh, EUP, 1960).

Barrow, G. W. S. — Regesta Regum Scottorum, II, (Edinburgh, EUP,1974).

Barrow, G. W. S. — The Anglo-Norman Era, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1980).

Barrow, G. W. S. — Scotland : 1000 - 1306, (London, Edward Arnold, 1981).

Barrow, G. W. S. — Scotland and its Neigbours in the Middle Ages, (London, Hambledon, 1992).

Batsford, Harry — The Greater English Church, (London, Batsford, 1943-44).

Beer, R Roy Gilyard- — Abbeys, (London, HMSO,1976).

Billings, R. W. — Architectural Illustrations and Descriptions of the Cathedral Church at Durham, (London, 1843).

Billings, R. W. — The Antiquities of Scotland, 4 vols. (1852).

Binney, Marcus and Burman, Peter — Change and Decay, (London, Cassel Collier and MacMillan,1977).

Binns, Alison — Dedication of Monastic Houses in England and Wales, (Woodside, Boydell, 1989).

Black, C. S. — The History of Paisley, (Paisley, J & J Cook, 1952).

Black, George F. — Surnames of Scotland, (NY, NY Public Library, 1946).

Black, W. G. — A Handbook of the Parochial and Ecclesiastical Law of Scotland, (Edinburgh, W Gree, 1888).

Bock, Henning — Der Decorated Style, (Heidelberg, Carl Winter, Universtatsverlag 1960).

Boinet, Amédée — Les Eglises Parisiennes, 3 vols (Paris, Les Editions de Minuit, 1952).

Bond, Francis — Gothic Architecture in England, 1st ed. (London, Batsford, 1905).

Bond, Francis — Westminster Abbey, (London, OUP,

1909).

Bond, Francis — Cathedrals of England and WAles, (London, Batsford, 1912).

Bony, Jean — The English Decorated Style, (London, Phaidon, 1979).

Bony, Jean — French Gothic Architecture of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, (Berkeley, UCP, 1983).

Bottomley, Frank — The Abbey Explorer's Guide, (London, Kaye & Ward, 1981).

Bowman, Henry and Carruthers, J.S. — The Churches of the Middle Ages, 2 vols (London, Bell, 1857).

Branner, Robert — Burgundian Gothic Architecture, (London, Zwemmer, 1960).

Branner, Robert — Gothic Architecture, (New York, Braziller, 1982).

Braun, Hugh — English Medieval Architecture, 2nd. ed. (London, Bracken Books, 1985).

Braunfels, Wolfgang tr. Alistair Young — Monasteries of Western Europe, (London, Thames & Hudson, 1979).

Bray, Warwick and Trump, David — The Penguin Dictionary of Archaeology, (London, Penguin Books, 1982).

Breeze, David J. — A Queen's Progress, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1987).

Breffey, Brian de and Mott, George — The Chruches and Abbeys of Ireland, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1976).

Briggs, Martin R. — Cathedral Architecture, (London, 1974).

Britton, John — Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain, 5 vols (London 1807-27).

Brown, Robert — The History of Paisley, 2 vols (Paisley, J & J Cook, 1886).

Brown, Tim Tatton- — Great Cathedrals of Britain, (London, BBC Books, 1989).

Budden, Charles W. — English Gothic Architecture, (London, 1927).

Bumpus, T. Francis — The Cathedrals and Churches of Belgium, (London, Werner Laurie, 1909).

Bumpus, T. Francis — The Cathedrals of England and Wales, (London, Werner Laurie, 1934).

Bumpus, T. Francis — The Cathedrals of France, (London, Werner Laurie, 1927).

Bumpus, T. Francis — The Cathedrals of Northern France, (London, Werner Laurie, 1910).

Bumpus, T. Francis — The Cathedrals of Northern Germany and the Rhine, (London, Werner Laurie, 1906).

Burleigh, J. H. S. — A Church History of Scotland, (London, OUP, 1960).

Burton, Janet — Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain 1000-1300, (Cambridge, CUP, 1994).

Busch, Harald and Lohse, Bernd — Gothic Europe, (London, Batsford, 1959).

Butler, Cuthbert — Benedictine Monachism, 2nd ed. (Canterbury, Speculum Historiale, 1961).

Butler, D. — Scottish Cathedrals and Abbeys, (Edinburgh, R & R Clark, 1901).

Butler, Lionel and Given-Wilson, Chris — Medieval Monasteries of Great Britain, (London, Michael Joseph, 1987).

Cain, Francois — L'Ordre FLamboyant, (Paris, Arthaud, 1967).

Calkins, Robert G. — Monuments to Medieval Art, (London, Cornell University Press, 1979).

Campbell, J. — Balmerino and its Abbey, (Edinburgh, Paterson, 1867).

Cant, Ronald G. — The College of St Salvator, (London, Oliver & Boyd, 1950).

Cant, Ronald G. — The Building of St. Machar's Cathedral, Aberdeen, (Aberdeen, Friends of St Machar's, 1976).

Carrick, J. C. — The Ancient Abbeys and Churches of

Scotland, (Glasgow, GUP, 1908).

Chalmers, George — Caledonia, 7 vols (Paisley ed., Gardner, 1887-94), III.

Chalmers, Peter McGregor — A Scots Medieval Architect, (Glasgow, William Hodge, 1895).

Chalmers, Peter McGregor — Glasgow : The Cathedral and See, (London, Bell Series, 1914).

Chapman, Alfred — Whitby Abbey, (London, HMSO, 1972).

Clapham, A. W. — English Romanesque Architecture after the Conquest, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1934).

Clapham, A. W. — Whitby Abbey, (London, HMSO, 1952).

Cobb, Gerald — English Cathedrals : The Forgotten Centuries, (London, Thames & Hudson, 1980).

Clark, Sylvia — Paisley - A History, (Edinburgh, Mainstream, 1988).

Cocke, Thomas ed. — Recording a Church : an Illustrated Glossary, (London, CBA, 1984).

Coltart, J. S. — Scottish Church Architecture, (London, Sheldon Press, 1936).

Conant, Kenneth J. — Benedictine Contributions to Church Architecture, (Wimmer Lecture 1, Latrobe Pa., 1949).

Conant, Kenneth J. — Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture 800-1200, (London, Penguin Books, 1959).

Conant, Kenneth J — Les Églises et la Maison du Chef de L'Ordre, (Medieval Academy of America Pub. 77, Cambridge, Mass., Mâcon, 1968).

Constable, Giles — Medieval Monasticism : A Select Bibliography, (Toronto, Univerity Toronto Press, 1976).

Cook, G. H. — Portrait of Lincoln, (London, Phoenix House, 1950).

Cook, G. H. — English Monasteries in the Middle Ages, (London, Phoenix House, 1961).

Cook, G. H. — The English Cathedral through the Ages, (London, Phoenix House, 1957).

Cook, Olive — English Abbeys and Priories, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1960).

Coppack, Glyn — Abbeys and Priories, (London, Batsford/English Heritage, 1990).

Coulton, G. G. — Scottish Abbeys and Social Life, (Cambridge, CUP, 1933).

Cowan, I. B. — Blast and Counter Blast, (Edinburgh, The Saltire Society, 1960).

Cowan, I. B. and Easson, D. E. — The Religious Houses of Scotland, 2nd ed. (London, Longman, 1976).

Cranage, D. H. S. — The Home of the Monk, (Cambridge, CUP, 1926).

Crawfurd, George — The Lives, Characters of the Officers of the Crown, and of State in Scotland from the beginning of The Reign of DaviD I - and the Union of the two KINGDOMS, (Edinburgh, Robert Fleming & Co., 1726).

Crawfurd, George and Semple, William — A History of the Shire of Renfrew, (Paisley, 1782).

Crawfurd, George and Robertson, George — General Description of the Shire of Renfrew, (Paisley, H. Chrichton, 1818).

Crossley, F. H. — The English Abbey : its Life and Work in the Middle Ages, (London, Batsford, 1935).

Crossley, F. H. — English Church Design 1040-1540 : An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Buidling, (London, Batsford, 1945).

Cruden, Stewart — St Andrew's Cathedral, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1950).

Cruden, Stewart — Scottish Abbeys, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1960).

Cruden, Stewart — Scottish Medieval Churches, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1986).

Dalrymple, David, Lord Hailes — Annals of Scotland, (Edinburgh, Balfour and Smellie, 1776).

Dickinson, J. C. — Monastic Life in Medieval England, (London, Black, 1961).

Dilworth, Mark — Scottish Monasteries in the Late Middle Ages, (Edinburgh, EUP, 1995).

Dixon, H. Claiborne — The Abbeys of Great Britain, (London, Werner Laurie, 1908).

Dixon, Roger and Mathesius, Stefan — Victorian Architecture, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1978).

Donaldson, Gordon — Scotland : James V - VII, (Edinburgh, Mercat Press, 1987).

Douglas, Francis — General Description of the East Coast of Scotland, (Paisley, Alex Weir, 1782).

Dowden, John — The Medieval Church in Scotland, (Glasgow, Maclehose, 1910).

Dowden, John — The Bishops of Scotland, (Glasgow, Maclehose, 1912).

Dowdy, Mac, ed. Holmes, Reg and Youell, George — The Monastic Setting of Ely, (Ely, Ely Local History Publications Board, 1974).

Dufour, Xavier Léon — Dictionary of Biblical Theology, (London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1970).

Dunbar, John G. — The Historic Architecture of Scotland, (London, Batsford, 1978).

Dunbar, John G. and Fisher, Ian — Iona, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1983.)

Duncan, A. A. M. — The Making of the Kingdom, (Edinburgh, Mercat Press, 1989).

Dunlop, Annie I. — Scots Abroad in the Fifteenth Century, (London, Historical Association Pamphlet 124, 1942).

Dunlop, Ian — The Isle de France, (London, Collins, 1979).

Evans, Godfrey H. et al — The French Connection : Scotland and the Arts of France, Exhibition Catalogue, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1985).

Evans, Joan — Monastic Life at Cluny 910-1157, (London, OUP, 1931).

Evans, Joan — Art in Medieval France : 987-1498, (London, OUP, 1948).

Evans, Joan — Cluniac Architectuire of the Romanesque Period, (Cambridge, CUP, 1950).

Evans, Joan — The Romanesque Architecture of the Order of Cluny, (Cambridge, CUP, 1938).

Eyton, R. W. — The House of Fitzalan and Stuart : their Origins and Early History, (London, 1856).

Fairweather, F. H. — Ingleby's Supplement of Bloomfield's Norfolk, (1929).

Fawcett, Richard — Glasgow Cathedral, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1985).

Fawcett, Richard — Scottish Medieval Churches, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1985).

Fawcett, Richard — Inchmahome Priory, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1986).

Fawcett, Richard — The Abbey and Palace of Dunfermline, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1990).

Fawcett, Richard — Scottish Architecture from the Accession of the Stewarts to the Rerormation 137I-1560, (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1994).

Fawcett, Richard — Scottish Abbeys and Priories, (London, Batsford/Historic Scotland, 1994).

Fenwick, Hubert — Scotland's Abbeys and Churches, (London, Hall, 1978).

Ferguson, Peter — Architecture of Solitude, (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1984).

Fernie, Eric and — Medieval Architecture and its

Crossley Paul eds. — Intellectual Context, Studies in honour of Peter Kidson, (London, Hambledon, 1990).

Filstead, Alison et.al. — Dictionary of British Architects 1834 - 1900, (London, Mansell/RIBA, 1993).

Fleming, John, et.al. — A Dictionary of Architecture, 2nd. ed. (London, Penguin Books, 1971).

Fletcher, Banister — A History of Architecture, 16th ed. (London, Batsford, 1954).

Focillon, Henri Bony, Jean ed. — The Art of the West, 2 vols, 3rd ed. (Oxford, Phaidon, 1980).

Forrester, Harry — Medieval Gothic Mouldings : A Guide, (London, Phillimore, 1972).

Frankl, Paul — Gothic Architecture, (London, Penguin Books, 1962).

Gardner, Samuel — A Guide to English Gothic Architecture, (Cambridge, CUP, 1922).

Gasquet, Francis A. — English Monastic Llfe, (London, Methuen, 1904).

Gasquet, Francis A. — The Greater Abbeys of England, (London, Chatto & Windus, 1908).

Gentles, Thomas — A Plea for the Restoration of the Abbey of Paisley, (Paisley, Alexander Gardner, 1899).

Gloag, John — The Architectural Interpretation of History, (London, Black, 1975).

Gomme Andor, and Walker, David M. — The Buildings of Glasgow, (London, Lund and Humpries, 1987).

Goodall, W. — Introduction to the History and Antiquities of Scotland, 2 vols (Edinburgh, Peter Williamson, 1773).

Gordon, J. F. S. — The Cathedral of St Kentigern, (Glasgow, Oliver & Boyd, 1894).

Gore, W. Ormsby — Northern England, (London, HMSO, 1936).

Graham, Rose — The History of the Alien Priory of Wenlock, (London, HMSO, 1971).

Graham, Rose — Monk Bretton Priory, (London, HBMCE, 1986).

Grant, J. Chalmers — Dunblane Cathedral, (Church Service Society).

Grant, William and Murison, David D. — Scottish National Dictionary, 10 vols (Edinburgh, Scottish National Dictionary Assoc, 1931-1976), IX.

Gray, Stuart A. — Edwardian Architecture : A Biographical Dictionary, (London, Duckworth, 1985).

Greene, J. Patrick — Medieval Monasteries, (Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1992).

Grodecki, Louis — Gothic Art, (London, Academy Editions, 1976).

Grodecki, Louis — Gothic Architecture, (London, Faber and Faber/Electa-Milan, 1986).

Groome, Francis H. — Ordnance Gazetteer of Scotland, 6 vols, (Edinburgh, Jack, 1882-1885), III & V.

Grose, Francis — The Antiquities of Scotland, 2 vols, (London, Hooper, 1797), II.

Gueranger, Prosper — Les Abbeyes de France au Moyen Age et en 1947, (Paris, Editions G Durrassié, 1947).

Hamilton, William — Description of the Sheriffdoms of Lanark & Renfrew, (Glasgow, 1831).

Hancock, P. D. — Bibliography of Works Relating to Scotland, 1916-1950, 2 vols (Edinburgh, EUP, 1959).

Hanks, Patrick and Hodges, Flavia — Dictionary of Surnames, (Oxford, OUP, 1988).

Hannah, Ian C. — The Story of Scotland in Stone, (London, Oliver and Boyd, 1988).

Hardy, Joseph — Inside the Cloister : The History of Monasticism and a day in the Life of Buckfast Abbey, (Buckfast, Buckfast Abbey, 1984).

Harper, H. W. — Lichens from an Old Abbey, (Paisley, 1878).

Harris, Cyril M ed. — Historic Architecture Source Book, (London, McGraw-Hill, 1977).

Harris, John and Lever Jill — An Illustrated Glossary of Architecture, (London, Faber and Faber, 1966).

Harrison, Henry — Surnames of the United Kingdom, 2 vols, (London, Eaton Press, 1912).

Harvey, John — Henry Yevele, (London, Batsford, 1946).

Harvey, John — The Gothic World : 1100-1600, (London, Batsford, 1950).

Harvey, John — The English Cathedrals, (London, Batsford, 1950).

Harvey, John — The Master Builders, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1971).

Harvey, John — The Medieval Architect, (London, Wayland, 1972).

Harvey, John — Man the Builder, (Norwich, Priory Press, 1973).

Harvey, John — The Cathedrals of England and Wales, (London, Batsford, 1974).

Harvey, John — The Perpendicular Style, (London Batsford, 1978).

Hauser, Arnold — The Social History of Art from Prehistoric Times to the Middle Ages, I (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984 ed.).

Hay, George — Architecture of Scotland, 2nd ed. (London, Oriel Press, 1977).

Henderson, Arthur E. — Tintern Abbey : Then and Now, London, Simpkin Marshall, 1935).

Hill, J. C. — History of Paisley, (Paisley, 1953).

Horn, Walter and Born, Ernest — The Plan of St Gall, 3 vols, (California, UCP, 1979).

Howell, A. R. — Paisley Abbey, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1929).

Hudson, Kenneth — Exploring Cathedrals, (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1978).

Huizinga, Johan — The Waning of the Middle Ages, (London, Edward Arnold, 1924).

Hunt, Noreen — Cluny Under St. Hugh 1104-1109, (London, Edward Arnold, 1967)

Hunt, Noreen — Cluniac Monasteries in the Central Middle Ages, (London, MacMillan, 1971).

Jackson, T Graham, Jackson, Basil H. ed. — Recollections of Thomas Graham Jackson, (London, Oxford University Press, 1950).

Jackson, T Graham — Gothic Art in France England and Italy, 2 vols (NY, Hacker Art Books, 1975 ed.).

Jacobs, David — Master Builders of the Middle Ages, London, Cassel, 1969).

James, John — Temple Makers of the Paris Basin, (Australia, West Grinstead Publishers, 1989).

Jamieson, John — Dictionary of the Scottish Language, (London, P Nimmo, 1867).

Jenner, Michael — Journeys into Medieval England, (London, Michael Joseph, 1991).

Jenner, Michael — The Architectural Heritage of Britain and Ireland, (London, Michael Joseph, 1993).

Johnston, Norman M. (adapted from) — Dunfermline Abbey, (Dunfermline, MacPherson,1964).

Jones, Lawrence E. — The Beauty of English Churches, (London, Constable, 1978).

Jungmann, J. A. — The Mass of the Roman Rite : Its Origins and Development, (NY. 1955).

Kamen, Ruth H. — British and Irish Architectural History : A Bibliography, (London,

Architectural Press, 1981).

Kellas, James G. — The Scottish Political System, (Cambridge, CUP, 1973).

Kelly, J. N. D. — Oxford Dictionary of the Popes, (Oxford, OUP, 1986).

Ker, W. Lee — The Abbey of Kilwinning, (Ardrossan, 1900).

Kerr, Nigel and Mary — A Guide to Medieval Sites in Britain, (London, Paladin, 1988).

Kidson, Peter — The Medieval World, (London, Hamlyn, 1967).

Kidson, Peter et.al. — A History of English Architecture, (London, Penguin Books, 1978).

King, Archdale A. — Liturgies of the Religious Orders, (London, Longman Green, 1955).

Knoop, Douglas Jones, G. P. — The Scottish Mason, (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1939).

Knowles, David — The Religious Houses of Medieval England, (London, Sheed & Ward, 1940).

Knowles, David — Religious Orders in England, 3 vols, (Cambridge, CUP, 1948-59).

Knowles, David and St Joseph, J. K. S. — Monastic Sites from the Air, (Cambridge, CUP, 1952).

Knowles, David — The Monastic Order in England, 2nd. ed.(Cambridge, CUP, 1966).

Knowles, David — Medieval Religious Houses of England and Wales, (London, Longman, 1971).

Landrieux, Maurice — The Cathedral of Reims, (London, Kegan Paul, 1920).

Lasteyrie, R. de — Architecture Religieuse, 2 vols. (Paris, 1927).

Latham, R. E. — Revised Medieval Latin Word-List, (London, OUP, 1965 ed.).

Lavedan, Pierre — French Architecture, (London, Scolar Press, 1979 ed.)./

Lawrence, C. H. — Medieval Monasticism, (London, Longman, 1984).

Leask, Harold G. — Irish Churches and Monastic Buildings, 3 vols (Dundalk, Dundalgan Press, 1955-1960).

Lees, J. Cameron — The Abbey of Paisley, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1878).

Levi, Peter — The Frontiers of Paradise, (London, Collins Harvill, 1987).

Lindsay, Ian G. — The Cathedrals of Scotland, (Edinburgh, W & R Chambers, 1926).

Little, Bryan — Abbeys and Priories in England and Wales, (London, Batsford, 1979).

Little, J. P. Brooke- — Bouttells's Heraldry, (London, Butler and Tanner, 1977 ed.).

Lloyd, Nathaniel — History of the English House, (London, Architectural Press, 1975).

Loyn, H. R. — The Middle Ages : A Concise Encyclopaedia, (London, Thames and Hudson,

Lübke, Wilhem Wheatley, L. A. trans. — Ecclesiastical Art in Germany During the Middle Ages, (Edinburgh, Thomas C Jack, 1877).

Malden, John — Let Paisley Flourish, (Paisley, Renfrew District Council, 1991).

Malden, John — The Abbey and Monastery of Paisley, (Paisley, Renfrew District Council, 1993).

Mâle, Louis — The Gothic Image, (London, Harper & Row, 1972 ed.).

Mâle, Louis — Religious Art, (Princeton, PUP, 1977 ed.).

Martindale, Andrew — Gothic Art, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1979).

Macaulay, James — The Gothic Revival, (Glasgow, Blackie, 1975).

MacDougall, Norman — James III, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1982).

MacDougall, Norman — James IV, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1989).

Mackie, Charles — Historical Description of the Town and Abbey of Paisley, (London, 1835).

Mackie, J. D. — A History of Scotland, (London, Penguin Books, 1972).

Mackie, R. L. and Cruden, Stewart — Arbroath Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1954).

Mackie, R. L. and Cruden, Stewart, ed. Fawcett, Richard. — Arbroath Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1982).

Maclean, Allan — Monks and Monasteries, (Glasgow, 1854).

Maclean, A. M. — Paisley Abbey Restoration - 1913, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1913).

MacLeod, Isebail ed. — The Scots Thesaurus, (Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Press, 1990).

MacRoberts, David ed. — The Medieval Church of St Andrews, (Glasgow, Burns, 1976).

MacWilliam, Colin ed. — Buildings of Scotland - Lothian, (London, Penguin Books, 1978).

MacWilliam, Colin ed. — Buildings of Scotland - Edinburgh, (London, Penguin Books, 1984).

McCann, Justin — The Rule of St Benedict, (London, Burns Oates, 1960).

McCarthy, Mary — A Social Geography of Paisley, (Paisley, Paisley Public Library, 1969).

McGibbon, David and Ross, Thomas — Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland, 3 vols, (Edinburgh, D Douglas, 1896).

McGibbon, David and Ross, Thomas — Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland, 5 vols, (Edinburgh, D Douglas, 1887-1892).

McGladdery, Christine — James II, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1990).

McKean, Charles et.al. — Central Glasgow : An Illustrated Architectural Guide, (Edinburgh,

Academic Press/RIAS, 1989).

McKenzie, W. M. — The Medieval Castle in Scotland, Rhind Lectures 1925-26, (London, Methuen, 1927).

McKinlay, James M. — Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland, 2 vols (Edinburgh, David Douglas, 1911-1914).

McKinstry, Sam — Rowand Anderson : The Premier Architect of Scotland, (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1991).

Markham, Violet R. — Romanesque France : Studies in the History and Archaeology of the Twelfth Century, (London, Murray, 1927).

Maxwell, J. Stirling — The Shrines and Homes of Scotland, (London, Maclehose, 1937).

Metcalfe, W. M. — A History of the County of Renfrew, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1905).

Metcalfe, W. M. — A History of Paisley 600-1908, (Paisley, Alex Gardner, 1909).

Meyer, Peter and Hürliman, Martin — English Cathedrals, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1950).

Mitchell, Ann — The Great Buildings of the World : Cathedrals of Europe, (Feltham, Hamlyn, 1968).

Moncrieff, George S. — The Stones of Scotland, (London, Batsford, 1938).

Moorhouse, Geoffrey — Against all Reason, (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1986 ed.).

Morley, B. M. — Wenlock Priory, (London, HMBCE, 1985).

Morris, Richard — The Church in British Archaeology, Research Report 47, (CBA, 1983).

Muir, T. S. — Descriptive Notices of some of the Ancient and Parochial and Collegiate Churches of Scotland, (London, John Henry Parker, 1848).

Muir, T. S. — Characteristics of Old Church Architecture in Scotland, (Edinburgh, Edmonston & Douglas,

1861).

Mumford, W. F. — Wenlock in the Middle Ages, (Shrewsbury, Mumford, 1977).

Mussat, André — L'Architecture dans L'Ouest de la France, (Paris, Picard, 1913).

Mylne, Robert S. — The Master Masons to the Crown of Scotland, (Edinburgh, 1893).

Dirsztay, Patricia — Inside Churches - A Guide to Church Furnishings, (London, Capability, Publishing, 1989).

New, Anthony — Guide to Cathedrals of Britain, (London, Constable, 1985).

New, Anthony — A Guide to the Abbeys of England and Wales, (London, Constable, 1985).

New, Anthony — A Guide to the Abbeys of Scotland, (London, Constable, 1988).

Nicholson, C. B. — England's Greater Churches, (London, Batsford, 1949).

Nicholson, Ranald — Scotland : The Later Middle Ages, (Edinburgh, Mercat Press, 1989).

Osborne, Harold — The Oxford Companion to Art, (Oxford, OUP, 1981).

Paisley Abbey — Paisley Abbey Guide, (Norwich, Jarrold, 1985).

Paley, F. A. ed. Fawcett, W. — A Manual of Gothic Mouldings, 5th ed. (London, Gunney and Jackson, 1891).

Palmer, R. Liddesdale — English Monasteries in the Middle Ages, (London, Constable, 1930).

Parkhill, John — The History of Paisley, (Paisley, 1857).

Parlane, J. and R. — Lichens from and Old Abbey, (Paisley, 1857).

Paterson, J. Wilson and McRoberts, David — Inchcolm Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1984).

Paton, H. J. — The Claim of Scotland, (London, Allen and Unwin, 1968).

Pennant, Thomas — A Tour in Scotland, (Warrington, Eyres, 1772)

Pevsner, Nikolaus — Buildings of England - North West and West and South Suffolk, (London, Penguin Books, 1961).

Pevsner, Nikolaus — Buildings of England - Shropshire, (London, Penguin Books, 1958).

Pevsner, Nicolaus and Nairn, Ian — Buildings of England - Sussex, (London, Penguin Books, 1958).

Pevsner, Nikolaus — An Outline of European Architecture, Jubilee Edition, (London, Penguin Books, 1960).

Pevsner, Nikolaus — Buildings of England - North West & South Norfolk, (London, Penguin Books, 1962).

Pevsner, Nikolaus — Buildings of England - Northumberland, (London, Penguin Books, 1979).

Photographs — Pitkin Pictorials.

Platt, Colin — The Abbeys and Priories of Medieval England, (London, Secker and Warburg, 1984).

Platt, Colin — Abbeys of Yorkshire, (London, English Heritage, 1988).

Post, W. Ellwood — Saints, Signs and Symbols, (London, Morehouse-Barlow, 1974).

Pothorn, Herbert — A Guide to Architectural Styles, (Oxford, Phaidon, 1983).

Pride, Glen L. — Scottish Building Terms, (Glasgow, Scottish Civic Trust, 1989).

Prior, Edward S. — A History of Gothic Art in England, (London, G Bell, 1900).

Raby, F. J. E. and Baillie Reynolds, P. K. — Thetford Priory, Norfolk, (London, HBMCE, 1984).

Raby, F. J. E. and Baillie Reynolds, P. K. — Castle Acre Priory, Norfolk, (London, HMSO, 1983).

Raby, F J E, and Baillie Reynolds, P. K. — Castle Acre Priory, Norfolk, (London, HBMCE, 1986).

Radding, Charles M. and Clark William W. — Medieval Architecture : Medieval Learning, (London, Yale University Press, 1992).

Radford, C. A. Raleigh- — Glasgow Cathedral, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1970).

Radford, C. A. Raleigh- — Cluniac Abbey of Crossraguel, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1970).

Radford, C. A. Raleigh- — Crossraguel Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1990).

Radford, C. A. Raleigh-, and Donaldson, Gordon — Whithorn, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1984).

Ramsey, P. A. — Views of Renfrewshire, (1839).

Randall, Gerald — The English Parish Church, (London, Batsford, 1982).

Renfrew — Archaeological and Historical Collections Relating to the County, 2 vols (Paisley, Gardner, 1885-90).

Renwick, Robert — Glasgow Memorials, (Glasgow, Maclehose, 1908).

Reyntiens, Patrick — The Technique of Stained Glass, (London, Batsford, 1967).

Richards, J. M. — Who's Who in Architecture : from 1400 to the Present Day, (London, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1977).

Richardson, J. S. and Wood, Marguerite — Dryburgh Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1948).

Richardson, J. S. and Wood, Marguerite — Melrose Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1949).

Richardson, J. S. — The Medieval Stone Carver in Scotland, (Edinburgh, EUP, 1964).

Richardson, J. S. — Sweetheart Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1977).

Richardson, J. S. — The Abbey and Palace of Holyroodhouse, (Edinburgh, HMSO,

1978).

Richardson, J. S. — Inchmahome, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1978).

Richardson, J. S. and Mackintosh, H. B. — Elgin Cathedral, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1980).

Richardson, J. S. and Tabraham, C. J. — Dundrennan Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1981).

Richardson, J. S. and Wood, Marguerite ed. Tabraham C. J. — Melrose Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1981).

Richardson, J. S. and Tabraham, C. J. — Dryburgh Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1983).

Richardson, J. S. and Hume, John — Sweetheart Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1987).

Richardson, J. S. and Tabraham, C. J. — Dryburgh Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1987).

Riches, Anna and — Materials and Traditions in Scottish Building : Essays in Honour of Sonia Hackett, (Edinburgh, Scot. Vernacular Buildings Working Group, 1992).

Rickman, Thomas — Gothic Architecture, (London, Parker, 1881).

Rickman, Thomas — Terms in Architecture, abridged ed. (Oxford, Parker, 1846).

Rivoira, G. T. Rushforth, G. McN. trans. — Lombardic Architecture, 2 vols, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933).

Roberts, H. Ernest — Medieval Monasteries and Minsters, (London, SPCK, 1949).

Robinson, Mairi — Concise Scots Dictionary, (Aberdeen, University Press, 1987).

Root, Margaret E. — Dunkeld Cathedral, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1950).

Rose, Elise Whitlock — Cathedrals and Cloisters of the South of France, 2 vols, (London, G P Putnam, 1906).

Ross, Stewart — Monarchs of Scotland, (Moffat, Lochar Publishing, 1990).

Rowand, David — Pictorial History of Paisley,

(Darvel, Alloway Publishing, 1993).

Rowley, Trevor — Norman Britain, (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986).

Rykwert, Joseph and — The Brothers Adam, (Glasgow, Collins, 1985).

Salzman, L. F. — Building in England, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1952).

Sanfaçon, Roland — L'Architecture Flamboyante en France, (Quebec, Les Presses de L'Universitey de Laval, 1971).

Savio, Sister Dominic — Kilwinning Abbey, (Irvine, Fasprint Services, 1988).

Savage, Peter — Lorimer and the Edinburgh Craft Designers, (Edinburgh, Harris, 1980).

SCOTLAND:
RCAHMS — Argyll : An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments, 4 vols; Iona IV (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1963).

RCAHMS — Roxburghshire : An Invertory of the Ancient Monuments, 2 vols, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1956).

RCAHMS — Stirlingshire : An Invertory of the Ancient Monuments, 2 vols (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1963), II.

Statistical Account, VII, "Renfrew and Argyll", (1845).

Third Statistical Account, "Bute and Renfrew", (1962).

Scott, Gilbert — Medieval Architecture, 2 vols, (London, John Murray, 1879).

Semple, David S. — St Mirin, (Paisley, Cook, 1870).

Semple, David S. — Supplement to St Mirin, (Paisley, Cook, 1873).

Semple, David S. — History of the First Abbey Bridge of Paisley, (Paisley, Cook, 1878).

Semple, David S. — Second Supplement to St Mirin, (Paisley, Cook, 1874).

Semple, David S. — Removal of Houses on the East Side of Abbey Close, (Paisley, Cook, 1874).

Semple, David S. — Town Improvements, Restoration and Preservation of Paisley Abbey, (Paisley, Cook, 1878).

Sharpe, Edward — A Treatise on the Rise and Progress of Decorated Window Tracery in England, (London, 1849).

Sharratt, F. and P. — Écosse Romane, (Paris, Zodiaque, 1985).

Sherry, Frank A. — The Rising of 1820, (Glasgow, MacLellan, 1968).

Simson, Otto von — The Gothic Cathedral, (London, Routledge Kegan Paul, 1956).

Simpson, Ann Turner and Stevenson, Sylvia — Scottish Burgh Survey, "Historic Paisley, The Archaeological Implications of Development", (Glasgow, Glasgow University, Department Archaeology, 1982).

Simpson, W. Douglas — The Ancient Stones of Scotland, (London, Hale, 1965).

Simpson, W. Douglas — The Church of the Holy Rude, (Stirling, Society of Friends, 1967).

Skinner, Basil C. — Pluscarden Abbey, (Pilgrim Press).

Slezer, John — Theatrum Scotiae, 2nd. ed. (Edinburgh, 1874).

Small, J. W. — Scottish Architectural Details, (Edinburgh, 1901).

Smith, Edwin et. al. — English Parish Churches, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1976).

Smith, Edwin and — English Cathedrals, (London, Herbert Press, 1989).

Steel, David — St Michael's Linlithgow, (Edinburgh, Blackwood).

Stell, Geoffrey — Exploring Scotland's Heritage, "Dumfries and Galloway", (Edinburgh, RCHAMS, 1986).

Stoddard, Whitney S. — Art and Architecture in Medieval France, Icon Edition, (London, Harper & Row, 1972).

Stone, Lawrence — Sculpture in Britain : The Middle Ages, (London, Penguin Books, 1955).

Sturgis, Russell et.al. — Sturgis's Illustrated Dictionary of Architecture and Building, 3 vols (NY, Dover Books, 1989 ed.).

Swaan, Wim — The Late Middle Ages : Art and Architecture, (London, Omega Books, 1977).

Swaan, Wim — The Gothic Cathedral, (London, Omega Books, 1984 ed.)

Swartwout, R. E. — The Monastic Craftsmen, (Cambridge, Heffer, 1932).

Tabraham, C. J. — Jedburgh Abbey, (Edinburgh, HMSO, 1986).

Tasker, David — Medieval Masonry, (Hull, Polygon Press, 1978).

Taylor, Alex Clifton — The Cathedrals of England, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1967).

Todd, A. S. — The Cathedral Church of St Machar's Old Aberdeen.

Todd, George Eyre ed. — The Book of Glasgow Cathedral, (Glasgow, Morrison, 1898).

Thompson, A. Hamilton — English Monasteries, (Folcroft, Folcroft Lib Editions, 1974 ed.)

Vaillant, Norbert — La Charité-sur-Loire, (Paris, Zodiaque, 1976).

Vallance, Aymer — Greater English Church Screens, (London, Batsford, 1947).

Vermeulen, F. A. J. — Handboek tot de Geschiedenis der Nederlandische Boukunst, (The Hague, 1928).

Virey, Jean — L'Abbey de Cluny, (Paris, Henri Laurens, 1957).

Virtue — Catholic Encyclopaedia, 3 vols.

(London 1965).

Walcott, M. E. C. — Sacred Archaeology, (London, 1868).

Walcott, M. E. C. — Scoti-Monasticon : The Ancient Church of Scotland, (London, Virtue Spalding and Daldy, 1874).

Walker, Frank A. — The South Clyde Estuary, (Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press/RIAS, 1986).

Watkin, David — A History of Western Architecture, (Barne and Jenkins, 1986).

Watkin, E. I. — Catholic Art and Culture, (London, Hollis & Carter, 1947).

Watson, T. Lennox — The Double Choir of Glasgow Cathedral, (Glasgow, Hedderwick, 1916).

Webb, G. — Architecture in Britain - The Middle Ages, (London, Penguin Books, 1956).

Webster, J. M. — Dunfermline Abbey, (Glasgow, McCorquodale, 1948).

Weir, Alison — Britain's Royal Families, (London, The Bodley Head, 1989).

West, T. W. — A History of Architecture in Scotland, (London, University of London Press, 1967).

Who's Who in Glasgow, 1909.

Who's Who, 1912.

Wilkie, James — The Benedictine Monasteries of Northern Fife, (Edinburgh, Blackwood, 1927).

Wilson, Christopher — The Gothic Cathedral, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1990).

Wood, Margaret — The English House, (London, Bracken Books, 1982).

Yarwood, Doreen — Encyclopaedia of Architecture, (London, Batsford, 1985).

Zarnecki, George — The Monastic Achievement, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1971).

THESES.

Chazin, Carol Anne — The Planning of English Monastic Infirmary Halls in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries : A TYPOLOGICAL STUDY, (unpublished MA Thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1966).

Malone, Carolyn L. M. — Monastic Planning after the Plan of St Gall : Tradition and Change, (unpublished MA Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1968).

McKinstry, Sam — The Life and Work of Sir Robert Rowand Anderson, 1834 - 1921, (unpublished PhD Thesis, St Andrews University, 1986).

Sowers, Ossa Raymond — Medieval Monastic Planning : Its Origins in the Christian East and Later Development in Western Europe, (unpublished PhD Thesis, Columbia University, 1951).

PERIODICALS and JOURNALS.

Architect's Journal.

The Baillie.

The Builder.

Journal Royal Institute of British Architects.

ARTICLES.

Adams, Ian H. — "The Medieval Burgh", in The Making of Urban Scotland: (London, Groom Helm, 1978).

Anderson, Arthur R. — "Scottish Medieval Churches still in use for Divine Service : an index to ancient and historical churches in Scotland", TSES, 12 (1936-39), 111-6.

Anderson, Arthur R. — "Twentieth Century Restorations of Scottish Medieval Churches", TGAS, 12 (1953), 94-102.

Anderson, Arthur R. — "Augustinian and Benedictine Monasteries in Scotland", TGAS, 13 (New Series 1954), 91-102.

Anderson, W. J. "Three Sixteenth Century Scottish Missals", IR, 9 (1958), 204-209.

Arnold, Thomas "An account of St Columba's Abbey, Inchcolm", Arch.Scot. 5 (1890), 45-70.

Asaert, G. "Documenten voor de Geschiedenis van de Beeldhouw Kunst ter Antwerpen in de XVe eeuw", Jaarboek van het Koniklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen, (1972), 43-86.

Astley, H. J. D. "Castleacre", JBAA, 31 (1925), 141-167.

Ballantine, J. "A Short History of Church Stained Glass", TSES, 3 (1909-12), 347-54.

Barbour, J. "Notes on Lincluden Abbey, 1833-1834", DGNHAS (1887), 18-34.

Barrow, G. W. S. "The Gilbertine House of Dalmilling", AANHSC, 6 2nd series (1955-57), 51-67.

Barrow, G. W. S. "James Fifth Stewart of Scotland", 1260(?)-1309" in Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland, Keith J. Stringer, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1985).

Bilson, John "Architecture of the Cistercians", Arch.J. 66 (1909), 185-280.

Bober, Harry "A Reapraisal of Rayonnant Architecture", in The Forward Movement of the Fourteenth Century, F. L. Utley ed. (Columbus, 1961)

Boog, Robert "Account of Queen Bleary's Tomb", Arch. Scot. 2 (1822), 456-61.

Bony, Jean "Diagonality and Centrality in English Rib Vaulting", Gesta, 15 (1976), 15-25.

Boyle, Alex "Notes on Scottish Saints", IR, 32 (1981), 59-82.

Branner, Robert "Drawings from a thirteenth century architect's shop : the Rheims Palimpsest", JSAH, 17 (1958), 9-21.

Branner, Robert "Paris and the Origins of Rayonnant Gothic", Art Bulletin, 54 (1962), 39-51.

Breakspear, Harold — "Excavations at some Wiltshire Monasteries", (Monkton Farley Priory), Archaeologia, 77 (1923), 236-44.

Breakspear, Harold — "A West Country School of Masons", Archaeologia, 81 (1931), 1-18.

Breakspear, Harold — "The Abbot's House at Battle", Archaeologia, 83 (1933), 139-66.

Brock, E. P. C. — "Visit to Paisley Abbey", JBAA, 95 (1889), 280-1.

Burns, J. H. — "Scottish Churches and the Council of Basle 1431-49, IR 13 (1962) part 1, 3-53; entry 21. Andrew Stewart, Prior of Paisley, 27-8; part 2, 157-189; App. B on Thomas Morow, Abbot of Paisley, 187-188.

Cambridge, Eric — "The Early Building History of St Andrews Cathedral, Fife, and its context in Northern Transitional Architecture", Antiq.J. 57 (1977), 277-88.

Chalmers, Peter MacGregor — "The evolution of church architecture in Scotland", TGES, 2 (1898), 35-8.

Chalmers, Peter MacGregor — "Paisley Abbey", TSES, 2 (1908-1909), 404-1.

Chilton, Margaret — "The making of a stained glass window", TSES, 14 (1948-1954), 17-25.

Clapham, A. W. — "The Architecture of the Praemonstatensians with Special Reference to their Buildings in England, Archaeologia, 73 (1923), 117-146.

Conant, K. J. — "Medieval Excavations at Cluny" - Speculum, 4 (1929), 3-32, part 2, 168-76, part 3, 291-317, part 4, 443-450; 6 (1931), 3-24; and 45 (1970), 2-39.

Conant, K. J. — "Cluny II and St Bénigne at Dijon", Archaeologia, 49 (1965), 179-94.

Constable, Giles — "Famuli and Conversi at Cluny", Cluniac Studies, (London, Variorum, 1980), 326-350.

Cooper, James — "Some post-Reformation notices of Elgin Cathedral and other ecclesiastical edifices in Moray", TGES, 3 (1901), 90-8.

Cooper, James — "Dunkeld Cathedral", TSES, 4 (1912-15), 21-36.

in Scotland", TSES, 4 (1912-15), 116-26.

Cooper, James "The English Cradle of the Stuarts", TSES, 5 (1915-18), 158-79.

Cowan, Ian B. "Church and Society" in Brown, Jennifer M. ed. Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century, (London, Edward Arnold, 1977), 112-35.

Cowan, Ian B. "The Medieval Church in Scotland: A Select Critical Bibliography", RSCHS, 21 (1981), 91-110.

Cox, J. Charles "The Treatment of our Cathedral Churches in the Victorian Age", Arch.J. 54 (1897), 239-74.

Cram, H. M. and "Notes on an English Cluniac Chronicle", EHR, 44 (1929), 94-104.

Cranage, D. H. S. "The Monastery of St. Milburga at Much Wenlock, Shropshire", Archaeologia, 77 (1921-1922), 105-132.

Cruden, Stuart "Arbroath Abbey", PSAS, 88 (1954-1956), 94-9; and "Seton Collegiate Church", 417-37.

Dauphin, H. "Monastic Reforms from the tenth to the twelfth centuries", Downside Review, 77 (1952), 62-74.

Davis, Ralph H. C. "Mason's Marks", JBAA, 17 (1954), 43-76.

Delepierre, O "Documents from the records of west Flanders relative to the stalls of Melrose Abbey", Archaeologia, 31 (1846), 346-49.

Dilworth, Mark "Monks and Ministers after 1560", RSCHS, 18 (1974), 201-20.

Dilworth, Mark "Monks, Ministers and the Reformation", RSCHS, 19 (1972-74), 201-21.

Dilworth, Mark "The Social Origin of Scottish Monks", RSCHS, 20 (1980), 197-209.

Dow, Helen J. "The Rose Window", JWCI, 20 (1957), 248-97.

Dunbar, John G. "Materials for the Study of Scottish Architectural History", Art Libraries'

Journal, 4 (Autumn 1979), 17-26.

Duncan, A. M. M. "Documents relating to the Priory of the Isle of May", PSAS, 90 (1956-57), 52-80.

Duncan, J. D. "The Abbey Church of Cluny", TGES, 2 (1898), 39-48.

Durkan, John "Paisley Abbey : Attempt to make it Cistercian", IR, 7 (1956), 60-2.

Durkan, John "Paisley Abbey and Glasgow Archives - Some New Directions", IR, 14 (1963) 46-53.

Durkan, John "Paisley Abbey in the Sixteenth Century", IR, 27 (1976), 110-26.

Easson, D. E. "Church dedications in Scotland, 1242", TSES, 13 (1939-45), 21-4.

Easson, D. E. "The Scottish Abbeys and the War of Independence", RSCHS, 11 (1955), 63-81.

Easson, D. E. "The Reformation and the Monasteries in Scotland and England : some Comparison", TSES, 15 (1957-65), 7-23.

Edwards, John "Visit to Kilwinning Abbey", TSES, 5 (1915-18), 259-260.

Eeles, F. C. "Medieval Stained Glass recently recovered from the Ruins of Holyrood Abbey Church", PSAS, XCLX (1914-15), 81-91.

Etherton, D. "The morphology of flowing tracery", ARCH.R. 115 (1965), 172-180.

Fawcett, Jane "A Restoration Tragedy : Cathedrals in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century", in The Future of the Past : ATTITUDES TO CONSERVATION 1174-1974, ed. Jane Fawcett, (London, Thames and Hudson, 1976).

Fawcett, Richard "Late Gothic architecture in Scotland : Considerations on the influence of the Low Countries", PSAS, 112 (1982), 477-96.

Fawcett, Richard "Medieval Window Tracery", in Studies in Scottish Antiquity Presented to Stewart Cruden, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1984), 148-231.

Fawcett, Richard — "Ecclesiastical Architecture in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century," in Scotland in the Reign of Alexander III, ed Norman Reid, (Edinburgh, Donald, 1990), 148-80.

Fawcett, Richard — "Glasgow Cathedral", in Buildings of Scotland - Glasgow, in Elizabeth Williamson, (London, Penguin Books, 1990), 108-36.

Fawcett, Richard — "The Blackadder Aisle at Glasgow Cathedral : a reconsideration of the Architectural Evidence", PSAS, 115 (1985), 277-87.

Fawcett, Richard — "Medieval Churches of Glasgow and adjacent Areas", ARCH.J. 143 (1986), 3-6.

Fawcett, Richard — "Dunblane Cathedral", ARCH.J. 143 (1986), 20-2.

Ferguson, Peter — "The late Twelfth Century Rebuilding at Dundrennan Abbey", ANTIQ.J. 53 (1973), 232-43.

Folco, John di — "A Survey of medieval floor tiles in St Andrews Cathedral Museum and the Abbot's House, Arbroath Abbey", PSAS, 115 (1985), 289-95.

Geddes, William — "Notes on the restoration of King's College, Aberdeen", TAES, 2 (1890-93), 60-81.

Gem, Richard — "The Romanesque Cathedral of Winchester : Patron and Design in the Eleventh Century", BAA Conference Transactions 1980, VI (Medieval Art and Archeology at Winchester Cathedral, 1983).

Girdlestone, C. M. — "Thirteenth Century Gothic in England and Normandy - A Comparison", ARCH.J. 102 (1945), 111-33.

Godfrey, W. H. — "English Cloister Lavatories", ARCH.J. 106 supplement for year 1949 (1952), 91-7.

Gomme, Andor — "Glasgow Cathedral", ARCH.J. 143 (1986), 37-40.

Gordon, Alistair — "Paisley Abbey", ARCH.J. 143 (1986),

27-8.

Gow, Ian — "Design and Practice in British Architecture" in Studies in Architectural History Presented to Howard Colvin, ARCH.H. 27 (1984), 543-54.

Graham, Rose — "The English Province of the Order of Cluny", TRHS, 7 4th series, (1924), 98-130.

Graham, Rose — "The Priory of La Charité-sur-Loire and the Monastery of Bermondsey", JBAA, 32 (1926), 156-87.

Graham, Rose and Clapham, A. — "The Monastery of Cluny 910-1155", Archaeologia, 80 (1930), 143-78.

Graham, Rose — "The Church of the Cluniac Monastery of St Saviour at Bermondsey", JBAA, 2 3rd series (1937), 145-9.

Graham, Rose — "The Cluniac Priory of St. Martin des Champs, and its dependant Priories in England", JBAA, 11 3rd series (1948), 35-59.

Graham, Rose — "A History of the Buildings of the English Province of the Order of Cluny after the Suppression of some Priories and the General Dissolution of the Monasteries", JBAA, 15 3rd series (1952), 13-29.

Grant, Francis J. — "The Thistle Chapel", TSES, 14 (1948-54), 28.

Hannah, Ian C. — "The Penetration into Scotland of Late Gothic Forms", PSAS, 64 (6th series 4) (1930), 149-55.

Hannah, Ian C. — "The rise of Christian architecture", TSES, 10 (1930-33), 154-63.

Hannah, Ian C. — "Screens and Lofts in Scottish Churches", PSAS, 70 (1935-36), 181-201.

Haws, Charles H. — "Scottish Religious orders at the Reformation", RSCHS, 16 (1968), 203-26.

Hay, George — "The late Medieval Development of the High Kirk of St Giles", PSAS, 107 (1975-76), 242-60.

Helliwell, L — "Prittlewell Priory and the Church Site : based on a report to the Public Libraries and Museum Committee of County Borough of Southend-on-Sea", JBAA, 3rd series (1957-58).

Hillberry, Harry H. — "La Charité-sur-Loire", Speculum, 30 no 1 (1955), 1-14.

Hodgson, J. F. — "On the Difference of Plan alleged to exist between the churches of Austin Canons and those of Monks", ARCH.J. 41 (1884) 374-414; 42 (1885), 96-119, 215-46 & 440-68; 43 (1886), 53-74, 290-35 & 403-22.

Honeyman, John — "Glasgow Cathedral", JBAA, 45 (1889), 25-32.

Honeyman, John — "The Shrine of St Columba at Iona", TSES, 1 (1903-1906), 271-5.

Hope, W. StJ. — "The Architectural History of the Cluniac Priory of St Pancras at Lewes", ARCH.J. 41 (1874), 1-34.

Hope, W. StJ. — "Castleacre Priory", Norfolk Archaeology, 12 (1895), 105-57.

Hope, W. StJ. — "The Cluniac Priory of St Pancras at Lewes", Sussex Archaeological Collections, 49 (1906), 66-88.

Hoey, Lawrence — "Piers versus vault shafts in Early English Gothic Architecture", JSAH, 46 (1987), 241-64.

Howell, A. R. — "Paisley Abbey", TSES, 9 (1928-29), 141-2.

Howell, A. R. — "Paisley Abbey : Monastic and Reformed", TSES, 11 (1935-36), 145-54.

Howell, A. R. — "The Restored Abbey of Paisley : A Souvenir of the Dedication of the Choir, First December, 1928." (Blackwood, 1928 reprint).

Innes, Thomas — "Heraldry in Scottish Church Decoration", TSES, 9 (1933-36), 92-103.

Jacob, E. F. — "Notes on an English Cluniac Chronicle, Eng.H.R. 44 (1929), 93.

Johnson, Ian — "St Ailred and Paisley", IR, 4 (1953). 61.

Kelly, William — "Restoration of Dunblane Cathedral", TSAS, 2 (1890-93), 59-62.

Kerr, Henry F. — "Kinloss Abbey, Moray", TSES, 12 (1936-39), 61-4.

Knowles, David — "Some Developments in English Monastic Life 1216-1336", TRHS, 26 4th series (1944), 37-52.

Knoop, Douglas and Jones, G P — "Masons and apprenticeships in medieval England", ECON.H.R. 3 (1931-32), 346-66.

Krautheimer, R. — "Introduction to an Iconography of Medieval Architecture," JWCI, 5 (1942), 1-33.

Laing, Alexander — "Present Condition of Lindores Abbey", PSAS, 9 (1870-72), 208-12.

Lethaby, W. R. — "The Cloister of Southwark Priory and other early Cloisters", ARCH.J. 71 (1914), 155-160.

Lethaby, W. R. — "How Exeter was built", ARCH.R. 13 (1913), part I, 109-20; part II, 166-76.

Lewis, T. Hayter — "Scottish Mason's Marks compared with those of other Countries": JBAA, 14 (1888-89), 145-54.

Lindsay, Ian — "The restoration of Iona Abbey and Pluscarden Priory", TSES, 14 (1948-54), 7-17.

Lockett, R. B. — "A Catalogue of Romanesque Sculpture from the Cluniac Houses in England", JBAA, 24 3rd series (1971), 43-61.

Mackay, Reay Robertson- — "Recent Excavations at Thetford", MED. ARCH. 1 (1957), 96-104.

MacPherson, Norman — "On the Chapel and Ancient Buildings of King's College, Aberdeen", ARCH.SCOT. 5 (1890), 415-52.

MacRoberts, D. — "The medieval Scottish liturgy illustrated in surviving documents", TSES, 15 (1957-65), 24-40.

MacRoberts, D. "Notes on Scoto-Flemish artistic contacts", IR, 9 (1959), 91-6.

MacRoberts, D. "Material Destruction caused by the Scottish Reformation" IR, 10 (1959), 126-172.

McConnachie, G. "Dundrennan Abbey", TAES 2 (1890-93), 21-35.

McKay, Denis "The Four Heid Pilgrimages of Scotland", IR, 7 (1968), 76-7.

Malden, John "The Monastery of Paisley", Glasgow Archaeologocal Society Bulletin, 28 (Spring 1992).

Marghi, Raffaella "Monastic Reform and Cluniac Spirituality", in Cluniac Monastucism in the Central Middle Ages, Noreen Hunt, (London, MacMillan, 1971), 11-28.

Martin, A. R. "On the Topography of the Cluniac Abbey of St.Saviour Bermondsey", JBAA, 32 (1926), 192-228.

Micklethwaite, J. T. "Notes on the Abbey Buildings of Westminster", ARCH.J. 32 (1876), 15-48.

Miner, John N. "Joseph Robertson and the Scottish Middle Ages", IR, 32 (1981), 34-54.

Morris, Charles H. "Ecclesiology modern and historic", TSES, 15 (1957-65), 57-62.

Morris, Richard K. "The Development of later Gothic mouldings in England c.1250-1400", Part I, ARCH.H. 21 (1978), 25-57. Part II, ARCH.H. 22 (1979), 1-48.

Morris, Richard K. "An English Glossary of Medieval Mouldings: with an Introduction to Mouldings," JSAH, 25 (1992), 1-17.

Morison, John Brown- "Shaw of Sauchie", in Genealogical Notes anent some Ancient Scottish Families, (1884).

Oldrieve, W. T. "Holyrood Abbey Church", TSES, 3 (1909-12), 326-30.

Oldrieve, W. T. "The Ancient Roof of Glasgow

Cathedral - its Condition and Restoration", PSAS, 50 (1915-16), 155-72.

Paisley Abbey — Parish Magazine, (February, 1956)

Paisley Abbey — Report : Restoration of Paisley Abbey, (1898).

Perry, Canon — "Life and worship in four Shropshire monasteries", TSES, 8 (1924-27), 134-139.

Pevsner, Nikolaus — "Terms of Architectural Planning in the Middle Ages", JWCI, 5 (1942), 232-7.

Pevsner, Nikolaus — "The term architect in the Middle Ages", Speculum, 17 (1942), 549-62.

Primrose, James — "Glasgow Cathedral in the Thirteenth Century", PSAS, 52 (1917-18), 151-8.

Proceedings — "Report of visit to Monks Horton Priory", ARCH.J. 36 2nd series (1930), 314-317.

Proceedings — "Report of visit to Castleacre Priory", JBAA, 40 new series (1935), 55-6.

Radford, C. A. Raleigh- — "The Cluniac Priory of St James, Dudley", ANTIQ.J. 20 (1940), 449-59.

Richards, D. Hawkes — "The Chimney", JBAA, 24 (1961), 67-91.

Richardson, J. S. — "Altar Retables of Medieval Date in Scotland", PSAS, 52 (new series 2) (1928), 197-224.

Roberts, Eileen — "Moulding analysis and architectural research : the late Middle Ages", ARCH.H. 20 (1977), 5-13.

Robertson, Joseph — "Scottish Cathedrals and Abbeys", Quarterly Review, 80 no.169 (June 1849), 103-56.

Robertson, Joseph — "Sketch of the History of Architecture, Ecclesiastical and Secular, in Scotland prior to the Union, 1707," Mitchell Libra: Pamphlets, (Mitchell Library, 1856), 145-: ref. 33605-21.

Robin, Françoise — "Louis d'Anjou et le rayonnement d

l'art parisien (1360-1380)", J.MED.H. 12 (1986), 55-80.

Ross, Thomas "The Sculptures in St Mirren's Chapel, Paisley Abbey; also Incised Sepulchral Slabs, recently discovered in the Abbey Church, Paisley", PSAS, 35 (1901), 44-66.

Ross, Thomas "The west front of St Andrews", TSES, 8 (1924-27), 93-4; see frontispiece.

Ross, Thomas "The west front of Holyrood Abbey, TSES, 8 (1924-27), 162-3; see frontispiece.

Russell, Georgina "North Window of the Nine Altars Chapel, Durham Cathedral", BAA. Transactions for year 1977, III Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham 1980.

Scott, G. G. "The Transition from the Romanesque Style to the Pointed Style in England", ARCH.J. 32 (1875), 347-68.

Shelby, Ron R. "The role of the master mason in medieval England", Speculum, 39 (1964), 387-403.

Shelby, Ron R. "Medieval Masons' Templates", JSAH, 30 (1971), 140-54.

Simpson, W. Douglas "The Valliscaulian Priory at Beauly", Antiq.J. 35 (1955), 1-19.

Simpson, W. Douglas "Coldingham Priory", TSES, 14 (1950), 26-31.

Smith, David B. "Notes on the history of the church fabric as illustrated in Canon Law", TSES, 3 (1909-1912), 32-53.

Smith, John Alex "Notes on Melrose Abbey especially in reference to wall of the South Transept", PSAS, 2 (1855-6), 166-75.

Smith, R. J. L. ed. "Much Wenlock", in A Guide to Cathedrals and Greater Churches, (R. J. L. Smith, 1988).

Stell, Geoffrey "Architecture - The Changing Needs of Society", in Scottish society in the Fifteenth Century, Jennifer M. Brown, (London, Edward Arnold,

1977), 153-83.

Stretton, Grace — "Some Aspects of Medieval Travel", TRHS, 7 4th series (1924), 77-97.

Stevenson, Wendy B. — "The Monastic presence in Scottish Burghs in the Twelfth and Thirteenth centuries", SHR, 40 (Oct. 1981), 97-118.

Stevenson, Wendy B. — "Medieval Identification Marks and their survivals in Scotland", TGAS, 13 new series (1954), 103-23.

Tamir, Max M. — "The English Origin of the Flamboyant Style", Gazette des Beaux Arts, 29 series 6 (1946), 257-68.

Venables, Edmund — "The Architectural History of Lincoln Cathedral", ARCH.J. 40 (1883), 159-418.

Waddell, J. Jeffrey — "Bothwell Church and Castle", TSES, 3 (1909-12), 113-20.

Waddell, J. Jeffrey — "The reconstructed church of St Bride's, Bothwell", TSES, 12 (1936-39), 88-91.

Warmlow, Joseph — "Cluny : Silentia Claustra", in Benedict's Disciples, ed. D. H. Farmer, (London, Fowler Wright Books, 1980), 118-38.

Watson, David A. — "A rebuilt choir at Bordesley Abbey", JBAA, 132 (1979), 42-9.

White, T. P. — "Notes on the Priory Church of Beauly, Inverness-shire," PSAS, 3 (1868-70), 430-64.

Wilkie, James — "The abbey of Lindores", TSES, 8 (1924-1927), 95-109.

Willis, R. — "Description of the Ancient Plan of the Monastery of St Gall, in the Ninth Century", ARCH.J. (1848), 85-117.

Willis, R. — "The Archaeological History of the Monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury", Archaeologia Cantiana, 7 (1868), 1-206.

Wilson, Rowand A. — "About the Medieval Clergy", JBAA, 36 new series (1930), 89-108.

NEWSPAPERS.

Paisley Advertiser.

Renfrew Advertiser.

Paisley Daily Express.

Paisley Daily Express.

Paisley Herald.

Paisley Pictorial.

Paisley and Renfrew Gazette.

Paisley and Renfrew Standard.

The Bulletin.

The Glasgow Herald.

The Glasgow Herald. "Thomas Morow, Abbot of Paisley", Baxter, J. H., 12/1/1929.

Glasgow Saturday Post.

The Scotsman.

GLASGOW UNIVERSITY

Monument to John Hamilton
Last Abbot of Paisley, and
Archbishop of St. Andrews.